

*“We have known about it [The Hoax of the Twentieth Century] for some time. But we didn’t want to give it any publicity and help the sales. Now it’s too late; it’s out in the open and we have to face it squarely.”*

—Abbot A. Rosen, Chicago Executive Director, ADL, *Pittsburgh Press*, Jan. 26, 1977

First published in 1976, this slightly revised and enhanced edition of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* is the seminal work of “Holocaust” revisionism and still the most widely read on the subject.

In 502 pages of penetrating study and lucid commentary, Dr. Butz gives the reader a graduate course on the subject of the Jews of World War Two Europe – concluding not only that they were not virtually wiped out, but what’s more, that no evidence exists to date to confirm that there was ever any Hitler attempt to do so.

Chapter by solidly referenced chapter, Dr. Butz applies the scientist’s rigorous clinical technique to every cornerstone of the legend. He focuses on the post-war crimes trials where the prosecution’s false “evidence” was secured by coercion and even torture. He re-examines the very German records so long misrepresented; he critiques the European demographics, which do not allow for the loss of the “Six Million”; he re-evaluates the concept and technical feasibility of the “gas chambers” with some startling conclusions; and he separates the cold facts from the sheer tonnage of disinformation that has served as a formidable barrier to the truth since the end of WWII.

This is the book that has caused unprecedented shockwaves throughout the academic and political world. Its open sale has been banned in an increasing number of countries including Germany and Canada. It is a book violently denounced by those unable to refute its thesis – the most hysterical reactions to it coming from those whose own historical views cannot withstand the light of honest review.

Now in its third edition, five major supplements have been added to bring the reader up-to-date on the continuing “Holocaust” controversy and its impact almost everywhere World War Two is discussed. A best-seller by any meaningful standard, yet still ignored and maligned by the people who have known of it but have never even made the effort to read it, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* is a book you must read if you want a clear picture of the scope and magnitude of the historical cover-up of our age, who is behind it, and what can be done to put an end to it.

ISSN 1529-7748

ISBN 0-9679856-9-2



HOLOCAUST Handbooks Series  
Volume Seven  
Theses & Dissertations Press  
PO Box 257768  
Chicago, IL 60625, USA

Twentieth  
Century  
of the  
The Hoax  
Arthur R. Butz ·

Arthur R. Butz

# The Hoax

of the

# Twentieth Century

The Case Against the Presumed  
Extermination of European Jewry



THE HOAX OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY  
THE CASE AGAINST THE PRESUMED EXTERMINATION OF EUROPEAN JEWRY



# **The Hoax**

of the

# **Twentieth Century**

The Case  
Against the Presumed  
Extermination of European Jewry

**Arthur R. Butz**



**Theses & Dissertations Press**


**PO Box 257768, Chicago, Illinois 60625**

**September 2003**



## The Author

Arthur R. Butz was born and raised in New York City. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Electrical Engineering from M.I.T. and his Ph.D. in Control Sciences from the University of Minnesota in 1965. In 1966 he joined the faculty of Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences. Dr. Butz is the author of numerous technical papers.



### **HOLOCAUST Handbook Series, vol. 7:**

Arthur R. Butz:

*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.*

*The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry*  
3<sup>rd</sup> edition.

Chicago (Illinois): Theses & Dissertations Press,  
Imprint of Castle Hill Publishers, September 2003

ISBN: 0-9679856-9-2

ISSN: 1529-7748

© by Arthur R. Butz 1976, 2003

Distribution Australia/Asia: Peace Books, PO Box 3300,  
Norwood, 5067, Australia

Distribution Rest of World: Castle Hill Publishers  
UK: PO Box 118, Hastings TN34 3ZQ  
USA: PO Box 257768, Chicago, IL 60625

Set in Times New Roman.

[www.vho.org](http://www.vho.org)

[www.tadp.org](http://www.tadp.org)

# Table of Contents

Page

<b>Foreword to the 2003 Edition.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Acknowledgments .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Foreword.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>A Short Introduction to the Study of Holocaust Revisionism .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Trials, Jews and Nazis .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Trials and Doubts.....	23
How Many Jews?.....	27
Our Method, Argument, and Conclusion.....	33
The War Crimes Trials.....	34
<b>Chapter 2: The Camps.....</b>	<b>55</b>
Horror Scenes and ‘Extermination’ Camps .....	55
The Camps and Their End.....	57
The Industrial Role of Auschwitz.....	67
<b>Chapter 3: Washington and New York.....</b>	<b>73</b>
The Rubber Crisis of 1942.....	73
Auschwitz of Great Interest to Americans.....	77
The First ‘Extermination’ Claims and Washington.....	81
The First ‘Extermination’ Claims and New York .....	90
German Reactions.....	116
The War Refugee Board Report: Birth of the Auschwitz Legend .....	116
Rudolf Vrba .....	124
<b>Chapter 4: Auschwitz.....</b>	<b>129</b>
Structure of the Legend .....	129
The Höss ‘Confession’ .....	130
Contradictions at the Outset.....	133
When Did It Start?.....	135
The Alleged Gassings and Zyklon.....	135
Lines of Authority.....	139
Transports to Auschwitz .....	139
A Hospital for the People Being Exterminated?.....	141
“Special Treatment”.....	144
The Crematories .....	147
Back to the ‘Gas Chambers’ .....	154
Why in English? .....	157
The Role of Birkenau .....	157
Summary for Auschwitz .....	165
<b>Chapter 5: The Hungarian Jews.....</b>	<b>167</b>
The International Red Cross .....	167
1944 Propaganda .....	183
Where are the pictures? .....	187

Air Raids on Auschwitz: Rudolf Vrba Overreaches Himself .....	188
Documentary Evidence? .....	190
The Producers .....	200
What Happened in Hungary?.....	210
Can Anybody Believe such a Story?.....	212
<b>Chapter 6: Et Cetera.....</b>	<b>215</b>
More ‘Extermination’ Camps .....	215
Logic of Defense Testimonies .....	218
Josef Kramer, ‘Beast of Belsen’ .....	218
Hermann Göring <i>et al.</i> at the IMT .....	220
Oswald Pohl at Nuremberg.....	225
Adolf Eichmann.....	226
West German Trials .....	229
Precedents for the Trials? .....	232
Torture?.....	233
Adolf Hitler .....	236
Heinrich Himmler.....	237
Joseph Goebbels .....	241
The <i>Einsatzgruppen</i> .....	241
<b>Chapter 7: The Final Solution .....</b>	<b>251</b>
The German Policy and the Wannsee Conference.....	251
Numbers Deported: Whence and Whither.....	264
The Polish Ghettos.....	269
What Happened to Them? .....	271
Zionism Again .....	277
Migration to the USA .....	282
Recapitulation.....	285
J. G. Burg .....	286
Conclusions .....	287
Himmler Nailed it Perfectly .....	287
<b>Chapter 8: Remarks.....</b>	<b>289</b>
Miscellaneous Objections.....	289
Postwar Germany and Willy Brandt .....	292
The Talmud.....	294
Credentials.....	297
Other Matters.....	298
Some Implications .....	299
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>303</b>
Appendix A: The “Statement” .....	303
Appendix B: SS Ranks .....	317
Appendix C: Deportation of Jews.....	319
Appendix D: The Belsen Trial.....	325
Appendix E: The Role of the Vatican .....	345

<b>Supplements.....</b>	<b>365</b>
Supplement 1: The International Holocaust Controversy.....	365
Supplement 2: Context and Perspective in the Holocaust Controversy.....	379
Supplement 3: A Response to a Major Critique of Holocaust Revisionism.....	409
Supplement 4: Zyklon B and Gas Detectors in Birkenau Crematorium II ....	431
Supplement 5: <i>Vergasungskeller</i> .....	443
<b>Illustrations.....</b>	<b>449</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>484</b>
<b>Index.....</b>	<b>492</b>

## Foreword to the 2003 Edition

My investigations of the Jewish “Holocaust” commenced in 1972, and twenty seven years have passed since the first publication of this book in 1976 in England as *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Twenty six years have passed since the release of the slightly revised second British and first American edition of 1977. This text consists of the last, preceded by a short article I wrote for the student newspaper at Northwestern University in 1991<sup>1</sup> and followed by five supplements representing writings from 1979-1997. There is also an addendum to Appendix E (“The Role of the Vatican”), consisting of the obituary/tribute I wrote on Rev. Robert A. Graham. All were published in the *Journal of Historical Review*. Also Appendix A on Kurt Gerstein, has been revised somewhat.

I am proud that this book remains of interest to anybody a quarter century after publication. Nevertheless, the age of this text, and the great advances that have subsequently occurred in Holocaust revisionism, require some comments on the value of the book to today’s reader. How can a quarter century old text not be obsolete today? What does today’s reader gain from it? Would it not be better to revise this text to take into account more recent developments?

From the perspective of today, the book has defects, and several people, of whom I am one, could now do better. In admitting such defects, I can plead that I was one man working with little help. Except for Wilhelm Stäglich, the correspondents I had before publication in 1976 were not then, and have not subsequently become, significant in revisionist work. The literature of revisionist orientation was scanty. Some of it was rubbish that constituted a minor nuisance. On the positive side were Paul Rassinier, Thies Christophersen, and Wilhelm Stäglich. At that time the writings of Rassinier, a former political prisoner at Buchenwald, were of interest both as a primary source, relating personal experiences, and as historical exposition (today Rassinier is of interest only as a primary source). Christophersen and Stäglich, Germans who had been stationed near Auschwitz, were of value only as primary sources, although Stäglich later wrote a book of historical exposition. Even taking these three into account, the historical complex was not there, as I shall explain below.

A common complaint about this work has been that I am not a trained historian or history professor. It is, however, not unusual for people who are not academic historians to make contributions to history. The great American historian Francis Parkman was no history professor; he had only a brief academic appointment as Professor of Horticulture at Harvard. The late Arnaldo Momigliano urged wariness of academic historians and pointed out that none of the three leading nineteenth century historians of the ancient world was a history professor, e.g. Mommsen was a Professor of Law.<sup>2</sup>

However, such examples do not satisfactorily illustrate the fact that history has

<sup>1</sup> Rhodes, 347. *Daily Northwestern*, May 13, 1991, correction May 14.

<sup>2</sup> A. Momigliano, “History in an Age of Ideologies,” *American Scholar*, Autumn 1982, pp. 495-507.

a closer relationship to popular culture than most other academic disciplines. This is easily clarified and proved. In the major book reviews (*New York Times*, *New York Review*, etc.) one can find reviews of, and advertisements for, many works on the leading edge of historical research, *i.e.* works not specifically written for popular readership. No such attention is given to leading edge works in electrical engineering and most other academic disciplines. Many intelligent laymen can read such historical works with comprehension. If many can read them, then some can write them. I could give reasons for this relatively popular status of serious history study, but it would carry us too far afield. In any case, there is no venality on the part of academic historians in approving of such popular promotion of their books.

Such observations show, however, that there is hypocrisy in their common implication, when denouncing Holocaust revisionism, that only people with their kinds of Ph.D. degrees are competent to deal with historical issues.

The style of my book is certainly not elegant. I believe my style has improved much since then but, like most men with a technical education, my style remains at best dry and not elegant. It was, however, good enough to do the job. I have even sometimes wondered if elegance of style might be incompatible with a subject as dreary as the present one.

It is not immodest for me to say that mine is the best book of its type, because it is the only book of its type. To compare my book to others, the approach of mine is horizontal, the others vertical. Subsequent investigators have taken specific subjects and gone more deeply into them than I did. Such vertical approaches should be contrasted with my horizontal. I attempted to cover every reasonably relevant aspect of the problem. The question of the existence of gas chambers was only one of many. I tried to show what did happen as well as what did not. I showed the relevance of the Zionist and related movements. I discussed the Allied policies and the Jewish influences in them. My use of sources (*e.g.* the Nuremberg trials, Red Cross reports, Vatican documents, contemporary newspaper accounts) today seems obvious but it was not then. To aid in comprehending the early war crimes trials, I gave witchcraft trials as a useful precedent.

I claim an additional contribution of this book that may seem ridiculous on its face. I treated the German concentration camps as specific institutions that existed in specific locations, with the alleged events that took place in them taking place, if at all, in real space and real time, together with other events that happened simultaneously in those same camps or in real space. By "real space" I mean a space that we all exist in so that, whatever happened at Auschwitz, it happened at the same time President Roosevelt held meetings in Washington, and I as a child went to school, etc., and in the same space.

That is so obvious that it may seem preposterous for me to present it as an original perspective, but please hear me out. My impression of the extant literature was that the events claimed there may as well be imagined as having taken place on Mars, if at all, so absent was a concern for the broader context. As I reminded readers on page 210:

*"There was a war going on during World War II."*

Consider my presentation of Auschwitz, the principal alleged “extermination camp”. I started by describing Auschwitz as a camp that performed functions similar to those performed by typical German camps that are not claimed to have been extermination camps; I outlined those functions and I presented a map showing where the German camps were. Then I described Auschwitz in its unique respects and showed, why the Allies would have been interested in events transpiring at Auschwitz. I presented pictures of crematorium ovens at Auschwitz and other camps. I presented a map of the Auschwitz region and a plan of the “Birkenau” section of the Auschwitz camp. That plan and the various maps showed the reader exactly where, in Europe, Poland, and at Auschwitz, the great gas chambers were supposed to have been located. Then I considered one of the specific groups of Jews, the Hungarian Jews, not only from the point of view of allegations of events in German camps but from the point of view of events in Hungary. That is, for me the problem of the Hungarian Jews was as much a problem of what happened in Hungary as what happened at Auschwitz. Even in considering events at Auschwitz, I chose to place my perspective elsewhere, among the Allies who, at the time in question, were very interested in Auschwitz as an industrial bombing target and would have photographed the camp for that purpose.

The photographs were produced almost three years after publication of my book and confirmed my conclusions, but that is not the point that I am now trying to emphasize. My point is that, as unlikely as it may seem, my method of placing Auschwitz in its general historical context was essentially unique in this historical area. True, some of what I said in that respect is to be found in earlier books that purported to relate how the “exterminations” transpired, but in scattered bits and pieces that were usually incidental to those accounts. Even so, much had to be culled from diverse sources. For example, though it seems obvious that any useful discussion of the Auschwitz problem required a map of the Auschwitz region and of the Birkenau camp, the former had to be constructed by me from several sources and the latter had to be lifted, not from one of the standard “Holocaust” books such as those by Hilberg or Reitlinger, but from a book about a German trial of Auschwitz personnel that took place in 1963-5. Hilberg, Reitlinger, and similar authors were very stingy with maps and pictures, except in books specifically devoted to presenting pictures. We can say, with only minor oversimplification, that they would sell you a book of pictures or a book of text, but not one book integrating the two in any useful way.

I believe my analysis provoked investigations of specific problems, even when such influence was not acknowledged. My implied skepticism about the reality of the mysterious “German industrialist” who in 1942, according to the World Jewish Congress, passed along information that a plan to exterminate the Jews had been discussed in Hitler’s headquarters, may have provoked the later investigations attempting to determine his identity. Walter Laqueur and Richard Breitman, in *Breaking the Silence*, 1986, unconvincingly proposed Eduard Schulte. I also stressed the inaction of the Allies with respect to Auschwitz, which Laqueur (*The Terrible Secret*, 1980) and Martin Gilbert (*Auschwitz and the Allies*, 1981) tried without success to explain.

The existence and relevance of the 1944 aerial reconnaissance photos of Auschwitz were, to the best of my knowledge, first argued in my book.<sup>3</sup> I also believe that my book provoked, perhaps through some intermediary, the 1979 release of these photos by the CIA, but again such influence is not admitted.

I analyzed the specifics of the alleged extermination process at Auschwitz. I showed that all of the specific material facts required a dual interpretation of relatively mundane facts, e.g. transports, selections, showers, shaving hair, Zyklon B, crematoria, etc., all real and all relatively mundane, had been given a second interpretation. That insight scarcely merits the label today, but it did then. It has been the main paradigm for all subsequent revisionist writing on Auschwitz and other alleged “extermination camps”. It may seem very simple and obvious after one reads this book; it certainly was not when I wrote it. The reader is shown what sorts of questions he should ask if he wants to go further. Those who have studied the development of ideas understand that the right answers are not attainable until the right questions are formulated (yes, questions can be right or wrong). This book, even today, shows how to do that.

I consider my book generally “right” even today in the sense of how the historical parts fit together, and they fit perfectly without major or fundamental mysteries. Contrast the gyrations of the typical historians who have nothing but mysteries. How and when was an order to exterminate given? Was such an order given at all? Why didn’t the Allies recognize what was (allegedly) happening at Auschwitz? Why didn’t the Pope forthrightly condemn physical extermination, even after the German had been driven out of Rome? Why didn’t the Allied press give greater prominence to reports of extermination of Jews, rather than bury them in the back pages of the larger newspapers?

This horizontal analysis remains unique in the revisionist literature. The book presented a historical complex that remains valid today. The book made specialized studies easier because investigators did not have to worry about coherence of the larger picture; they could direct a curious person to my book. I did a good enough job for that, even if not a perfect job. The proof is that, among revisionists, defects of the book are certainly seen, but, unfortunately, there seems to be no great demand for an improved integrated work of comparable scope and no aspiring author in view.

An example. You want to discuss the question of gas chambers at Auschwitz. My old book won’t help if you want to be current, and there would not necessarily be any reason to cite it. There are much more recent and conclusive writings, but I could not imagine a person securely venturing into such a controversy without having a grasp of the general historical complex, as provided in my book. Thus, I cannot imagine contemporary Holocaust revisionism existing without a book such as mine, even if it is never necessary to cite it today.

---

<sup>3</sup> There is an unconfirmed and disputed claim that U.S. Army Capt. Jacob Javits (later U.S. Senator) used the photos, in 1944, to argue for bombing Auschwitz. See letters in the New York Jewish weekly *Forward*, 23 Feb. 2001, p. 10, and 6 April 2001, p. 16. If the claim is true, the photos were forgotten until I argued, in my 1976 book, that they had to exist. I am inclined to think the claim is not true.



It is still the only book of this sort. A better one would be nice but there are two problems that occur to me. First such a book, if written from the point of view of our knowledge today, would not fit into a single volume. This explains why I reject the idea of trying to bring this book up to date. Such a project would quickly run away from “updating”, resulting in an entirely new work. Any attempt to respect the original content and organization of the book would be a handicap in the updating project. The best single volume for bringing the reader up to date on revisionist scholarship is a compilation of papers by many people, not an integrated work.<sup>4</sup>

Second, a paradox: a weakness of the book explains some of its strength. From the present point of view, there seems much in the book that is awkwardly presented. This is because I did not write this book as an expert. The book was written as works of research normally are: I was myself struggling to understand, as would an intelligent and serious reader. Thus, the book expresses a relationship of common perspective, and therefore implicit mutual empathy, between author and reader that could not exist in a new book, written today from a position of expertise and directed at a neophyte reader, which is the only relationship possible today. I believe this explains the occasional overwhelming effect the book has. From this point of view the book is still contemporary, as well as “right”, and ought not undergo major revision.

For these reasons, I have rejected any idea of “updating” this book. Rather, several later writings from 1979 on have been provided here, as specified above.

That this book is still valuable today is due to the distortions and misrepresentations that have continued to issue from the media and academe, resulting in millions of people so uninformed that a viewpoint of 1976 is a great revelation for them in 2003.

I consider this book as successful as could have been judiciously hoped under the circumstances, but it is important to view it as one of the successes in the phenomenon of Holocaust revisionism, for which no single person, or set of specific persons, can take credit. It seems to me to be just something that was timely and had to develop and that I was just a part of this development. I discussed this in my paper reproduced as Supplement 1, but to try to make my point clearer, let me emphasize that the Jews have played a very important role in this development; they must take some of the credit. It was they who chose, in 1977, to spread the news of this obscure book to the most remote corners of the universe. Who could have imagined such massive publicity for a book from an unknown publisher, written by an unknown author, and only barely available in the USA? They have used their powerful positions in the media to keep the subject of “Holocaust” uppermost in the minds of the populace; we get it for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. The present “Holocaustomania”, which younger readers may believe has been a

---

<sup>4</sup> Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust: The Growing Critique of “Truth” and “Memory”*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Theses & Dissertations Press, PO Box 257768, Chicago, IL 60625, USA, 2003. Expanded version of the text originally published as *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte: Ein Handbuch über strittige Fragen des 20. Jahrhunderts*, by Ernst Gauss (ed. = Germar Rudolf), Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen, 1994. Probably not available from Grabert now, but available from T&DP.

permanent feature of our public affairs since World War II, can be fairly said to have started with the 1978 NBC-TV “docudrama” *Holocaust*. Only Jewish groups (either formally Jewish or having a largely Jewish membership), on the campus of Northwestern University, have maintained students’ interest in my work on the “Holocaust”. Such mutual dependency only holds for things that had to happen.

When I wrote this book, there were perhaps a half dozen serious Holocaust revisionist researchers (most not known by me). Today there are too many for me to even try to list, and readers of contemporary Holocaust revisionist literature in all languages certainly number in the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions.

There are many back-handed compliments to our success. Perhaps the most conspicuous is the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. A February 1992 funds appeal for it, signed by “National Campaign Chairman” Miles Lerman, named “revisionists” as those whom the museum would “counter”. The Museum formally opened in April 1993 with the “Intent on refuting revisionist attempts to diminish the scope of the Holocaust”.<sup>5</sup> As if that weren’t enough, the 104th Congress passed, without dissent, a resolution making only two points: it “deplores” revisionism and “commends the vital, ongoing work of the [...] Museum.”<sup>6</sup> That silly Museum is an ironic monument to Holocaust revisionism.<sup>7</sup>

The Museum will not be the last such monument. In 1996, Jewish Senators Barbara Boxer and Arlen Specter handed Jewish movie director Steven Spielberg a check representing a \$1 million federal grant for his “Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation” (a project of videotaping accounts of “survivors” – “Shoah” is the Hebrew word used in place of “Holocaust”). Specter motivated the grant in terms of opposing the considerable success of revisionists.<sup>8</sup>

A more recent example is the projected Holocaust Memorial in Berlin. A July 2001 advertisement, appealing for funds, raised the danger of revisionism.<sup>9</sup>

Revisionist apostasy has been rare. It has been most visible in cases where some public figure who was not actually a revisionist made public remarks supportive of revisionism. A 1996 example was Abbé Pierre, a sort of French Mother Teresa (although more active in public affairs) who, despite his quick recantation of his revisionist remarks, will never be forgiven by his former friends.<sup>10</sup> This epi-

---

<sup>5</sup> *Chicago Tribune*, 23 April 1993, sec. 1, p. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Senate resolution 193 passed 9 Nov. 1995, and House resolution 316 passed 16 April 1996.

<sup>7</sup> Perhaps the most telling point is that the Museum, after so much promotion and millions spent, has failed to depict a homicidal gas chamber. Robert Faurisson has commented on this and related his humorous encounter with the Museum’s director, Dr. Michael Berenbaum. *Journal of Historical Review*, Jan./Feb. 1994, p. 23; Nov./Dec. 1994, p. 4.

<sup>8</sup> *Boston Globe*, 24 July 1996, p. A6. Spielberg got into “Shoah business” (from an American expression – “there’s no business like show business”) via his *Schindler’s List* movie, which also failed to depict a gassing or homicidal gas chamber. On the basis of his other movies and other scenes in this one, I could not attribute the failure to squeamishness on Spielberg’s part. He is a good enough showman to have realized that a complete depiction of a gassing via Zyklon B, faithful to the legend and to physical possibility, would have been far too preposterous even for him. The Jewish worker who was shot for exceeding her assigned tasks was routine rubbish, but the gassing would have been too much.

<sup>9</sup> *NY Times*, 18 July 2001, p. A6.

<sup>10</sup> *NY Times*, 1 May 1996, p. A6. *Boston Globe*, 23 July 1996, p. A5.

sode is one of many that illustrate the handicaps that Holocaust revisionism has labored under.

A final proof, if needed, of our success is the fact of laws passed in recent years, in several European countries, criminalizing the publication of revisionist views on the Holocaust. Such literature circulated freely in Europe until the present revisionist movement started making its impact in the late 70s. In the United States we are still free of state suppression, although there is considerable whining in some quarters about “First Amendment absolutism”. Here the repression works largely by extra-legal means of intimidation and reprisal. For example, Fred Leuchter was the leading execution technologist in the USA when he published his famous 1988 report on the alleged Auschwitz gas chambers.<sup>11</sup> Since then, his business has been ruined and his marriage destroyed. All such developments are of course back-handed and evil tributes to the success of Holocaust revisionism. Even the most naive reader will see the point: they don’t want you to know these things! They are trying to hold back the wind.

We are successful, but we have a long way to go, as the brute strength of the dying monster is considerable.

Evanston, Illinois  
June 2003

---

<sup>11</sup> S. Lehman, “A Matter of Engineering,” *Atlantic Monthly*, Feb. 1990, pp. 26-29. Also see the letters in the May issue; Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto 1988; for an update on this issue, see Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report. Expert Report on Chemical and Technical Aspects of the ‘Gas Chambers’ of Auschwitz*, Theses & Dissertations Press, PO Box 257768, Chicago, IL 60625, USA, 2003.

# Acknowledgments

A number of individuals contributed valuable suggestions and critiques which are reflected in the text of this book, but of course the responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation, if such be found, is entirely my own. I also wish to reserve for myself any problems that may arise on account of the reaction to this book, and for this reason I refrain from making the applicable personal acknowledgments here.

Institutional acknowledgments are made to the U.S. National Archives, the U.S. Army Audio-visual Agency, and the Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center of the U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC, to the Panstwowe Museum, Oświęcim, and to the Library of the University of Chicago, and the Center for Research Libraries, Chicago.

Special acknowledgment is made to the staffs of the Imperial War Museum, London, the national office of the Netherlands Red Cross, The Hague, and the Library of Northwestern University (especially the inter-library loan department), Evanston, all of whom contributed more than routine services without, of course, being aware of the exact nature of the research involved.

A.R. Butz



# Foreword

In common with virtually all Americans, who have had their opinions formed since the end of World War II, I had, until not very long ago, assumed that Germany had given the world a particularly murderous outburst during World War II. This view has ruled Western opinion since 1945 and earlier, and I was no exception in accepting the essentials of it.

An important qualification in the preceding is the term “essentials,” for the collection of crimes of which the Germans were supposedly guilty in World War II grows rapidly smaller as one examines the evidence and arguments assembled in readily available “revisionist” books. An elementary critical examination reveals that most of the crimes that are real even in the minds of “intellectuals” (e.g. lampshades manufactured by some Germans from the skins of human beings killed in concentration camps for the purpose) obviously had no basis in fact. Likewise with legends about mistreatment of American and British prisoners of war. Moreover, the general problem is elaborated considerably when one weighs, as the revisionists do, the appalling wartime and postwar brutalities of the Western Allies.

Such an investigation does not overturn the “Holocaust” legend, however, and the “six million” Jews murdered, mainly in “gas chambers,” can seem immovable fact. The revisionist books which overturn some of the most popular misconceptions seem to accept the gas chambers as factual. All educated opinion that the investigator consults accepts the “extermination” story. Professors of history who have specialized in Germany, if asked, seem to consider the charge as established as the Great Pyramid. Liberal and conservative publicists, though they have very different attitudes toward World War II and America’s entry into it, and though they squabble with each other on almost everything else, close ranks on the reality of the “Holocaust.” Noting the obvious ways in which this legend is exploited in contemporary politics, notably in connection with the completely illogical support that the U.S. extends to Israel, I had long had lingering doubts about it, and there was also the fact that there existed a small number of respected observers whose views had not been formed entirely after World War II and who, in the very limited channels open to them and with various degrees of explicitness, denied even the approximate truth of the legend. A good example is the distinguished American scholar John Beaty, who was called to active duty in the military Intelligence Service of the War Department General Staff just before the entry of the U.S. into the war and attained the rank of Colonel by the end of the war. Among other things, Beaty was one of the two editors of the daily secret “G-2 Report,” which was issued each noon to give persons in high places, including the White House, the world picture as it existed four hours earlier. In his book *Iron Curtain Over America*, published in 1951, he ridiculed the six million legend with a few remarks that were unfortunately brief and inconclusive, but, coming from a man who was one of the best informed in the world during the war, carried some amount of authority.

Elementary investigation into the question, of the sort the non-historian cus-

tomarily does, led me nowhere. The meager amount of literature in the English language which denied the truth of the legend was not only unconvincing; it was so unreliable and unscrupulous in the employment of sources, when sources were employed, that it had a negative effect, so that the case for the truth of the essentials of the legend (disregarding quantitative problems, e.g., whether it was six million or four million or only three million) seemed strengthened. At the time I became aware that there existed additional literature in French and German but, being quite unaccustomed to reading texts in those languages except on rare occasions when I consulted a paper in a French or German mathematics journal, I did not undertake to acquire copies of the foreign language literature.

Moreover, I assumed that if such literature was worth more than what was being published in English, somebody would have published English translations.

Still possessing my lingering doubts I sat down, early in 1972, and started to read some of the "Holocaust" literature itself rather more systematically than I had previously, in order to see just what claims were made in this connection and on what evidence. Fortunately, one of my first choices was Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews*. The experience was a shock and a rude awakening, for Hilberg's book did what the opposition literature could never have done. I not only became convinced that the legend of the several million gassed Jews must be a hoax, but I derived what turned out to be a fairly reliable "feel" for the remarkable cabalistic mentality that had given the lie its specific form (those who want to experience the "rude awakening" somewhat as I did may stop here and consult pp. 567-571 of Hilberg<sup>12</sup>).

Although my long-lingering skepticism in regard to the legend was no longer on the defensive, my information could not, early in 1972, be considered conclusive, and my knowledge of the subject was not comprehensive, so I set out, at first in my "spare time," to investigate the subject with the thoroughness that was required.

The reader will have surmised that my "spare time" eventually expanded considerably.

Several – for me startling – discoveries made the subject irresistible in a purely intellectual sense. I acquired the foreign language literature. Ultimately, I spent the entire summer of 1972 working on an exposé of the hoax, since by then I had penetrated and demolished the whole sorry mess. While the book you are holding differs considerably in quantity of factual content and general quality from the picture I had formed by the summer of 1972, that picture, whose essentials are transmitted here, was in such overwhelming contradiction to the lies that Western society had equipped me with, that my attention could not be drawn from the subject by any appeal to prudence or any such practical calculation. Because even early in the summer of 1972, it was evident that my research had carried the subject beyond the existing literature, I felt an inescapable obligation and an intellectual imperative to put forward for society's evaluation what I knew about this most pernicious hoax. It quickly became clear that only a book would do; the sub-

---

<sup>12</sup> Vol. 3, pp. 885-890 in the "revised and definitive edition" of 1985. Editor's note: Cf. J. Graf, *The Giant with Feet of Clay*.

ject could not, given the years of propaganda, be treated in a research paper or pamphlet and, *a fortiori*, it could not be treated in the form of a lecture.

The body of a text was written in the summer of 1972, and then the manuscript was gradually improved in the course of the next two years. A trip to Europe in the summer of 1973 was very rewarding, as was a trip to Washington later in the year. The book was essentially finished in late 1974.

There will be those who will say that I am not qualified to undertake such a work and there will even be those who will say that I have no right to publish such things. So be it.

If a scholar, regardless of his specialty, perceives that scholarship in acquiescing, from whatever motivation, in a monstrous lie, then it is his duty to expose the lie, whatever his qualifications. It does not matter that he collides with all “established” scholarship in the field, although that is not the case here, for a critical examination of the “holocaust” has been avoided by academic historians in all respects and not merely in the respect it is treated in this book. That is, while virtually all historians pay some sort of lip service to the lie, when it comes up in books and papers on other subjects, none has produced an academic study arguing, and presenting the evidence for, either the thesis that the exterminations did take place or that they did not take place. If they did take place then it should be possible to produce a book showing how it started and why, by whom it was organized and the line of authority in the killing operations, what the technical means were and that those technical means did not have some sort of more mundane interpretation (*e.g.* crematories), who the technicians involved were, the numbers of victims from the various lands and the timetables of their executions, presenting the evidence on which these claims are based together with reasons why one should be willing to accept the authenticity of all documents produced at illegal trials. No historians have undertaken anything resembling such a project; only non-historians have undertaken portions.

With these preliminary remarks, therefore, I invite your study of the hoax of your century.

Evanston, Illinois  
August 1975





# A Short Introduction to the Study of Holocaust Revisionism

*First published in the Daily Northwestern, May 13, 1991, correction May 14.*

I see three principal reasons for the widespread but erroneous belief in the legend of millions of Jews killed by the Germans during World War II: U.S. and British troops found horrible piles of corpses in the west German camps they captured in 1945 (*e.g.* Dachau and Belsen), there are no longer large communities of Jews in Poland, and historians generally support the legend.

During both world wars Germany was forced to fight typhus, carried by lice in the constant traffic with the east. That is why all accounts of entry into the German concentration camps speak of shaving of hair, showering, and other delousing procedures, such as treatment of quarters with the pesticide Zyklon. That was also the main reason for a high death rate in the camps and the crematories that existed in all.

When Germany collapsed in chaos, then of course all such defenses ceased, and typhus and other diseases became rampant in the camps, which quartered mainly political prisoners, ordinary criminals, homosexuals, conscientious objectors, and Jews conscripted for labor. Hence the horrible scenes, which however had nothing to do with “extermination” or any deliberate policy. Moreover, the west German camps involved were not the alleged “extermination camps”, which were all in Poland (*e.g.* Auschwitz and Treblinka) and which were all evacuated or shut down before capture by the Soviets, who found no such scenes.

The “Final Solution” spoken of in the German documents was a program of evacuation, resettlement, and deportation of Jews with the ultimate objective of expulsion from Europe. During the war, Jews of various nationalities were being moved east, as one stage in this Final Solution. The legend claims that the movements were mainly for extermination purposes.

The great majority of the millions allegedly exterminated were east European, not German or west European, Jews. For that reason study of the problem via population statistics has been difficult to impossible, but it is a fact that there are no longer large communities of Jews in Poland. However, the Germans were only one of several parties involved in moving Jews around. The Soviets deported virtually all of the Jews of eastern Poland to their interior in 1940. After the war, with Polish and other Jews pouring out of the east into occupied west Germany, the Zionists moved large numbers to Palestine, and the U.S. and other countries absorbed many Jews, in most cases under conditions making impossible a numerical accounting. Moreover, the Polish borders were changed drastically at the end of the war; the country was literally moved west.

Historians generally support the legend, but there are precedents for nearly incomprehensible blindness on the part of scholars. For example, throughout the Middle Ages even the Pope’s political enemies conceded his false claim that the

4th century Emperor Constantine had ceded rule of the west to the Pope, although all knew very well that Constantine had been succeeded by more emperors. Near unanimity among the academics is especially suspect when there exist great political pressures; in some countries Holocaust revisionists have been prosecuted.

It is easy to show that the extermination legend merits skepticism. Even the casual reader of the Holocaust literature knows that during the war virtually nobody acted as though it was happening. Thus, it is common to berate the Vatican, the Red Cross, and the Allies (especially the intelligence agencies) for their ignorance and inaction, and to explain that the Jews generally did not resist deportation because they did not know what was in store for them. If you add all this up you have the strange claim that for almost three years German trains, operating on a continental scale in densely civilized regions of Europe, were regularly and systematically moving millions of Jews to their deaths, and nobody noticed except for a few of our Jewish leaders who were making public “extermination” claims.

On closer examination, even those few Jewish leaders were not acting as though it was happening. Ordinary communications between the occupied and neutral countries were open, and they were in contact with the Jews whom the Germans were deporting, who thus could not have been in ignorance of “extermination” if those claims had any validity.

This incredible ignorance must also be attributed to Hans Oster’s department in German military intelligence, correctly labeled “the veritable general staff of the opposition to Hitler” in a recent review.

What we are offered in evidence was gathered after the war, in trials. The evidence is almost all oral testimony and “confessions.” Without the evidence of these trials there would be no significant evidence of “extermination”. One must pause and ponder this carefully. Were trials needed to determine that the Battle of Waterloo happened? The bombings of Hamburg, Dresden, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki? The slaughter in Cambodia?

Yet this three year program, of continental scope, claiming millions of victims, required trials to argue its reality. I am not arguing that the trials were illegal or unfair; I am arguing that such historical logic as the legend rests on must not be countenanced. Such events cannot happen without generating commensurate and evidence for their reality, just as a great forest fire cannot take place without producing smoke. One may as well believe that New York City was burned down, if confessions to the deed can be produced.

Detailed consideration of the specific evidence put forward in support of the legend has been a focus of the revisionist literature, but I shall mention one point here. The claim of the legend is that there were no technical means provided for the specific task of extermination, and that means originally provided for other purposes did double duty in improvised arrangements. Thus, the Jews were allegedly gassed with the pesticide Zyklon, and their corpses disappeared into the crematories along with the deaths from “ordinary” causes (the ashes or other remains of millions of victims never having been found).

Surely any thoughtful person must be skeptical.

# Chapter 1: Trials, Jews and Nazis

## Trials and Doubts

The “war crimes trials,” which the victors in World War II conducted, mainly of Germans but also of many Japanese, were precedent-shattering in their scope and in the explicitness of the victorious powers’ claims to some sort of legal jurisdiction in respect of laws or understandings, which did not exist at the time they were allegedly broken by the Axis powers. Thus, in disregard of European honor conventions, which had been respected for centuries, German civilian and military prisoners, many of the highest rank, met violent deaths while in Allied captivity as a supposed consequence of these extraordinary proceedings.

Nothing resembling the trials of 1945-1949, which were conducted by the war-time enemies of Germany, has ever occurred before. The case of Joan of Arc comes to mind, but that involved a solitary prisoner, not an entire state, and the English who were, in the last analysis, responsible for the trial did everything to make the issue appear to be one of heresy and witchcraft, already formally proscribed, to be decided by an impartial and universal church according to pre-existing rules of evidence and procedure.

In the United States, the real progenitor of the trials, opinion on the appropriateness of having conducted such trials has always been divided, but the balance has varied. In the immediate post-war period, opinion generally favored the trials with, however, some significant voices in opposition. In the middle of the heated election campaign of 1946, just before the major Nazis Göring, Ribbentrop *et al.* were to be hanged, Senator Robert A. Taft delivered a speech attacking both the legal basis for the trials and the sentences which had been imposed; his speech seems to have hurt his Republican Party in those elections.

A decade later, views had evidently changed somewhat, since at that time the then obvious presidential candidate John F. Kennedy published a book, *Profiles in Courage* (a survey of various people whom Senator Kennedy thought courageous), in which he commended Taft for taking this stand, adding that Taft’s views “are shared [...] by a substantial number of American citizens today.”<sup>13</sup>

With the Eichmann abduction in 1960 and subsequent “trial” and with the associated later publicity, opinion seemed to move again, however slowly, toward approval of the trials. Many reasons may be offered for this extraordinary reversal, but it seems to me that what had happened was that in a peacetime, generally non-hysterical atmosphere the world’s attention had been focused on one tale of a peculiarly macabre sort: the killing, mainly in “gas chambers,” of several (usual

---

<sup>13</sup> Kennedy, 216-219; 236-239 in Memorial Edition.

figure, six) million Jews of all ages and conditions by the Nazis during the war, as part of a program of ridding Europe of Jewry. Gerald Reitlinger's *The Final Solution*, 2nd edition (1968), is generally accepted as the most detailed and useful presentation of this claim, and Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews* (1961) tells essentially the same story. Other writings are Nora Levin's *The Holocaust* (1968), several books by Léon Poliakov, and *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945*, by Lucy S. Dawidowicz (1975).

Returning to the problem of the appropriateness of the war crimes trials, everybody would agree as to the (at least) shaky legal foundations of the trials, but apparently many people would go along with the claim that the trials were appropriate anyway because normal wartime excesses were not involved; the extraordinary nature of the crime, the extermination of the European Jews, called for extraordinary proceedings. Such cruelty must not only be punished but documented as well, the argument goes.

I do not propose in this book to settle the question of what degree of cruelty justifies what degree of legal irregularity. Rather, a rarely heard point, which is at least relevant to the debate, is insisted upon here: It is a fact that without the evidence generated at these trials, there would be no significant evidence that the program of killing Jews ever existed at all. One has only to examine the sources employed by Hilberg and by Reitlinger to see this. If the trials had not been held, a person claiming the existence of the extermination program could not, if challenged, produce any evidence for this, save a few books (not including Hilberg or Reitlinger) whose claims are just as unsupported as his original claim. Thus, the problem that had been involved in deciding whether or not to hold trials on the Jewish extermination aspect was not a simple question of whether or not to try mass murder; unlike the usual murder case there was legitimate and very solid doubt that the deed had been committed at all.

This may surprise the reader who regards the tale of Jewish extermination as a near certainty; such is simply not the case. There are many considerations supporting this view, and some are so simple that they may surprise the reader even further. The simplest valid reason for being skeptical about the extermination claim is also the simplest conceivable reason: at the end of the war, they were still there.

This must be qualified only slightly. Consider a West European observer, who had been familiar with the status of European Jewry prior to the war, making a survey of West European Jewry in, say, late 1946 (East European Jewry was out of bounds). He would have found Italian, French, Belgian, and Danish Jewry essentially unscratched (these points will be discussed more fully in later chapters). On the other hand, he would have found that large numbers of Jews, possibly majorities, were missing from Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Czechoslovakia (then accessible from the West). German-Austrian Jewry was confused because, although most had emigrated before the war, it was difficult to be precise about what numbers had emigrated to where. In any case, large numbers, possibly majorities, of those who had remained were no longer resident in their former homes.

However, the absences were offset by the obvious fact that displaced persons' camps in Germany were full of Jews (a figure of more than 250,000 has been

given<sup>14</sup>) and that many European Jews had emigrated to the U.S. or Palestine or elsewhere since the beginning of the war. The facts available to the West European observer in late 1946 argued very strongly against the extermination claims, which had received such wide publicity during the war and at the recent trial at Nuremberg.

The passage of a quarter of a century has, despite superficial developments, gradually strengthened this view of the extermination tale, although for many years there was only one serious writer in the field, the late French geographer Paul Rassinier. In 1948, he published a book, *Passage de la Ligne*, on his experiences as a left wing political prisoner at Buchenwald, 1943-1945, “generally received with sympathy, provoking only muffled and inconclusive gnashings of teeth on a certain side.”<sup>15</sup> Then in 1950, he published *Le Mensonge d’Ulysse* (The Lie of Ulysses), a critical study of the concentration camp literature, in which he challenged the certainty of the gas chambers: “It is yet too early to pronounce a definitive judgment on the gas chambers.”<sup>16</sup> This provoked a violent press campaign, which led ultimately to legal actions, in which author, preface author, and publisher were first acquitted, then found guilty with judgments involving fines, damages, and suspended prison sentence, and finally acquitted again.

In 1955, the two books were combined as *Le Mensonge d’Ulysse*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, in which material increasingly critical of the gas chamber claim had been added. The most common (but not very common) edition today is the fifth (referenced here), published in 1961, in which year Rassinier also published a short “complementary” volume, *Ulysse Trahi par les Siens*, consisting of three essays showing that he had moved rather strongly in the direction of a negative judgment on the gas chambers; the last essay is the text of a speech given in several German and Austrian cities in the early spring of 1960 (just before the Eichmann affair). In 1962 followed *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann* (The Real Eichmann Trial), a study of the entire range of alleged German crimes in their historical and political contexts; by this time, he had reached a definitive conclusion on the tale of extermination of the Jews: “a historic lie: the most tragic and the most macabre imposture of all time.”<sup>17</sup>

Rassinier employed two basic approaches to reach this conclusion: the material and the demographic.

By the material approach we mean the analysis of the evidence that mass executions of Jews by gassings or other specific means were in fact conducted by the Germans during World War II. The material approach is nearly synonymous with analysis of the war crimes trials evidence, or of the trials evidence as interpreted by Hilberg and by Reitlinger, and as supplemented by them with similar evidence. Rassinier only tentatively explored the demographic approach in *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, but in his final general work on the Jewish extermination problem, *Le Drame des Juifs Européens* (The Drama of the European Jews), 1964, he

---

<sup>14</sup> Grayzel, 792.

<sup>15</sup> Rassinier (1961), 9.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>17</sup> Rassinier (1962), 112.

presented a lengthy analysis of the question from a demographic point of view. In 1965, he published *L'Opération "Vicaire,"* a critique of Rolf Hochhuth's play *The Deputy*. One must comment that it is necessary to check up on Rassinier in his interpretation of sources; some do not check out, and, in addition, he employs some clearly unreliable sources at a few points. There are also some glaring but relatively irrelevant errors of fact, such as characterizing Hanson Baldwin as the *New York Times*' "expert in matters of Jewish population" (it is doubtful that the *Times* ever had a staff member who could be characterized thus) and in asserting that the majority of American Jews are anti-Zionist and support the outlook of the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism (which was never a politically significant organization). However, Rassinier was a courageous pioneer in an ignored area and, despite the various shortcomings of his work, no fair minded person could read it without becoming at least skeptical about the "exterminations." Rassinier passed away in July 1967. His books had appeared in German, Spanish, and Italian translations, but no English translation was published for some years.<sup>18</sup>

Rassinier's books were followed by three books, which Josef Ginsburg published under the pseudonym J. G. Burg: *Schuld und Schicksal* (Guilt and Fate), 1962, *Sündenböcke* (Scapegoats), 1967, and *NS-Verbrechen* (National Socialist Crimes), 1968. Ginsburg's books are not particularly well researched, since his views are based mainly on what he had read in the newspapers plus his personal experiences as a Jew who, together with his family, was deported during the war to occupied eastern territory by the Nazis and the Romanians. After the war, Ginsburg took his family to Israel, but he eventually became very anti-Zionist and moved back to Europe, eventually setting up a bookbindery in Munich. While he believes that many Jews perished as a result of the combined effects of Nazi policies and wartime conditions, he denies that the German government ever contemplated the extermination of the Jews of Europe, and he is particularly scornful of the six million figure. He is unsure of the existence of gas chambers, but he believes that many Jews perished on account of epidemics, pogroms, air raids, and executions of partisans and offers an estimate of about three million as the maximum possible number of victims, although he believes the correct figure is much lower. As a reward for his efforts to get at the truth, Ginsburg, a small man and not young, was beaten up by Jewish thugs while visiting his wife's grave in the Israelite cemetery in Munich.

In 1969, a short book was published in the United States, *The Myth of the Six Million*, attributed to an anonymous author. While some things can be said in favor of this book, e.g. I learned of Rassinier there, it also contains so many errors of fact that it illustrates that it is not enough that a book's thesis be correct, for quite a few people who used it as a basis for prosecuting public controversy got burned as a result.

The next development was the publication in Germany of a book by Emil Aretz, *Hexen-Einmal-Eins einer Lüge* (The Witches' Multiplication Table of a Lie), of which only the third edition, Munich, 1973, seems to have attained sig-

---

<sup>18</sup> Editor's note: A collection of the most important texts by Rassinier was published in 1978: Paul Rassinier, *Debunking the Genocide Myth*.

nificant circulation. Aretz carries the case against the exterminations only slightly beyond Rassinier. He depends heavily on Rassinier in this respect, although he provides some new material. A major function of his book is the presentation of a remarkably bold and forthright general defense of the German nation.

The unreasonable continuation of war crimes trials in West Germany and the absence of any statute of limitations with respect to alleged war crimes by Germans have had a seldomly remarked implication: people who “were there” have been afraid to come forward and report what, to their knowledge, actually happened. They would rather not call attention to the fact that they “were there.” However, it was inevitable that a few courageous individuals would come forward nevertheless. The most important of these, to date, has been Thies Christophersen, author of the booklet *Die Auschwitz Lüge* (The Auschwitz Lie). Christophersen was at Auschwitz from January to December 1944. In 1973, he published his recollections and his firm view that no exterminations ever took place there. An English translation of Christophersen’s booklet, to which some colorful announcements had been added, was published in 1974. Christophersen was followed by Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich, a retired Hamburg judge, who had been assigned to an anti-aircraft unit near Auschwitz during 1944 and had visited the camp on a few occasions. For such honest reporting of his recollections, Stäglich was punished with a five year, twenty percent reduction of his pension.<sup>19</sup>

In late 1973, Austin J. App, a retired English professor in Maryland, published a short booklet, *The Six Million Swindle*. Early in 1974, Wolf Dieter Rothe published the first volume of his study, *Die Endlösung der Judenfrage*, and later in 1974, Richard Harwood published in England his book, *Did Six Million Really Die?* Harwood’s booklet is quite good in convincing power, although it has some weak points, and the reader is referred to Rassinier for a definitive treatment of the subject. It was favorably reviewed by Colin Wilson in the November 1974 issue of the influential British monthly *Books and Bookmen*, setting off a months-long controversy in the pages of that journal.

In early 1975, Harry Elmer Barnes’ translation of one of Rassinier’s books, *The Drama of the European Jews*, was issued by a small publisher in the United States.

## How Many Jews?

In this introductory chapter, we quickly review the principal problems that arise when demographic questions are asked. We then indicate, how demographic problems are resolved in this book, but indicate that the specific task of resolution must be deferred until later in the book.

The problems inherent in a demographic study are formidable. First, all sources of post-war primary data are private Jewish or Communist sources (exclu-

---

<sup>19</sup> *Nation Europa*, vol. 23 (Oct. 1973), 50; vol. 25 (Aug. 1975), 39. The Ginsburg beating incident is well known and is mentioned by App, 20.



sively the latter in the all important cases of Russia and Poland). Second, it appears that one can get whatever results desired by consulting the appropriately selected pre-war and post-war sources. Consider world Jewish population. The 1939 study of Arthur Ruppin, Professor of Jewish Sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, gave 16,717,000 Jews in the world in 1938.<sup>20</sup> Because Ruppin (who passed away in 1943) was considered the foremost expert on such matters, on account of many writings on the subject over a period of many years, the estimates of other pre-war sources tend to agree with him. Thus, the American Jewish Committee estimate for 1933, which appears in the 1940 *World Almanac*, was 15,315,359. The *World Almanac* figure for 1945 is 15,192,089 (page 367); no source is given, but the figure is apparently based on some sort of religious census. The 1946 *World Almanac* revised this to 15,753,638, a figure which was retained in the editions of 1947 (page 748), 1948 (page 572), and 1949 (page 289). The 1948 *World Almanac* (page 249) also gives the American Jewish Committee estimate for 1938 (*sic*), 15,688,259 while the 1949 *World Almanac* (page 204) reports new figures from the American Jewish Committee, which were developed in 1947-1948: 16,643,120 in 1939 and 11,266,600 in 1947.

However, *New York Times* military expert Hanson Baldwin, in an article written in 1948 dealing with the then forthcoming Arab-Jewish war on the basis of information available at the UN and other places, gave a figure of 15 to 18 million world Jewish population as well as figures for such things as Jews in Palestine, Jews in the Middle East, Arabs in Palestine, total Arabs, total Moslems, etc.<sup>21</sup>

Such a sketch illustrates some of the simpler uncertainties that exist in a demography study. To carry the matter further, the 11-12 million postwar world Jewish population figure, which it is necessary to claim in order to maintain the extermination thesis, is very vulnerable on two points. The first is the set of statistics offered for the U.S., and the second is the set offered for Eastern Europe. Both, especially the latter, are subject to insuperable uncertainties. Let us first consider the United States. Census figures for the total U.S. population are:<sup>22</sup>

**Table 1: U.S. total population**

YEAR	POPULATION
1920	105,710,620
1930	122,775,046
1940	131,669,275
1950	150,697,361
1960	179,300,000

while U.S. Jewish population figures, as given by the Jewish Statistical Bureau (subsidiary of either the American Jewish Conference or the Synagogue of America), H. S. Linfield, Director, are:<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Ruppin, 30-33.

<sup>21</sup> *New York Times* (Feb. 22, 1948), 4.

<sup>22</sup> *World Almanac* (1931), 192; (1942), 588; (1952), 394; (1962), 251.

<sup>23</sup> *World Almanac* (1931), 197; (1942), 593; (1952), 437; (1962), 258.

**Table 2: U.S. Jewish population**

YEAR	JEWISH POPULATION
1917	3,388,951
1927	4,228,029
1937	4,770,647
1949	5,000,000
1961	5,530,000

It is important to note that all of the U.S. Jewish population figures are given by the same source (Linfield).

The indicated growth of U.S. Jewish population, 1917-1937, is 40.8%, while the growth of total U.S. population, 1920-1940, is 24.6%. This contrast is generally reasonable, since in the period under consideration Jewish immigration was fairly heavy. However, Jewish immigration into the U.S. raises some problems of its own. The American Jewish yearbook gave a net Jewish immigration for the years 1938-1943 and 1946-1949 (inclusive) of 232,191.<sup>24</sup> Figures for 1944 and 1945 do not seem to be available. It was in those two years, incidentally, that an indeterminate number of Jews were admitted to the U.S. "outside of the regular immigration procedure." It was claimed that there were only 1,000 such Jews quartered at a camp near Oswego, New York, and that they were not eligible for admission to the U.S. This was supposed to be a U.S. contribution to relieving the problems of refugees, but the whole episode seems most strange and suspicious.<sup>25</sup>

Rather than attempt to settle the problem of the extent of Jewish immigration, suppose one allows the Jewish population a growth rate in 1937-1957 at least equal to that of the U.S. Jewish population of 1917-1937, as seems at least reasonable in view of various facts, *e.g.*, the reasons which sent 1.5 million Jews to Palestine during the World War II and aftermath period appear to motivate immigration to the U.S. just as well, and no national or racial immigration quotas were applicable to Jews as such. In such a case, there should be at least 6,678,000 Jews in the U.S. in 1957, not the 5,300,000 that are indicated. There are about 1,400,000 Jews missing from the interpolated figures for 1957, and we consider this a conservative figure for the reason given. The period 1937-1957 was one of Jewish movement on an unprecedented scale.

On the other hand, we can adopt an equally conservative approach and assume that the 4,770,647 Jews of 1937 grew in 1937-1957 at the same rate as the U.S. population in 1940-1960. Under this assumption, these should have become 6,500,000 Jews in the U.S. in 1957. If one adds the reasonable figure of 300,000 more due to immigration, we have 6,800,000 in 1957. Thus, by either method of extrapolation the figures offered for post-war U.S. Jewish population are at least approximately 1.5 million short for 1957.

The specific major fault of the U.S. Jewish population figures is the inexplicably small claimed growth from 1937 to 1949 despite record Jewish movement and

<sup>24</sup> *World Almanac* (1952), 438.

<sup>25</sup> US-WRB (1945), 64-69; *New York Times* (June 10, 1944), 1; (June 13, 1944), 1; (Aug. 10, 1944), 5; (Oct. 24, 1944), 14; (Oct. 25, 1944), 13; Myer, 108-123.

a very open U.S. immigration policy.

Eastern Europe, however, presents the core of the demographic problem. In order to avoid very serious confusion, one must first recognize that there have been extensive border changes in Eastern Europe in the course of the twentieth century. A map of Europe on the eve of World War I (1914) is given as Fig. 1. A map for January 1938 showing, essentially, Europe organized according to the Treaty of Versailles, before Hitler began territorial acquisitions, is given in Fig. 2, and Fig. 4 shows the post-war map of Europe. The principal border change at the end of World War II was the moving westward of the Soviet border, annexing the three Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia) and parts of Romania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and East Prussia. Poland was compensated with the remainder of East Prussia and what used to be considered eastern Germany; the effect was to move Poland bodily westward.

Pre-war (1938) Jewish population estimates for Eastern Europe were offered by H. S. Linfield and the American Jewish Committee in the 1948 (*sic*) *World Almanac* (page 249). Post-war (1948) figures are published in the 1949 *World Almanac* (page 204).

**Table 3: Eastern European Jewish population (est.)**

COUNTRY	1938	1948
Bulgaria	48,398	46,500
Hungary	444,567	180,000
Poland	3,113,900	105,000
Romania	900,000	430,000
USSR	3,273,047	2,032,500
TOTALS	7,779,912	2,794,000

The claimed Jewish loss for Eastern Europe is thus 4,985,912. The figure for the USSR includes, in both cases, the three Baltic countries and the Jews of Soviet Asia. The pre-war figures are in all cases in close agreement with the figures that Ruppin published shortly before the war. To the extent that the extermination legend is based on population statistics, it is based precisely on these statistics or their equivalents.

The trouble is that such figures are absolutely meaningless. There is no way a Western observer can check the plausibility, let alone the accuracy, of such figures. He must either be willing to accept Jewish or Communist (mainly the latter) claims on Jewish population for Eastern Europe, or he must reject any number offered as lacking satisfactory authority.

It is possible to reinforce our objection on this all important point and simultaneously deal with a reservation that the reader may have; it would appear excessively brazen to claim the virtual disappearance of Polish Jewry, if such had not been essentially or approximately the case or if something like that had not happened. This seems a valid reservation, but one must recall that much of the territory that was considered Polish in 1939 was Soviet by 1945. It was possible for Polish Jewry to virtually disappear, if, during the 1939-1941 Russian occupation of Eastern Poland, the Soviets had dispersed large numbers of Polish Jews into the

Soviet Union and if, during 1941-1944, the Germans had concentrated Polish Jews eastwards, with the Soviet Union ultimately absorbing many of these Jews into its territory, with those who did not wish to remain in the Soviet Union emigrating, mainly to Palestine and the U.S., but also to some extent to the new Poland and other lands. This, in fact, is what happened to the Jews who had resided in Poland before the war.

Whatever may be said about Soviet Jewish policy after, say, 1950, it is clear that the earlier policies had not been anti-Jewish and had encouraged the absorption of Jews into the Soviet Union. It is known that many Polish Jews were absorbed during and immediately after the war, but of course numbers are difficult to arrive at. Reitlinger considers this problem and settles on a figure of 700,000, without giving reasons why the correct figure might not be much higher. He then notes that the evidence that he employs of extermination of Jews in Russia (documents alleged to be German) indicates about the same number of Soviet Jews exterminated, from which he correctly infers that, in the period 1939-1946, the Soviet Jewish population may have actually increased.<sup>26</sup> This important concession, coming from the author of *The Final Solution*, shows that our unwillingness to accept the Communist figures need not be regarded as motivated merely by the necessities of our thesis. The figures are inarguably untrustworthy. It is claimed by the Soviets that their Jewish population declined by 38%, despite the acquisition of territory containing many Jews. Since the USSR is one of the lands where "Jew" is a legally recognized nationality, the Soviets do indeed possess accurate figures on the number of Jews they have but have chosen (in Reitlinger's opinion, if you choose not to accept this author's) to claim an utterly mythical Jewish population loss of 38%.

Likewise with the value to be attached to the remainder of the figures offered.

The most relevant research by a demographer appears to be that of Leszek A. Kosinski of the University of Alberta (*Geographical Review*, Vol. 59, 1969, pp. 308-402 and *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Vol. 11, 1969, pp. 357-373), who has studied the changes in the entire ethnic structure of East Central Europe (i.e. excluding Germany and Russia) over the period 1930-1960. He explains the extreme difficulties with basic statistics:

*"The criteria used in compilation differ from country to country and are not always precise. In principle, two types are used: objective criteria, such as language, cultural affiliation, and religious denomination, and subjective criteria, based on the declaration of the persons themselves. Each type has virtues and deficiencies. Objective criteria define nationality only indirectly and are difficult to apply in marginal cases (for example, bilingual persons).*

*The same criticism applies even more to subjective criteria. External pressure and opportunism can influence the results, especially where national consciousness is not fully developed or where an honest answer can bring undesirable consequences. Official data are not always reliable, then, even when they are not forged, as has also occurred. However, criticism of the official*

---

<sup>26</sup> Reitlinger, 534, 542-544.

*data cannot be applied in the same degree to all the countries, and reliability is very much a function of national policy."*

Jews are of course one of the groups Kosinski is interested in, and he presents various figures, generally comparable to those given above, for numbers of pre-war Jews. However, his post-war data are so useless from this point of view that he does not even attempt to offer specific post-war numbers for Jews, although he offers post-war figures for other groups, *e.g.* gypsies, giving numbers less significant, statistically, than the numbers of Jews who, according to the extermination mythologists, survived in Eastern Europe. It is true that he accepts the extermination legend in a general way and presents a bar graph showing a catastrophic decrease in the Jewish populations of Poland, Hungary, Romania and Czechoslovakia. He also remarks that the combined war-caused population losses for Yugoslavs, Jews, Poles and east Germans was about 12.5-14 million, not breaking the total down, and referring the reader to the statistical summary *Population Changes in Europe Since 1939* by Gregory (Grzegorz) Frumkin, whose figures for Jews come from the American Jewish Congress, the Zionist Organization of America, and the *Centre de Documentation juive contemporaine* (Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation) in Paris.

However, the point is that Kosinski arrives at no figures for Jews, as he obviously should not, given the problems he has noted. The ethnic population figures from Communist Hungary are based on language, and the figures from Communist Poland, Communist Czechoslovakia, and Communist Romania are based on "nationality," whatever that means in the various cases. Naturally, he apologizes for his use of "official statistics, imperfect as these may be." We will return to demographic problems, especially those which involve the Polish Jews, in Chapter 7.

We must also remember that the problem of counting Jews in Western countries contains enormous difficulties on account of the lack of any legal, racial, or religious basis for defining a "Jew." As an example, the statistics available to Reitlinger indicate to him that early in World War II there were 300,000 Jews in France, including refugee German Jews.<sup>27</sup>

The Nazis, on the other hand, thought that there were 865,000, and I see no motivation for deliberate inflation of this figure; other figures used by the Nazis were not wildly inflated compared to the figures of other sources.<sup>28</sup> I should add that I really have no idea how many Jews there are in the U.S. I can consult the *World Almanac*, which will tell me that there are about 6,000,000, but I cannot see how that figure was arrived at and have little confidence in it. As far as I know, the correct figure could as easily be 9,000,000. There must be at least 4,000,000 in the New York area alone.

To summarize what has been said with respect to Jewish population statistics: the problem of compiling such statistics is formidable even without political interference or pressure. Moreover, in the demographic argument for a five or six million drop in world Jewish population, the sources and authorities for the figures

---

<sup>27</sup> Reitlinger, 327.

<sup>28</sup> NG-2586-G in NMT, vol. 13, 212.

used are Communist and Jewish and thus, by the nature of the problem we are examining, must be considered essentially useless. In addition, the post-war figures for the United States are demonstrably too low by a significant amount.

One should not form the impression that it is essential to my argument that any demographic conclusions seemed to be reached above be accepted by the reader. It has only been shown what sorts of problems arise if one attempts a too direct demographic approach; it is not possible to settle anything in such a manner. In the final analysis, the difficulty is that the figures available amount to nothing more than statements, from Jewish and Communist sources, that millions of Jews were killed. Such claims are to be expected, but they must certainly not deter us from looking deeper. We will take up the demographic problem later in the book, however, because the nature of the situation is such that reasonably useful demographic conclusions are possible once it is understood what, in general, happened to the Jews.

Rassinier's demographic study, in fact, does not really even attempt to settle the problem, strictly speaking. His basic approach is to analyze the inferences that have been drawn from two different sets of data, that of the *Centre de Documentation juive contemporaine* and that of Hilberg, both of whom infer from their data five to six million Jewish victims of the Nazis. Rassinier's conclusion is that the former can only claim 1,485,292 victims from its data and the latter 896,892.<sup>29</sup> Rassinier accepts the reality of about a million Jewish *victims of Nazi policies*, while rejecting the claims of *extermination*. For example, it is known that some East European peoples took advantage of general political-military conditions to persecute Jews. Also, many Jews who were deported from their homes no doubt perished as a result of generally chaotic conditions, which accompanied the latter part of the war.

Believing that the task is not possible, I will offer here no definite estimate of Jewish losses. However, I have no strong reason to quarrel with Rassinier's estimate.<sup>30</sup>

## Our Method, Argument, and Conclusion

As stated, the "material" approach will be extended here and, in addition, a "historical-political" approach will be "introduced." This is just a fancy way of saying that we will grasp that there are two political powers involved in the problem, not just one. That is to say, we have a tale of extermination, and we should inquire into the circumstance of its generation. Clearly, there are two states involved in the problem. Germany had an anti-Jewish policy involving, in many cases, deportations of Jews from their homes and countries of citizenship. That is

---

<sup>29</sup> Rassinier (1964), 220.

<sup>30</sup> Editor's note: compare in this regard Walter N. Sanning, *The Dissolution of the Eastern European Jewry*, and Germar Rudolf, "Holocaust victims: A Statistical Analysis", in Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, pp. 181-213.

certain. The wartime policy of Washington was to claim extermination, and the post-war policy was to hold trials, at which there was generated the only evidence that we have today that these wartime claims had any foundation. That is also certain. The policies of both states are necessarily of interest, and if there is any respect, in which this book may be breaking fundamentally new ground on the problem, it is in its insistence in seeing Washington as an active agent in the generation of the story. Thus, we are interested not only in what Hitler, Himmler, Göring, Goebbels, and Heydrich were doing during the war in regard to these matters, but also what Roosevelt, Hull, Morgenthau, and the *New York Times* and associated media were doing during the war, and what the various tribunals controlled or dominated by Washington did after the war. This is not only a fair but, more importantly, an illuminating historical approach.

The conclusion is that Washington constructed a frame-up on the Jewish extermination charge. Once this is recognized, the true nature of German Jewish policy will be seen.

## The War Crimes Trials

Before we review the details of the story, it should be pointed out that there are excellent *a priori* grounds for expecting a frame-up. There is of course the very general argument that political enmity of a magnitude to bring on armed conflict between two states necessarily excludes the impartiality on the part of one of them, which is a necessity for a fair trial and for which there exists no substitute. The judges had pursued political careers in the contexts of the internal politics of the Allied powers hostile to Germany and after the trials would, assuming they had not done anything highly improbable at the war crimes trials, return to these careers. They had, in addition, for several years heard only the anti-German viewpoint. In sitting on the military tribunals, they were *ad hoc* political appointees. Such considerations exclude approximate impartiality.

There are, however, much more specific reasons for expecting a frame-up. In order to see this, it is only necessary to consider the easily obtainable facts concerning the various tribunals involved.

First, there was the “big trial” conducted by the “International Military Tribunal” (IMT) at Nuremberg immediately after the war. This was the trial of the top Nazis Göring, Hess, Ribbentrop, *et al.*, which ran from November 1945 to October 1946. The judges and prosecutors were American, British, French, and Russian. As with all “military” tribunals, there was no jury. There were three acquittals, seven prison sentences, and eleven death sentences. The latter were carried out almost immediately after the trial, except that Göring escaped the noose by swallowing a potassium cyanide capsule just before the hangings. It was never determined where Göring had obtained the poison or how he had managed to hide it for any length of time. A unique sequel to this episode was that the first Nuremberg prison psychiatrist, Dr. Douglas M. Kelley, a leader in the treatment of psy-

**Table 4: NMT Trials**

CASE NO.	U.S. VS.	DESCRIPTION	NMT VOLS.
1	Brandt	Medical Case	1,2
2	Milch	Milch Case	2
3	Alstötter	Justice Case	3
4	Pohl	Concentration Camps Case	5, 6
5	Flick	Business Men Case	6
6	Krauch	I. G. Farben Case	7, 8
7	List	Hostages Case	9
8	Greifelt	RuSHA Case	4, 5
9	Ohlendorf	Einsatzgruppen Case	4
10	Krupp	Krupp Case	9
11	Weizsäcker	Wilhelmstrasse, or Ministries, Case	12, 14
12	von Leeb	High Command Case	10, 11

chiatric disorders with drugs, shortly later published a book on his experiences at Nuremberg, giving Göring and Göring's last act a laudatory treatment.<sup>31</sup>

*“He stoically endured his long imprisonment that he might force down the Allied Tribunal and browbeat the prosecuting lawyers on their own terms. [...] His suicide [...] was a skillful, even brilliant, finishing touch, completing the edifice for Germans to admire in time to come. [...] History may well show that Göring won out at the end, even though condemned by the high court of the Allied powers.”*

A decade later, Dr. Kelley followed Göring by taking one of several potassium cyanide capsules which he possessed, said to be ‘souvenirs’ taken off Göring's body.

The IMT trial was the only one that received very great attention. It was important in the sense that the Allied powers committed themselves to a specific version of the extermination claim, but there was little evidence presented of any substantial nature relative to Jewish extermination; it was almost entirely testimony and affidavits, not at all difficult for the victorious powers to produce under the circumstance. The only relative merit of the IMT trial, for our purposes, is that the complete transcript and a reasonably complete selection of the documents put into evidence are readily available in numerous libraries as a 42 volume set with a very complete subject and name index (see References).

From 1946 to 1949 a series of twelve superficially less important trials were held by the Americans before what is here called the Nuremberg Military Tribunal (NMT). They are referred to variously according to the “case number,” the major defendant, or a more descriptive title, see Table 4.

Several death sentences resulted from these trials, but the great majority received prison sentences, in many cases rather lengthy ones. However, almost all were free by the early Fifties.

The only cases among these that will concern us here in any way are Case 1, a trial of medical personnel involved in euthanasia and medical experiments, Case

<sup>31</sup> Kelley, 76-77; *New York Times* (Jan. 2, 1958), 18; Robertson, 266.



4, a trial of concentration camp administration, Cases 6 and 10, self explanatory, Case 8, dealing with German resettlement policies, Case 9 (the *Einsatzgruppen* were used for rear security in the east) and Case 11, a trial of officials of various ministries. The U.S. Government published a fifteen volume set of books, referred to here as the "NMT set," in which may be found "summaries" of the cases, along with very limited "selections" of the documents put into evidence. The volume numbers corresponding to the various cases are listed in the above table.

On this point, the student encounters a significant difficulty because, as can be seen by consulting Hilberg and Reitlinger, almost all the evidence for the extermination claim was developed at the NMT, not the IMT. That is to say the important documents, those which, for better or for worse, constitute major source material for writing any history of Nazi Germany, are those of the NG, NI and NO series, and these documents were put into evidence at the NMT trials. Documentary evidence is, especially in view of the irregular legal and political circumstances which prevailed, immeasurably more weighty than testimony, as has been suggested. The relevant documentary evidence generated at the NMT consists of certain kinds of material allegedly supporting the extermination charges: documents dealing with concentration camp administration, with crematory construction, with deportations, with certain Farben and Krupp operations which employed prisoner labor, with general Jewish policies of the German Government, etc. There is of course no direct documentary evidence for an extermination program. As Dr. Kubovy of the Center for Jewish Documentation in Tel-Aviv admitted in 1960:<sup>32</sup>

*"there exists no document signed by Hitler, Himmler, or Heydrich speaking of exterminating the Jews and [...] the word 'extermination' does not appear in the letter from Göring to Heydrich concerning the final solution of the Jewish question."*

The difficulty for the normally circumstanced person is that only small fractions of the NMT testimonies and documents are widely accessible in English translations (in the fifteen volume NMT set). Additionally, these translations cannot always be trusted, as will be seen. Also, the extracts which are published have been selected by unknown criteria.

Finally, the fifteen volume NMT set is likely to be found only in cities of moderately large size.

The situation is better if one lives in a very large city, since reasonably complete collections of documents together with the mimeographed trial transcripts (almost always in German) exist in certain library centers. However, the normally circumstanced person may encounter trouble in arranging to examine specific pieces, which he may call for, and in some cases general browsing even by university faculty is not welcome. In addition, no subject or name indexes exist for the NMT trials (indexes of testimonies of witnesses, with many errors, appear in the NMT volumes).

The IMT and NMT trials are almost the only ones of significance here. Of

---

<sup>32</sup> Rassiner (1962), 83. See also Dawidowicz, 121.

general significance are a series held by the British; of these, only the Belsen case and the Zyklon B case interests us to any extent. The Poles, Russians, French, Dutch, and Italians have all held trials of no significance except to the victims. The Bonn Government has held some trials of slight interest, for example the "Auschwitz trial" of 1963-1965, reported on by Langbein, by Laternser, and by Naumann.

The manner, in which the IMT and the NMT were constituted, can be set forth with sufficient completeness for our purposes. Since the autumn of 1943, there had been in existence a United Nations War Crimes Commission, headquartered in London. However, the Commission never really did anything except realize, at one point, that if anything was to be done, it would be done by the individual Allied governments.

The first serious moves started in the United States. In August 1944, the Joint Chiefs of Staff considered a proposed program for dealing with war crimes. The proposal had been approved by the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Army. On October 1, 1944, the Joint Chiefs approved this proposal and, at about the same time and in accordance with directives of the Secretary of War, a "War Crimes Branch" was established in the Department of the Judge Advocate General. The War Crimes Branch, headed by Brigadier General John M. Weir with Colonel Melvin Purvis as his assistant, was responsible for handling all war crimes matters for the State, War, and Navy Departments.

The proposal that had been approved by the Joint Chiefs did not survive for very long, for its character had been rather traditional, in that it contemplated, basically, the trial of persons who had broken the accepted laws of war in the field. Thus, offenses committed before the war or acts by enemy authorities against their own nationals were not considered to be under Allied jurisdiction. Thus, for example, all measures against German Jews were considered outside the jurisdiction of the planned war crimes trials. The concept of war crimes was, at this point, strongly under the influence of the principle, never questioned, that a belligerent may try enemy soldiers for the same sorts of offenses for which he may try his own soldiers.

The Secretary of War, Stimson, had a conference with President Roosevelt on November 21, 1944, at which Roosevelt made it clear that he had in mind a much broader idea of war crimes and that the proposals approved by the Joint Chiefs were completely unsatisfactory.

Accordingly, in January 1945, Roosevelt designated Judge Samuel Rosenman as his personal representative in discussions on war crimes problems. A meeting of January 18, among Stimson, Rosenman, Attorney General Francis Biddle, and others resulted in general agreement on very much expanded conceptions of war crimes to be tried.<sup>33</sup>

Biddle was later to sit as a judge at the IMT, although, for Roosevelt's use at the Yalta conference, he had written in January 1945 that "the chief German leaders are well known and the proof of their guilt will not offer great difficulties."

---

<sup>33</sup> Taylor (Aug. 15, 1949), 1-3; *New York Times* (Feb. 1, 1945), 4.

The Russian IMT “Justice” Nikitchenko was slightly more direct in declaring before the trial that “we are dealing here with the chief war criminals who have already been convicted.”<sup>34</sup>

In early May 1945, President Truman approved the revised proposals and appointed Robert H. Jackson, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, to act as Chief of Counsel for the U.S. in the forthcoming trial and also to represent the U.S. in negotiations with foreign governments relative to constituting the trial. On June 6, 1945, Jackson made an interim report to the President, and later in June, Jackson and his staff set up headquarters in London, where much of the preliminary work for the IMT was done.

A key member of Jackson’s London staff was Colonel Murray C. Bernays, who was one of the first people who had been involved in war crimes problems. Graduated from Harvard in 1915, he established a law practice in New York. He was given a commission in the Army in 1942, and in October 1943, he was made chief of the Special Projects Branch, Personnel Division, Army General Staff. His major project in this position was the preparation of plans for trials of German “war criminals.” After each stage of negotiations with the White House and others, he made the appropriate revisions in the plans being considered, although he was the author of the plan that was eventually settled on, if one is to credit his account. In any case, shortly after the appointment of Jackson, Bernays was awarded the Legion of Merit, the citation reading in part:

*“Early recognizing the need for a sound basis in dealing with the problem of war criminals and war crimes, he formulated the basic concept of such a policy and initiated timely and appropriate action which assured its adoption as the foundation of national policy.”*

Bernays returned to the U.S. in November 1945 and immediately resigned from the Army. Because, as we have seen, there was considerable dialogue at higher levels relating to plans for war crimes trials, it is doubtful that one can take Bernays’s claims at full value, but he no doubt had a great deal to do with the drafting of the plans for the trials. Moreover, he had certainly been an appropriate choice for something as novel as the formulation of the “legal” structure for the war crimes trials, since his views of justice were equally novel. After his return to the U.S., he had a chat with some editors (who characterized him as “the man behind the gavel”), and in answer to their queries as to “how the small fry are going to be hooked,” he replied:<sup>35</sup>

*“There are a good many Nazi criminals who will get off if the roundups aren’t conducted efficiently. But if we establish that the SS, for example, was a criminal organization, and that membership in it is evidence per se of criminality, the Allies are going to get hold of a great many more criminals in one swoop. You know, a lot of people here at home don’t realize that we are now the government of Germany in our zone and that no judicial system can exist other than one we approve. We are the law. If we wanted to, for instance, we*

---

<sup>34</sup> Davidson, 6, 18, 21n.

<sup>35</sup> *New York Times* (June 21, 1945), 6; (Dec. 16, 1945), sec. 4, 8; *New Yorker* (Nov. 17, 1945), 24; *Survey Graphic* (Jan. 1946), 4-9; *Reader’s Digest* (Feb. 1946), 56-64.

*could try Germans for crimes twenty, thirty, forty years old.*

*We'll be too busy with the current crop of war criminals, though, to have much time to look into ancient wrongdoings."*

In London, Jackson negotiated with the Allies on the trials, and his interim report of June 6 became the basis for the "London Agreement" of August 8, signed by the U.S., Britain, Russia, and France. An "indictment" was filed against twenty four individuals and six organizations (the SS, the General Staff, etc.) on October 18, and the trial opened at Nuremberg on November 20, 1945. Three of the listed defendants did not stand trial. Martin Bormann was never found, Robert Ley committed suicide before the trial, and Gustav Krupp was too ill and too old to stand trial. An attempt was made by the prosecution to substitute Krupp's son as defendant, but this was too much even for that court, so the trial of Alfred Krupp had to wait until the NMT.

In passing we should note that Justice Jackson, in addition to being the American chief prosecutor at the trial, was also in a formal sense the leading personality in the London negotiations relative to the formulation of the legal system, under which he was to operate at the trial. A rare opportunity for a prosecutor, and probably an utterly unprecedented one in respect to proceedings that civilized people have seriously considered to be trials.

Equally unique features of the final charter of the IMT were that its jurisdiction was not restricted to acts taken in connection with the war but extended over the entire life of the Nazi Party, that the defense of superior orders was inapplicable, and that defendants could be compelled by the prosecution to testify.

The War Crimes Branch that had been set up in 1944 did not cease to operate, because in connection with the IMT trial Jackson had "enlisted the cooperation and participation of the War Crimes Branch of the Judge Advocate General's Department." Moreover, in the early months of the IMT trial (and perhaps also later), the ordinary prosecution staff, exclusive of Jackson, was "on the payroll of the Judge Advocate General."<sup>36</sup>

A significant role for the Judge Advocate General's department (JAG) was most natural under the circumstances because the JAG was the legal agency of the Army, and the basic American administrative machinery in Germany immediately after the war was that of the U.S. Army. The traditional role of the JAG had been the administration of military justice: courts-martial and related matters. However, during World War II the operations of the JAG had spread to all phases of military activity where legal matters arose; it even got involved in litigations relative to war production contracts. The Judge Advocate General, Major General Myron C. Cramer, had given a speech in May 1945, in which he declared that the pursuit and arraignment of Nazis was to tax to the utmost the capacity of the War Crimes Branch and become a major activity of the JAG, whose resources he pledged to Jackson. While it is not specified exactly what the War Crimes Branch did in connection with the IMT, it is most likely that it effectively supervised the American (hence major) role in the screening and selection of prosecution and defense law-

---

<sup>36</sup> Taylor (Apr. 1949), 248-255; Select Committee, 1536.

yers and staff, in the selection of other staff such as translators, and in interrogations. Of course, Jackson formally held much of this authority, but it is reasonably sure that such responsibilities were, in fact, exercised by the War Crimes Branch.<sup>37</sup>

The involvement of the War Crimes Branch in trials was, however, much deeper.

While the IMT and NMT trials were being conducted, several lesser trials were taking place. Among these were the trials held at the Dachau camp (outside Munich and thus not far from Nuremberg) of the staffs of some concentration camps (Buchenwald, Flossenbürg, Dachau) that had been captured by the Americans and of those accused of killing 83 American prisoners at Malmédy during the Battle of the Bulge. These trials were supervised by the War Crimes Branch.<sup>38</sup> They were perhaps the most shameful episodes in U.S. history.

The entire repertoire of third degree methods was enacted at Dachau: beatings and brutal kicking, to the point of ruining testicles in 137 cases, knocking out teeth, starvation, solitary confinement, torture with burning splinters, and impersonation of priests in order to encourage prisoners to “confess.” Low rank prisoners were assured that convictions were being sought only against higher ranking officers and that they had absolutely nothing to lose by cooperating and making the desired statements. Such “evidence” was then used against them when they joined their superiors in the dock. The latter, on the other hand, had been told that by “confessing” they had taken all responsibility onto themselves, thereby shielding their men from trial. A favorite stratagem, when a prisoner refused to cooperate, was to arrange a mock trial. The prisoner was led into a room in which civilian investigators, dressed in U.S. Army uniforms, were seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center, with two candles providing the only light. This “court” then proceeded to hold a sham trial, at the conclusion of which a sham death sentence was passed. The “condemned” prisoner was later promised that, if he cooperated with the prosecutors in giving evidence, he would be reprieved. Sometimes interrogators threatened to turn prisoners over to the Russians. In many cases the prisoner’s family was threatened with loss of ration cards or other hardships if cooperation was not obtained.

As distinct from the mock trials, the official trials were also an apparently deliberate mockery of any conception of due process. The mockery started with the “indictment,” which made only general reference to very broad categories of crimes allegedly committed in the years from 1942 to 1945 (in the cases of concentration camp personnel), and then proceeded to present a long list of defendants accused of being criminal in the extremely general sense stated. Specific crimes by specific people on specific dates were not part of the indictments (*e.g.* document 3590-PS).

In some cases, the “defense counsel” was an American with no legal training who could not speak German. Competent interpreters were not provided at the trial. The “prosecution” also lacked legal training, as did the “court,” which con-

<sup>37</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 17, 1943), sec. 6, 10; (May 20, 1943), 15.

<sup>38</sup> Kolander; Taylor (Aug. 15, 1949), 4, 10, 13, 14.

sisted of ten U.S. Army officers. There was one person with legal training present, all of whose rulings on the admissibility of evidence were final. There were 1,416 convictions out of 1,672 tried, with 420 death sentences.

While the prosecution could hunt all over Europe for witnesses and, if necessary, torture or otherwise coerce Germans in order to get “evidence,” the accused, cut off from the outside world and without funds, were rarely able to summon anybody to their defense.

In addition, the “Association of Persons Persecuted by the Nazis,” by a propaganda campaign, forbade former concentration camp inmates to testify for the defense.

The American lawyer George A. McDonough, who had had the rather peculiar experience of having served as both a prosecutor and defense counsel in the war crimes program and later on as a member of a reviewing board and an arbiter on clemency petitions, wrote to the *New York Times* in 1948 complaining about the lack of legal basis for the trials and remarking that “in nine problems out of ten the authorities and the textbooks had no answer” to the legal questions that regularly and consistently came up for anybody seriously concerned with matters of legality. For McDonough, the major problem was whether or not a defense of superior orders should be accepted in war crimes trials. He wrote:

*“At the Dachau trials, the claim of the accused that he would have been shot himself if he had not obeyed his superior’s order to commit an act which he, in ignorance, may have believed to be a legal order, or knew to be illegal, seemed to be handled by the courts as an issue of fact. The availability of this defense seemed to depend upon the age and the rank of the accused, and the state of battle existing at the time of the offense. Again it would seem high-handed procedure to hold an enlisted man to the knowledge of the illegality of a particular act when the international authorities themselves are in disagreement as to its illegality or have never defined the act at all.*

*[...] Hearsay evidence was admitted indiscriminately and sworn statements of the witnesses were admissible regardless of whether anybody knew the person who made the statement or the individual who took the statement. If a prosecutor considered a statement of a witness to be more damaging than the witness’ oral testimony in court he would advise the witness to go back to his home, submit the statement as evidence, and any objection by defense counsel would be promptly overruled.”*

One notable incident occurred when investigator Joseph Kirschbaum brought a certain Einstein into court to testify that the accused Menzel had murdered Einstein’s brother. When the accused was able to point out that the brother was alive and well and, in fact, sitting in court, Kirschbaum was deeply embarrassed and scolded poor Einstein:

*“How can we bring this pig to the gallows, if you are so stupid to bring your brother into court?”*

The U.S. Army authorities in charge admitted some of these things. When the chief of the Dachau War Crimes Branch, Colonel A. H. Rosenfeld, quit his post in 1948, he was asked by newspapermen if there was any truth to the stories about

the mock trials, at which sham death sentences had been passed. He replied:<sup>39</sup>

“Yes, of course. We couldn’t have made those birds talk otherwise. [...] It was a trick, and it worked like a charm.”

The Malmédy defendants had had a competent defense attorney, Lieutenant Colonel Willis M. Everett, Jr. It was Everett’s repeated appeals to, among others, the U.S. Supreme Court, plus a chorus of protests from German clergymen and others, plus such details regarding what was going on that managed to get into the press by various routes, that persuaded the American military governor, General Lucius D. Clay, to request an investigation of the trials at Dachau. On July 29, 1948, the Secretary of the Army appointed a commission consisting of two American judges, Gordon Simpson of Texas and Edward Van Roden of Pennsylvania, both JAG reserve colonels. They were assisted by JAG Lieutenant Colonel Charles Lawrence, Jr. The commission submitted its report to the Secretary of the Army in October 1948, and selected portions were made public in January 1949.

Subsequent public remarks by Van Roden and also, to some extent, by Simpson, plus an independent investigation by a review board appointed by Clay, decisively exposed the whole affair to the point where the defenders of the trials could only haggle about the numbers of German prisoners subjected to brutalities. The review board confirmed all that Van Roden claimed, taking exception only in respect to the frequencies of the brutalities.<sup>40</sup> Oddly, in his book, *Decision in Germany*, Clay denies the brutalities, but he is contradicted by his own review board.

The cases, especially the Malmédy case, attracted a good deal of attention through 1949, and a subcommittee headed by Senator Baldwin conducted an investigation. One witness, formerly a court reporter at the Dachau trials, testified that he was so repelled by what had gone on there that he quit the job. He said that the “most brutal” had been Lieutenant Perl, Frank Steiner, and Harry W. Thon. He explained that both Perl and his wife had been in Nazi concentration camps and that the Nazis had killed Steiner’s mother.

Judge Gordon Simpson (unlike Van Roden, trying to put the best interpretation, even if very strained, on the sorry facts that had come out) conceded that this was probably “a poor team,” and explained that the shortage of German-speaking American lawyers and interpreters had forced the Army to “draw on some of the German refugees.” Steiner, Kirschbaum, and Thon (later chief of the evaluation section of the civil administration division of the U.S. military government) appeared later and denied all, but they were shaken by the testimony of investigator Bruno Jacob, who admitted a few things. Speaking for the press, investigators Dwight Fanton and Morris Elowitz also denied all. Colonel Rosenfeld denied almost all. He charged that Lieutenant Colonel Harold D. McGown, commander of the American soldiers massacred at Malmédy, had fraternized with SS Colonel Joachim Peiper, the German commander, and this explained why McGown had appeared at Dachau as a defense witness for Peiper and had testified that Peiper

<sup>39</sup> *New York Times* (Apr. 31, 1946), Utley, 185-200; *Chicago Tribune* (Apr. 30, 1948), 12; (Feb. 13, 1949), 3; (Feb. 14, 1949), 3; (Feb. 17, 1949), 8; *New York Times* (Oct. 31, 1948), sec. 4, 8.

<sup>40</sup> *New York Times* (Jul. 30, 1948), 5; (Oct. 7, 1948), 15; (Jan. 7, 1949), 1, 9; (Mar. 2, 1949), 1, 14; (Mar. 5, 1949), 1, 4; (May 5, 1949), 8.

had held talks with him and had been responsible for saving a number of Americans. As evidence for the fraternization, Rosenfeld claimed that McGown and Peiper had been “entirely too friendly during those nights they spent talking together” and that, when Peiper and his men were later able to escape a U.S. Army trap, “McGown was with them.” Of course, McGown was Peiper’s prisoner.<sup>41</sup>

It will, of course, be argued that these nightmarish Dachau “trials” have little to do with our subject because the standard maintained in the trials at Nuremberg were not comparable and because the bearers of the extermination legend do not cite any of the “evidence” produced at these trials. There is partial truth to these contentions; brutality and coercion were not nearly as extensive at the prominent Nuremberg trials as they were at the Dachau trials, and mass exterminations were not emphasized in the Dachau trials (although gas chambers made occasional appearances in testimony). However, the Dachau trials cannot be waved aside so easily because the administering agency, the War Crimes Branch, was also deeply involved in the Nuremberg trials, as we have noted, and as we are to reconfirm shortly in a particularly striking respect. In addition, coercion was, in fact, employed in order to get evidence at the Nuremberg trials, but that subject is discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.

None of the four powers was happy with the IMT arrangement, and after the “big trial” they split up and held the kinds of trials they were interested in. The British trials reflected a general interest, but on points of relatively minor significance here. The only major French trial was of Saar industrial magnate Hermann Röchling, whom the French had also tried, *in absentia*, after World War I. Planning for the American NMT trials had actually started in 1945, and in March 1946, a division of Jackson’s office, headed by Telford Taylor, had been created for this purpose.

It is worth noting that in all of these trials of Nazis, from the IMT through the Eichmann “trial” of 1961 (in which defense witnesses were not permitted) to the “Auschwitz trial” of 1963-1965 (which the Bonn Government would not allow Rassinier to attend as observer), the defense lawyers had no staff of trained research assistants to go through the documents and, in addition, almost all of the documents, which were available to them were controlled by the prosecuting powers.<sup>42</sup> Whatever the legalistic evaluation of such a situation, it can produce a very distorted historical picture if not approached skeptically.

Under the legalistic schema of the occupation, there was an important constraint on the NMT and other single-nation tribunals:

*“The determination of the International Military Tribunal in the judgments [...] that invasions, aggressive acts, aggressive wars, crimes, atrocities or inhumane acts were planned or occurred, shall be binding on the tribunals established hereunder and shall not be questioned except insofar as the participation therein or knowledge thereof by any particular person may be concerned. Statements of the International Military Tribunal in the judgment [...]*

<sup>41</sup> *New York Times* (Mar. 5, 1949), 4; (Apr. 30, 1949), 2; (Sep. 6, 1949), 9; (Sep. 7, 1949), 9; (Sep. 8, 1949), 9.

<sup>42</sup> Arendt, 201, 251, (221, 274 in 1964 edition); Aretz, 28-29.



*constitute proof of the facts stated, in the absence of substantial new evidence to the contrary.*”

Two administratively distinct organizations functioned at the NMT. One was the collection of “Military Tribunals,” the judges, functioning administratively through a Secretariat, headed by a Secretary General. The judges were recruited in the U.S. “by the Department of the Army.” There were three or more judges at any one trial.

The second organization was the Office, Chief of Counsel for War Crimes (Telford Taylor), which had come into existence on October 24, 1946, immediately after Ribbentrop *et al.* had been killed. It filed its first indictment the next day. Although there was a trivial difference in their titles, Taylor, who had been an associate trial counsel at the IMT, was really the successor to Jackson in the trials being staged in the Nuremberg courthouse.<sup>43</sup>

We will have much to say of the NMT trials in this volume. However, the reader can grasp much of the spirit of these proceedings even from remarks made by some of the American judges who had been recruited by the U.S. Army to serve at Nuremberg. Understandably, these people were normally very reluctant to speak out publicly against what they observed. Thus, the remark of one of the judges in the Farben trial, that there were “too many Jews on the prosecution,” was a privately expressed hint to the prosecution, certainly not intended for publication. However, the presiding judge in Case 7 (trial of German generals for alleged wholesale murder of hostages), Charles F. Wennerstrum, spoke out publicly and forcefully immediately after sentences had been pronounced:<sup>44</sup>

*“If I had known seven months ago what I know today, I would never have come here.*

*Obviously, the victor in any war is not the best judge of the war crime guilt. Try as you will, it is impossible to convey to the defense, their counsel, and their people that the court is trying to represent all mankind rather than the country which appointed its members.*

*What I have said of the nationalist character of the tribunals applies to the prosecution. The high ideal announced as the motives for creating these tribunals has not been evident.*

*The prosecution has failed to maintain objectivity aloof from vindictiveness, aloof from personal ambitions for convictions. It has failed to strive to lay down precedents which might help the world to avoid future wars.*

*The entire atmosphere here is unwholesome. Linguists were needed.*

*The Americans are notably poor linguists. Lawyers, clerks, interpreters and researchers were employed who became Americans only in recent years, whose backgrounds were imbedded in Europe’s hatreds and prejudices.*

*The trials were to have convinced the Germans of the guilt of their leaders.*

*They convinced the Germans merely that their leaders lost the war to tough*

<sup>43</sup> Taylor (Apr. 1949), 272-276.

<sup>44</sup> DuBois, 182. *Chicago Tribune* (Feb. 23, 1948), 1, 2; (Feb. 24, 1948), 3; (Feb. 25, 1948), 4; (Feb. 26, 1948), 1, 8; (Feb. 28, 1948), 4, 8; (Feb. 29, 1948), 2; *New York Times* (Feb. 23, 1948), 5; (Feb. 25, 1948), 10; (Feb. 29, 1948), 10; (Mar. 6, 1948), 6.

conquerors.

*Most of the evidence in the trials was documentary, selected from the large tonnage of captured records. The selection was made by the prosecution.*

*The defense had access only to those documents which the prosecution considered material to the case.*

*Our tribunal introduced a rule of procedure that when the prosecution introduced an excerpt from a document, the entire document should be made available to the defense for presentation as evidence. The prosecution protested vigorously. General Taylor tried out of court to call a meeting of the presiding judges to rescind this order. It was not the attitude of any conscientious officer of the court seeking full justice.*

*Also abhorrent to the American sense of justice is the prosecution's reliance upon self-incriminating statements made by the defendants while prisoners for more than two and a half years, and repeated interrogation without presence of counsel. Two and one-half years of confinement is a form of duress in itself.*

*The lack of appeal leaves me with a feeling that justice has been denied.*

*[...] You should go to Nuremberg. You would see there a palace of justice where 90 per cent of the people are interested in prosecution.*

*[...] The German people should receive more information about the trials and the German defendants should receive the right to appeal to the United Nations."*

Ironically, the validity of Wennerstrum's attack on the low or non-existent standard of integrity maintained by the Nuremberg prosecution was confirmed even by the nature of Telford Taylor's reaction to Wennerstrum's statements, which were made in supposed privacy in Nuremberg for publication in the *Chicago Tribune*. *Tribune* reporter Hal Foust sent the message to Berlin for transmission to the U.S. on a wireless channel, which was supposedly secure from prying. However, the prosecution, apparently by employment of a ruse, managed to obtain a copy of the message. Ernest C. Deane, Taylor's press officer, immediately phoned Foust in order to attempt "to talk him out of sending the story." However, the story had already been sent, and Foust replied that "Taylor could not properly have knowledge of the article until its publication." Taylor thereupon prepared a reply to Wennerstrum's remarks, and the reply was actually made public before the *Tribune* published the Foust story containing Wennerstrum's attack. Taylor accused the judge, among other things, of making remarks "subversive to the interests and policies of the United States." Wennerstrum, on arrival in the U.S. shortly after the publication of Taylor's "reply" and of the *Tribune* story, stood firm on his remarks and again criticized Taylor.

This incident was one of the notable "government spying" incidents of the year 1948. The Army issued an order against such spying, and there was much speculation that Taylor might be court-martialed. When reporters asked Taylor for his opinion on the legality of his action, the following exchange occurred:

*"I don't know whether it was legal or not," he replied.*

*"Weren't you general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission*

*for two years before being commissioned in the army?*

*Yes, but what does that have to do with it?"*

Taylor steadfastly refused to express an opinion of the legality of his action but "off the record indicated he was as pleased with himself as a field officer [...] which he never was [...] who had just scored against the enemy by a trick outside the rules of warfare as prescribed by the 1907 Geneva convention."

The quote is from Hal Foust's story about the Taylor press conference. Foust claimed that this was the second instance of Army interference with his messages to his newspaper, and that in the first instance he had been picked up by Army agents for interrogation after his story had been sent.

## Who was in Charge?

In our examination of the Nuremberg trials, we are naturally interested in who supervised the NMT proceedings. *Pro forma*, Taylor supervised almost everything except the appointments of the judges, since the Chief of Counsel's formal responsibilities were not confined to the mere prosecution of cases. His Office was also charged with determining who should and who should not be tried (there was no separate proceeding for formulating indictments, such as a grand jury), what the former were to be charged with, and how the latter were to be disposed of. The Office also took over the functions of the Nuremberg staff and hence one may assume that the Office took over, at least formally, the (expanded) Nuremberg staff itself. Thus, the Office was responsible for interrogations, field work examination of documents, court reporting, and translating and interpreting.<sup>45</sup>

We have given reasons why one should expect that this Nuremberg staff had been under the effective supervision of the War Crimes Branch, and it will shortly be seen that, whatever Taylor's formal powers, his actual functions do not suggest that he ever took over the Nuremberg staff in any effective sense. The War Crimes Branch, although quartered in far-off Washington, continues to be involved in our consideration of the Nuremberg trials.

On June 12, 1948, the American press carried a story which reported that an officer of the U.S. Army, Colonel David "Mickey" Marcus, a West Point graduate operating under the alias "Mickey Stone," had been killed in action while serving as supreme commander of the Jewish forces in the Jerusalem sector in the Arab-Jewish war for the control of Palestine (actually, Marcus had been erroneously shot by one of his own sentries). The *New York Times* summarized his career. He had been Commissioner of Corrections in New York before the war and, as an Army officer, had helped draft the German and Italian surrender terms. He was a legal aid at the Potsdam conference (summer of 1945), after which point, if one judges for the adulatory *New York Times* article only, his career ended, since we are told of no other activity of Marcus' until he turns up with the Haganah in Palestine in January 1948, visits the U.S. in April, receiving a medal at a ceremony in the British Embassy in Washington (probably a cover for negotiations on the details of the final British capitulation), and then returns to Palestine after three

---

<sup>45</sup> Taylor (Apr. 1949), 272-276.

weeks to take over in Jerusalem. The only hint we get of any activity in the period August 1945 to January 1948 is a story on June 24, p. 15, reporting that the London *Daily Telegraph* of the same date said that:

*“He was at the time of his death a full colonel in the Judge Advocate General’s office of the organized reserve of officers. [...] Although not subject to military discipline, he had agreed to remain subject to recall.”*

Marcus had, in fact, been Weir’s successor as head of the War Crimes Branch. Immediately after the war, he had been “number three man in making American policy” in occupied Germany, but was taken out of this position early in 1946 in order to take the war crimes job. His appointment was effective as of February 18, 1946, but he spent a few months in Japan after leaving Germany and then moved into the Washington office of the War Crimes Branch until April 1947, when he retired from the Army and went into private law practice.<sup>46</sup>

Our previous observations obviously suggest that it was in reality the War Crimes Branch that exercised the crucial functions in respect to the NMT. This is the case, as is made clear by a careful reading of Taylor’s official final report on the NMT trials, although the fact is not emphasized there.<sup>47</sup> The fact is confirmed by the remarkable book by Josiah E. DuBois, who headed the I. G. Farben NMT prosecution, and Berkman’s book about Marcus provides some sketchy information on this aspect of Marcus’ career.<sup>48</sup>

Marcus was made head of the War Crimes Branch primarily in order “to take over the mammoth task of selecting hundreds of judges, prosecutors and lawyers” for the NMT and Far East (Tokyo) trials. In December 1946, DuBois had been summoned to Marcus’ office in Washington to discuss the possibility of DuBois’ taking over the prosecution of leading officials of the great German chemicals firm, I. G. Farben. DuBois had been undecided, so he conferred at length with Marcus on the problems involved; one of the problems being whether or not there was sufficient evidence to charge Farben with an “aggressive war” plot and, if so charged, the possible political repercussions that might ensue. They discussed the general advantages of bringing the Farben men to trial. One point Marcus made was that a trial might show how Farben managed to develop certain weapons in total secrecy. Then too, if they went free, they might start working for the Russians. Marcus displayed great knowledge of Farben. He pointed out that there was a “warehouse full” of Farben records in nearby Alexandria, Virginia, a fact that DuBois forgot, until later events forced him to recall and act on it during the pre-trial investigation.

They got around to the required length of the pre-trial investigation. Marcus said: “As far as I’m concerned, you could go over there for as long or as short a time as you liked.” DuBois suggested that he would need about four months, and Marcus replied: “I have no objection to that. Within a few days after you get home, you should get a wire from Telford Taylor agreeing to it.”

<sup>46</sup> Marcus; *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 11, 1945; Berkman, 44-45; *Saturday Evening Post* (Dec. 4, 1948), 179.

<sup>47</sup> Taylor (Aug. 15, 1949), 13, 14, 34, 35.

<sup>48</sup> DuBois, 19-22, 31, 53, 63, 69-70, 74-75; Berkman, 195-199, 157-159.

Taylor, of course, was in Europe in his capacity of Chief of Counsel. DuBois records Taylor's activities relative to the Farben trial. He responded favorably to a staff member's suggestion that DuBois (under whom the staff member had worked in the Treasury Department during the war) be appointed to prosecute Farben. He passed the recommendation on to Washington. After DuBois had taken the job, he had plans to see Taylor to get his okay for adding another man, specified by DuBois, to the prosecution staff. The okay was granted. Taylor went to Paris to plead before the French cabinet for the extradition of a key Farben man. Taylor gave the opening speech at the Farben trial and then disappeared from the proceedings. Taylor was not involved in the pre-trial investigation or in the formulation of the specific charges made by the prosecution.

All of this suggests rather strongly that Taylor's role was in public relations and that he was not deeply involved in the details of the running of the trials, which were his formal responsibility. Such situations are not unusual in large scale operations.

The facts show that the real organizers of the NMT trials were not as much in the public eye as Taylor was; in effect and possibly in intention Taylor was a front man. Marcus, as head of the War Crimes Branch, no doubt exercised effective control of much of the Nuremberg staff, and he selected the judges and lawyers for the trials (with only a handful of exceptions). The book by DuBois shows that Taylor was not involved with the trials on the working level, so the inescapable conclusion is that the substantial powers of Taylor's office were actually exercised either by the War Crimes Branch or by persons subordinate to Taylor. In examining the prominent persons in the latter group, one encounters Robert M. W. Kempner, who is discussed in Chapter 5.

Marcus seems to have had a real importance quite incommensurate with his relatively common rank of colonel, because we are told that during the war he had made a "favorable impression on FDR [...] he was one of the anonymous handful who charted American policy behind the scenes." A man whose career was remarkably intertwined with that of Marcus was General J. H. Hilldring, who headed the Army Civil Affairs Division, to which Marcus was assigned in 1943. The CAD had been created in 1943 within the Army General Staff in anticipation of a need for a group to concern itself with policies to be followed in occupied territories. It had been thought that Fiorello LaGuardia was to head the CAD, but the job went to Hilldring. Marcus became a member and later the chief of the Planning Branch of the CAD. It was as a consequence of Marcus' activities in the CAD that he made his mark; his assignment to the military government of Germany was a direct result of his CAD responsibilities. It was Hilldring who, several months later, pulled him out of his military government position and assigned him to head the War Crimes Branch (which was transferred from the JAG to the CAD on March 4, 1946). Then Hilldring immediately moved over to the State Department as an Assistant Secretary of State in charge of occupied areas problems; in this capacity he headed a secretariat, which coordinated Army, Navy, and State Department policies in Germany. In September 1947, he left the State Department and became an Adviser to the U.S. delegation at the United Nations, where the

diplomatic battle between the Zionists and the Arabs was being waged. Hilldring “was a tower of strength from the outset [...] as information link with the Jewish representatives, he frequently conversed with Zionist strategists.” Then, at about the time Marcus was made supreme commander of the Jewish forces in Jerusalem, Hilldring was appointed back to the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State for Palestine. Zionist sources have subsequently boasted that both the UN and second State Department appointments were direct result of Zionist lobbying.<sup>49</sup> Quite a pair, Marcus and Hilldring.

The filling of the War Crimes Branch position with a fanatical Zionist, the “first soldier since Biblical times to hold the rank of General in the Army of Israel,” is not only significant in terms of what the Zionist might do in the position, but also significant in revealing, in a simple way, the nature of the overall political forces operating at the trials. This is the important point. It is simply not possible to imagine an appointment that would make these trials more suspect.

Under these political conditions it is simply silly to expect anything but a frame-up at the “trials.” The associated “extermination” hoax will be exposed with complete clarity in these pages.

## The Nazis

This book is written for people who are already informed on the European side of World War II and the immediately preceding years. We have no intention of reviewing the nature of the Nazi state, the roles of Göring, Himmler, Goebbels, etc., or the anti-Jewish measures that were taken prior to the war, except that these matters will be touched upon here and there as a matter of course. The major events and approximate dates associated with the war are assumed known by the reader.

When Europe was dominated by the Germans, it was not organized according to the plan of the Treaty of Versailles; Figure 3 presents a map of Europe as it was organized in the autumn of 1942, at the apex of Hitler’s power. Germany had annexed Austria, Alsace-Lorraine, part of Czechoslovakia, and a great deal of Poland (more than just the part that had been taken from Germany after World War I). The part of Poland that remained was called the “General Government” and had the status of a subject province governed by the Germans, as did the three Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In the same subject status were White Russia, the Ukraine, Bohemia-Moravia (formerly western Czechoslovakia), and Banat (long a part of Hungary dominated by ethnic Germans). The eastern part of Czechoslovakia had become the independent state of Slovakia, and Yugoslavia had been reorganized as Croatia and Serbia, corresponding to the two dominant of the five nationalities that had constituted Yugoslavia. Italy also had an interest in this area of Europe, controlled Albania, and shared influence in adjoining countries with her German ally. Finland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria

---

<sup>49</sup> Marcus; Berkman, 191-193, 199; John & Hadawi, vol. 2, 209n, 367; Zink, 209, 210; *New York Times* (Apr. 8, 1943), 12; (Apr. 16, 1943), 10; (Mar. 17, 1946), 15; (Sep. 16, 1947), 10; (Apr. 29, 1948), 16; Blum, 383.

were also allied with Germany, and the Waffen-SS (regular military units within the SS) recruited troops all over Europe, particularly in the Baltic states, in the Ukraine, in Scandinavia, and in the Netherlands and Belgium.

Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, and much (later all) of France were occupied by the Germans. Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal remained neutral throughout the war.

It is convenient to review, at this point, some matters pertaining to the SS, a strange bureaucracy, which had responsibility for certain improbable combinations of functions.

Only three of these functions – security, concentration camp administration, and resettlement policies – are of interest in our study.

The best known agency of the SS was the RSHA, Reich Security Main Office, which embraced the Gestapo (Secret State Police, headed by SS Lieutenant General Heinrich Müller), the SD (Security Service, headed by SS Lieutenant General Schellenberg), the Kripo (Criminal Police, headed by SS Lieutenant Generals Nebe and, later, Panzinger) and related functions. The first head of the RSHA had been SS General Reinhard Heydrich, an ambitious and ruthless young man whose methods generated many enemies for him.

Ever since the Röhm purge of 1934, the substantial ambitions of the SS in respect to military matters had resulted in growing conflict between the SS and the regular military establishment, the Wehrmacht, and Heydrich was not in the least bit delicate in the methods he employed to prosecute the conflict. In 1938, he had forced the resignation of the Minister of War, General Blomberg, by showing that Blomberg's new wife had been a prostitute. Blomberg's obvious successor was General von Fritsch, so Heydrich constructed a frame-up of von Fritsch, based on perjured allegations of homosexuality. Although von Fritsch was eventually exonerated, his career had been ruined, and the bitterness toward Heydrich swelled.

The SS had a second basis for rivalry with the military establishment. The German intelligence services were the *Abwehr*, German military intelligence, responsible to the military high command and headed, since 1935, by Admiral Wilhelm Canaris, and the SD, the political intelligence arm, responsible to Heydrich and Himmler. Since the two types of intelligence activity cannot be strictly separated, Canaris and Himmler inevitably became rivals. Heydrich appears to have attempted to be cooperative with Canaris, at least at first; this may have been due to Heydrich's own background as a naval intelligence officer who, during the twenties, had served and trained under Canaris and had even been a frequent visitor to his home.

More significantly, the Admiral was a traitor; he is one of the awesome mysteries of World War II. During and even before the war (he was in contact with Churchill in 1938), Canaris betrayed Germany at every opportunity. A British official has expressed the role of Canaris most succinctly: "We had Admiral Canaris." The man's motivations remain as mysterious as his personality and his antecedents. Ian Colvin, one of the authorities on World War II intelligence operations, wrote a whole book about Canaris and, yet, never deciphered him:

*"The readers will have to judge for themselves whether Admiral Wilhelm*

*Canaris was a German patriot or a British spy, a European statesman or a cosmopolitan intriguer, a double agent, an opportunist, or a seer. It will not be easy for them to make up their minds."*

It may be of some relevance that the man whom Colvin, in his 1951 book, characterized as one of Canaris' "close personal friends," Otto John, the *Abwehr* man in the all important neutral capital of Lisbon during World War II, later became Chief of State Security for the Bonn Government and was subsequently exposed (in 1956) as a Soviet agent.<sup>50</sup>

The Canaris case is sometimes confused by grouping Canaris with the men behind the abortive coup d'état of July 20, 1944. This is utterly erroneous since Canaris used all his powers to betray Germany, whereas the men of July 20, merely betrayed Hitler and would never have betrayed Germany. No Englishman, after the war, could have truthfully said: "we had Erwin Rommel." The most one can say about Canaris' involvement is that he was no doubt aware of the conspiracy in its early stages and naturally gave its members the impression that he was with them. Canaris was a grand master at giving such impressions.

To return to Heydrich, great ambition had gotten the young SS General appointed Deputy Protector of Bohemia-Moravia in late 1941; he was thus starting to look bigger than his superior, Reichsführer-SS Heinrich Himmler. It might also be interesting to speculate that, at about this time, Heydrich may have started to grasp Canaris' game; as chief of the RSHA and as a former associate of Canaris, no man was better situated and motivated to penetrate Canaris' secret than Heydrich was. When one considers the long burning antagonism of the Army, it appears that Heydrich, by early 1942, had accumulated a very long list of powerful enemies in Germany. It was thus remarkable that at this point in Heydrich's career the English, it is said, fortuitously removed him in May 1942 by dropping two assassins from the sky. In accord with the all-too-common scenario for political assassinations (*e.g.* the Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy assassinations), the alleged assassins were said to have been killed before they got an opportunity to talk.

In an appointment that caused general astonishment, Heydrich was succeeded in early 1943 by the relatively obscure and much less ambitious Dr. Ernst Kaltenbrunner. Evidently desirous of avoiding repetition of the situation that had developed with Heydrich, Himmler retained a rather more direct control of the Gestapo and the SD than he had held previously. However, both agencies continued to be formally responsible to the head of the RSHA, now Kaltenbrunner. Himmler also charged Kaltenbrunner with a special task: to build up the intelligence service of the SD. This was a particularly timely decision on the part of Himmler, since Canaris fell from power (without being fully exposed) in February 1944 and, by a special Hitler decree, all military and political intelligence functions were taken over by the RSHA, thus uniting all intelligence activity under SD chief Schellenberg.

Canaris was arrested after the July 20 coup and he was executed shortly before

<sup>50</sup> Colvin, vii, 1-6; *New York Times* (Dec. 23, 1956), 1; (Jul. 6, 1969), 11. See Sturdza, 161-162, for an episodic illustration of Canaris at work.



the end of the war.

Concentration camp administration was under the WVHA, Economic-Administrative Main Office, headed by SS General Oswald Pohl. As its name suggests, the WVHA was concerned with the economic role of the SS which had arisen, for the most part, on account of the availability of the labor of concentration camp inmates. The commandants of the concentration camps reported to the Inspectorate of Concentration Camps, headed by SS Brigadier General Glücks, who reported to Pohl. Pohl reported to Himmler, and was formally equal in rank to Kaltenbrunner and Heydrich.

It is convenient to state at this point, in very general terms, what was going on with respect to the Jews of Europe during the life of the Nazi regime. Before the war, the German Government had used all means to encourage the emigration of Jews from Germany, and most German Jews had left Germany before the outbreak of the war. The persistent problems in connection with this emigration program were, first, the dislocations of the economy which were entailed in moving the Jews out and, second, the difficulty in arranging for other countries to take the Jews. By the summer of 1941, Germany was at war with Russia, and huge numbers of Jews, *i.e.*, the greater part of all the Jews of Europe, were in the German sphere of influence. However, the war had also opened up, temporarily, vast new territories for the Germans, and consequently, a program of Jewish resettlement got under way in the autumn of 1941. Through the course of the war, as long as Germany controlled any significant amount of eastern territory, European Jews were being resettled in the East. There were also a certain number of young, adult Jews conscripted for labor.

On account of certain political problems and the priority of war requirements, the resettlement program was only partially carried out and, of course, nowhere near six million Jews were involved. Excluding Polish and Romanian Jews, perhaps 750,000 Jews were resettled, primarily in the Ukraine, White Russia, and Latvia. Not all Polish Jews fell under German domination. Apart from those who managed to flee before or after the German occupation, several hundred thousand or perhaps a million Jews had been deported from Poland by the Russians in 1940 and had been dispersed in the Soviet Union. For the most part, the Polish Jews who came into German hands were crowded into ghettos in eastern Poland (1939 boundaries).

What happened to all of these people can be established only in a very general way, because all of the territory that the Jews had been resettled onto became Soviet territory after the war, and because the victorious powers engaged in considerable suppression of the data. However, there is sufficient evidence to permit us to see approximately what happened. Although it is very likely that a fair number perished in the disorderly and chaotic conditions that accompanied the German retreats, it is established that a large number of Jews, predominantly of pre-war Polish nationality, were absorbed into the Soviet Union, and the remainder of the Jews who had been uprooted ultimately resettled in Palestine, the U.S., Europe, and elsewhere.

These general remarks are supplied here to serve as a background to assist the

reader in interpreting the analysis of the “extermination” claims, which is the task of the next few chapters. However, the major evidence for these remarks concerning what actually happened to the Jews will not be presented until Chapter 7.

The RSHA was responsible for carrying out most aspects of this Jewish policy. Within the Gestapo there was an office, “B4,” which designated the “religions and cults division – Jewish religion subdivision,” headed by one Karl Adolf Eichmann, whose highest attained rank had been lieutenant colonel or colonel.<sup>51</sup> Eichmann did the routine chores associated with the Jewish emigration and resettlement policies of the German Government; most of his time was spent arranging with the various Jewish Councils to draw up transport lists of Jews, and arranging for transportation for the deportees. There is no evidence that Eichmann ever participated in formulating policy, and since he was not involved in concentration camp administration, he could not have been directly involved in whatever it was that happened in those camps.

It is, therefore, quite ridiculous that it was possible to get so many people excited about the case of a person such as Eichmann, who had performed completely routine functions in Nazi Germany. Those functions were carried out in accordance with specific orders transmitted by his superiors. His Jerusalem testimony was given “after consulting Reitlinger and Poliakov, (producing) seventeen multicolored charts, which contributed little to a better understanding of the bureaucratic machinery of the Third Reich.”<sup>52</sup> I see no point in viewing the Eichmann affair as anything but a publicity stunt on the part of a state accustomed to disregarding the constraints that other states feel bound to respect. A short discussion of the Eichmann case and of Eichmann’s Jerusalem testimony, is provided in Chapter 6 (pages 226ff.).

Other departments of the SS, which were involved in resettlement activities were the RKFDV (Reich Commission for the Strengthening of Germandom, headed by SS General Ulrich Greifelt), the RuSHA (Race and Settlement Main Office, headed by SS Generals Otto Hofmann and, later, Richard Hildebrandt) and the VoMi (Liaison Office for Ethnic Germans, headed by SS General Werner Lorenz). The most important responsibility of these departments was the resettlement of ethnic Germans on conquered territories, and Greifelt was the main personality in this program. However, they inevitably got involved in the program of Jewish resettlement to some degree.

---

<sup>51</sup> Reitlinger, 28; Red Cross (1947), 99; Eichmann, session 75, V1, W1.

<sup>52</sup> Arendt, 136 (152 in 1964 edition).



## Chapter 2: The Camps

### Horror Scenes and ‘Extermination’ Camps

When Germany collapsed in the spring of 1945, it was after a long allied propaganda campaign that had repeatedly claimed that people, mainly Jews, were being systematically killed in German “camps.” When the British captured the camp at Bergen-Belsen in northern Germany, they found a large number of unburied bodies lying around the camp.

Photographs, such as Fig. 10, and pictures of guards with unfortunate facial expressions, such as Fig. 12, were accordingly reproduced all over the world.

It is, I believe, Belsen, which has always constituted the effective, mass propaganda “proof” of exterminations, and even today you will find such scenes occasionally waved around as “proof.” In fact these scenes, repeated in varying degrees at other German camps, *e.g.* Dachau and Buchenwald, were much less related to “extermination” than the scenes at Dresden after the British-American raids of February 1945, when many, many times as many bodies were found lying around.<sup>53</sup> The deaths at Belsen were the result of a total loss of control, not a deliberate policy. Equivalent scenes could easily have existed in any country invaded on all sides by enemy armies, crippled by powerful “strategic” bombings, which had caused all sorts of shortages and chaotic conditions.

The major cause of the deaths at Belsen was a typhus epidemic. Everybody agrees that typhus was a constant menace in all German camps and eastern military operations; for this reason there was a real fear of typhus spreading throughout Germany and vigorous countermeasures were applied.<sup>54</sup> The typhus problem will play a most significant role in our story, because it was not merely at the end of the war that it manifested itself; the scenes at the end of the war were due to the total collapse of all measures against a disease that had plagued the German concentration camps since early in the war. The typhus was of the sort carried by the body louse, and consequently, defensive measures consisted in killing the lice, whose spread was due mainly to the constant rail traffic with the East.

Thus, all “survivor literature,” sincere or inventive and regardless of the type of camp involved, report the same basic procedures involved in entering a German camp: disrobe, shave hair, shower, dress in new clothes or in disinfested old clothing.<sup>55</sup>

At Belsen, the trouble had started in October 1944 with a breakdown of these measures. In the account of a political prisoner there:<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Veale, 133-136; Martin, 121.

<sup>54</sup> Reitlinger, 122, 402; Hilberg, 570-571; DuBois, 127.

<sup>55</sup> Burney, 9; Buber, 188; Lenz, 31; Cohen, 120-122.

<sup>56</sup> Sington, 117-118.

*“Towards the end of February 1945 my own situation changed completely.*

*By that time typhus had become a serious danger for the whole camp. It was the species of typhus which is transmitted by lice. At one time all the transports which arrived at Belsen had had to pass through a ‘human laundry’ and this disinfection seems to have been effective enough to keep the camp free from lice until the autumn of 1944.*

*At the end of October a big transport had, for the first time, been admitted to the camp without being disinfected, because there had been some damage to the machinery of the shower-baths. Unfortunately the people of this transport were louse carriers, and from that day the lice gradually spread over the whole camp. [...] Typhus broke out in Camp I about the end of January. At first there were only a few cases, but a month later a dozen had appeared, and it became impossible to check the disease [...].”*

Another serious complication was that, in the final months, Belsen was considered a *Krankenlager*, a sick camp, so that many people entering were sick to begin with.<sup>57</sup> The British could not check things at once, and over a quarter of those alive when they took over the camp were to perish in the first four weeks.<sup>58</sup>

Despite the very effective propaganda role of the Belsen scenes, nobody acquainted with the most easily obtainable facts claims exterminations at Belsen, and the British military court which tried the commandant, SS Captain Kramer, never accused him of supervising an extermination camp at Belsen.<sup>59</sup> Today, in fact, exterminations at any of the concentration camps in Germany are not claimed by anybody trying to be serious; Belsen, Buchenwald, Dachau, etc. were not extermination camps. The extermination camps are all supposed to have been in occupied Poland, namely the camps referred to as Auschwitz, Belzec, Kulmhof (Chelmno), Lublin (Majdanek), Sobibor, and Treblinka.<sup>60</sup>

Also, exterminations of Jews were supposed to have been conducted in Russia by the *Einsatzgruppen*, employing either mass shooting or “gasmobiles.” The camps in Poland are also claimed to have employed “gas chambers” but, except for the case of Chelmno, stationary rather than mobile ones.

Thus, the exterminations are supposed to have taken place only at locations which had been abandoned before being captured by the Russians, not at camps which were still functioning, however disastrously, when captured by Western troops.

Although six extermination camps are claimed, one of them, Auschwitz, is the key to the whole story. It is for Auschwitz that quantities of documentary evidence are offered; there is little of any sort offered for the others. It was Auschwitz, as will be seen, that got the very special attention of Washington long before the end of the war. Thus, much of this work is necessarily concerned with the claim that at Auschwitz Jews were being exterminated during World War II.

---

<sup>57</sup> Fyfe, 152.

<sup>58</sup> Sington, 48.

<sup>59</sup> Fyfe, 17.

<sup>60</sup> Hilberg, 561-564; Reitlinger, 94, 147-150, 154.

## The Camps and Their End

The subject of this book is the question of whether or not the Germans attempted to exterminate the European Jews. We are not concerned with considering in any detail the general question of alleged Nazi brutalities of all sorts or with presenting a complete picture of the functioning of German camps. However, it has been found that many people have such distorted views of these camps that, because at Auschwitz there were camps, it is difficult to separate Auschwitz at the outset and consider it in isolation from other camps. Thus, a few general words about the camps are in order. Fig. 23 presents a map (January 1938 boundaries) that shows the locations of a few of the most frequently referred to camps together with the locations of a few large cities.

There were many types of German camps, and only a fraction of them were called “concentration camps.” There were thirteen German concentration camps, each of them actually being a collection of neighboring camps. Only two of the six alleged “extermination camps,” Auschwitz and Lublin, were “concentration camps.” A table of many types of German camps, which includes many ordinary prisons, is given by Aronéanu, pp. 203-251, who lists about 1,400 “camps,” together with their locations and “characters.” While this table gives some idea of the scope and diversity of the German prison and camp systems, it has obvious major errors, such as giving the “character” of Birkenau as “medical experiments.” The major significance of Oranienburg, near Berlin, was that it quartered the Inspectorate of Concentration Camps, and was thus in direct communication with all concentration camps.

The typical inmate of a German concentration camp was a person being detained for punitive or security reasons. There were five major categories, and they were distinguished by colored insignia, which were associated with their uniforms:<sup>61</sup>

**Table 5: Concentration camp inmate insignia**

COLOR	CATEGORY
Green	Criminals
Red	Political prisoners (mainly communists)
Pink	Homosexuals
Black	Asocials (vagrants, drunkards, etc.)
Purple	Considered disloyal on account of religious views (mainly Jehovah’s Witnesses)

At Auschwitz and some other camps, a triangle of the appropriate color was attached to the uniform. If the prisoner was Jewish, a yellow triangle was superimposed on the first triangle, forming a star of David. This is referred to as the Auschwitz “star system.”

Economic conditions being what they were, the German government made every effort to use concentration camp inmates for labor. Prisoners of war

<sup>61</sup> Cohen, 26-28.

(POWs) were also used to the extent that such use did not conflict with the relevant conventions, as the Germans interpreted their obligations under them. Thus, Russian POWs were used freely, because Russia did not respect the conventions. Employment of western POWs was restricted to cases where certain legalistic “transformations” into civilian workers were possible, as with many French POWs,<sup>62</sup> or some cases where the work was not considered to be ruled out by the conventions, as with some British POWs employed under conditions to be discussed.

The number of inmates in the entire German concentration camp system was about 224,000 in August 1943 and 524,000 a year later.<sup>63</sup> These figures include only camps referred to by the Germans as concentration camps and do not include any transit camps or camps referred to in other terms, such as the Theresienstadt ghetto or any other establishments intended for quartering families.

It is generally accurate to say that there was no such thing as a “concentration camp” for Jews as such, but this remark must be clarified; there are three distinct categories of Jews, which must be considered in this connection.

First, a fraction of those interned for punitive and security reasons were Jews, and under the national socialist system it was natural, in the camps, to segregate them from the “Aryan” inmates. Thus, sections of the camps could, in this sense, be considered “for Jews.” Second, specific legislation existed for the labor conscription of Jews, and many selected specifically for labor found their ways into concentration camps on this basis.

The third category was Jewish families, but the closest they got to “concentration camps” was in certain *Durchgangslager*, transit camps, which in some cases were independent camps such as Westerbork in the Netherlands<sup>64</sup> and others (to be mentioned) and in some cases were separate compounds, which existed at some concentration camps, e.g. Belsen, possibly Dachau,<sup>65</sup> and others (to be mentioned). The transit camp, as its name suggests, was intended only for temporary quartering pending transport to some other destination.

In addition to the transit camps, there were “camps” for some Jewish families, such as Theresienstadt in Bohemia-Moravia and others far to the East, but the most pejorative term applicable in these cases would be “ghetto,” not “concentration camp.” In addition, as we shall see, toward the end of the war, as the Russians were approaching on the eastern front, the Germans put many formerly free Jews into ghettos for security reasons.

The full story regarding the position of Jews relative to German-controlled camps of all types is rather complicated. Rather than attempt to say here exactly what that position was, the subject will be touched on at many points in the book, and the reader will be able to form a reasonably complete picture.

There is no point in attempting to discuss the entire German camp system here. For our purposes it will suffice to discuss the three that are referred to most fre-

---

<sup>62</sup> Red Cross (1948), vol. 1, 546-547.

<sup>63</sup> 1469-PS and NO-1990 in NMT, vol. 5, 382, 389.

<sup>64</sup> Cohen, xiii.

<sup>65</sup> Aronéanu, 212.

quently (excluding Auschwitz): Belsen, Buchenwald, and Dachau (inmate populations in August 1943: 3,000, 17,600, and 17,300 respectively<sup>66</sup>). Then we will pass on to preliminary discussion of the alleged “extermination camp” Auschwitz in Poland.

## Belsen

Belsen had only a very brief history. It had originally been a Wehrmacht camp for wounded POWs. In mid-1943, the SS took over half the camp for the purpose, among others, of turning it into an “exchange camp,” a transit camp for foreign nationals and Jews whom the Germans contemplated exchanging for Germans held abroad. Some new grounds and buildings were also added to the camp. Jews from Salonika, Greece, who possessed Spanish passports were the first Jewish arrivals (it was hoped to send them to Spain), but eventually the Dutch Jews predominated (about 5,000). A fraction of the Dutch Jews were there on a semi-permanent basis, because they numbered many of the skilled craftsmen of the essential Amsterdam diamond cutting industry, and thus, their diamond cutting operations had merely been moved to Belsen. The quarters for Jews at Belsen formed what was called the “Star Camp,” which was strictly separated from the rest of the camp and was essentially untouched by the typhus epidemic of the last months.<sup>67</sup>

The Dutch Jews were particularly heavily hit by deportations; reasons for this will be given later. It was at Belsen in March 1945 that Anne Frank is said to have perished from typhus, although the Jewish families were mostly isolated from the typhus epidemic.<sup>68</sup> The question of the authenticity of the diary is not considered important enough to examine here; I will only remark that I have looked it over and don’t believe it. For example, as early as page 2 one is reading an essay on why a 13-year-old girl would start a diary, and then page 3 gives a short history of the Frank family and then quickly reviews the specific anti-Jewish measures that followed the German occupation in 1940. The rest of the book is in the same historical spirit.

The remainder of the Belsen concentration camp contained the usual assortment of inmates, and the fate of the camp has been seen. Bergen-Belsen never had a significant economic-industrial aspect, except for the diamond cutting.

## Buchenwald

The major significance of Buchenwald was industrial; its satellite camps at Beuchow, Dora, Ellrich, Elsing, Gandersheim, and Halberstadt existed primarily for the sake of an underground aircraft factory, which employed the usual concentration camp and foreign labor in addition to regular German labor.<sup>69</sup> There were, however, two other aspects, the medical experiments conducted at the main camp

---

<sup>66</sup> 1469-PS in NMT, vol. 5, 382.

<sup>67</sup> Reitlinger, 364-365, 406; Hilberg, 377-379, 632-633.

<sup>68</sup> A. Frank, 285.

<sup>69</sup> Aronéanu, 207, 213, 214, 217, 220.



Buchenwald and the activities of commandant Koch; these offer quite perfect illustrations on how the meanings of facts have been distorted in speaking of these camps. We are fortunate in having a book by Christopher Burney, a former inmate; this book not only indulges in some of this distortion but also offers us some facts or hints which enable us to see through the distortion. Burney's book should illustrate to any reader the necessity, when reading "personal experience" literature of this sort, of sharply and rigorously distinguishing between the scenes the author actually claims to have witnessed or the claims he had read or heard, on the one hand, and the inferences he has drawn or pretended to draw on the other. The differences are often most stark. Describing commandant Koch:<sup>70</sup>

*"No cruelty was foreign to him, no single cell of his brain had not at some time or other contributed to the planning of new refinements of anguish and death for the rats in his trap."*

Burney goes on to explain that, because Koch was a homosexual, Frau Ilse Koch used to make out with the prisoners, "who were then sent to the crematorium," except that highly valued tattooed skin was saved for lampshades. At this point in Burney's book things obviously look bad for him, especially if he has tattoos and Frau Koch finds him but, happily, all of that had happened before he arrived there in early 1944. Koch had been arrested in 1943 for embezzlement and was succeeded by Pister who was "one of the mildest concentration camp commanders in history" so that:

*"in the last year of its existence a casual observer who came to the camp and looked generally at it without probing its corners, would have seen little or no beatings, a large number of men doing no work, a much larger number working with a lethargy taught them by the Russians [...], living blocks which were clean, kitchens with huge, horrifyingly modern soup-cookers and a hospital which would just pass muster at first glance."*

The Koch arrest had, in fact, been part of the breaking of a ring of corruption which had spread through the German concentration camp system and had involved the murder of some prisoners who knew too much. It was exposed through the efforts of SS Judge Konrad Morgen. Koch was executed by the SS.<sup>71</sup>

The tattooed skin was undoubtedly due to the medical experiment role of Buchenwald. As remarked by Burney, when a Buchenwald inmate died, the camp doctors looked his body over and if they found something interesting they saved it.<sup>72</sup> It is fairly certain that the collection of medical specimens thus gathered was the source of the tattooed skin and the human head that turned up at the IMT as "exhibits" relating to people "murdered" at Buchenwald. What is probably the greater part of the collection is pictured in Figure 32. The head is normally pictured, without any explanation, in the company of some soap (Fig. 24), allegedly made from human bodies, which was submitted as evidence by the Russians who, when they learned there was to be a trial, evidently read up on what the Germans

---

<sup>70</sup> Burney, 10-14.

<sup>71</sup> Hoehne, 383-387 (434-436 in paperback).

<sup>72</sup> Burney, 10.

had been charged with in World War I.<sup>73</sup> By the time the IMT was done “developing” the fact about the tattooed skin found at Buchenwald, we had an official deposition:<sup>74</sup>

*“In 1939 all prisoners with tattooing on them were ordered to report to the dispensary. No one knew what the purpose was, but after the tattooed prisoners had been examined, the ones with the best and most artistic specimens were kept in the dispensary and then killed by injections. [...] the desired pieces of tattooed skin were detached from the bodies and treated. The finished products were turned over to Koch’s wife, who had them fashioned into lampshades and other ornamental household articles. I myself saw such tattooed skins with various designs and legends on them, such as ‘Hansel and Gretel’ which one prisoner had on his knee, and designs of ships from prisoners’ chests.”*

Frau Koch was convicted of such crimes at her trial before a U.S. military court, but in 1948, the American military governor, General Lucius Clay, reviewed her case and determined that, despite testimony produced at her trial, Frau Koch could not be related to the lampshades and other articles, which were “discovered” (*i.e.* planted) in the Buchenwald commandant’s residence when the camp was captured in 1945. For one thing, she had not lived there since her husband’s, and her own, arrest in 1943. Also her “family journal,” said to be bound in human skin and which was one of the major accusations against her, was never located and obviously never existed. Clay thus commuted her life sentence to four years imprisonment for ordinary sorts of brutalities.

What happened after the commutation provided one of the many episodes which, together with the 1948-49 revelations of what had transpired at the Dachau “trials,” exposed quite effectively the lawlessness that prevailed in the war crimes trials. Rabbi Wise and other influential people protested the commutation so strongly that there was a Senate investigation into the matter, which concluded that:

*“military authorities say they have been unable to find evidence of any other crime Ilse Koch committed on which she could be tried without violating the rule of double jeopardy. However [...] because the trial conducted by our special military government court was based on charges that the various accused had mistreated ‘non-German nationals,’ the German courts might well try Ilse Koch under their law for crimes committed against German nationals. [...] Should the German people bring Ilse Koch to trial on such charges, the subcommittee is convinced that it would then be the duty of our military authorities to give complete cooperation to the German authorities.”*

This distinction between crimes against Germans and crimes against non-Germans was merely a bit of sophistry that was trotted out for the occasion. Not only had the U.S. war crimes courts always assumed jurisdiction in cases of alleged crimes against German Jews, but the distinction was irrelevant anyway, for

<sup>73</sup> 3420-PS; 3422-PS. For pictures see, *e.g.*, Andrus, photographs. A “macabre collection” of specimens from Buchenwald is also pictured in Pélissier, 640 pp.

<sup>74</sup> 3421-PS; IMT, vol. 3, 515; quoted Shirer, 984.

Clay's commutation of her sentence was based on a conclusion that she was not guilty of the major charges against her, which had to do with lampshades and the like, irrespective of the nationality of the alleged victims.

Clay did not change his position throughout the long public controversy concerning efforts to try Frau Koch a second time on essentially the same charges, a controversy which, according to the *New York Times*, "rocked the United States and Europe." Clay was firm on his decision in the Ilse Koch case and explained that

*"examination of the record, based upon reports which I received from the lawyers, indicated that the most serious charges were based on hearsay and not on factual evidence. For that reason the sentence was commuted.*

*I hold no sympathy for Ilse Koch. She was a woman of depraved character and ill repute. She had done many things reprehensible and punishable, undoubtedly, under German law. We were not trying her for those things. We were trying her as a war criminal on specific charges."*

Despite this empathic stand of the American military governor, pressures from the U.S. induced the German authorities to move against Frau Koch after she was released from American detention in October 1949. She was again tried on the familiar "lampshade" charges. Although the defense was able to show that the testimonies of two of the prosecution witnesses contradicted declarations that they had made in connection with earlier proceedings, thus forcing the German court to strike their testimonies from the record, Ilse Koch was found guilty and sentenced to life imprisonment. She hanged herself in her cell in 1967.<sup>75</sup>

Burney reports some Belsen-like scenes at Buchenwald, but mainly among incoming prisoners evacuated from more eastern locations during the final chaotic weeks. So much for Buchenwald.<sup>76</sup>

## Dachau

Dachau was one of the oldest Nazi concentration camps, with an emphasis on Austrian political prisoners, Roman Catholic priests (detained for reasons that need not be examined here), and old and semi-employable people of all categories. The camp also had its group of ordinary criminals. Work was mainly at outside factories, but a herb plantation was being built up at the camp, and some prisoners worked at draining swamps.<sup>77</sup>

It is useful here to go into some detail on how, at the end of and immediately after the war, Dachau was misrepresented as an extermination camp with gas chambers. In showing that such events never took place at Dachau we are not, of course, contradicting the present story put forward by the bearers of the extermination legend, who do not claim Dachau in this connection, and build their story around the camps in Poland, with Auschwitz occupying the central position in this

<sup>75</sup> *New York Times* (Sep. 24, 1948), 3; (Oct. 1, 1948), 11; (Oct. 8, 1948), 10; (Oct. 22, 1948), 5; (Dec. 27, 1948), 1, 12; (Dec. 20, 1950), 15; Jan. 16, 1951), 1; (Sep. 3, 1967), 1.

<sup>76</sup> Burney, 106-109.

<sup>77</sup> Lenz, 32, 42, 78; 1063-PS.

respect. The point of exploring these details regarding Dachau is that the credibility of the U.S. occupation is thereby demolished. The U.S. propaganda had claimed exterminations in the German camps and Dachau was the major camp taken over by the Americans (Buchenwald was later surrendered to the Russians). Thus, an effort was made to distort and misrepresent what had happened at the Dachau concentration camp. A recognition of the amazing crudeness and clumsiness of that effort, and the ludicrous nature of the “evidence” put forward will prime the reader quite suitably for our analysis of the central part of the hoax, the Auschwitz lie.

The conditions in the camps had forced the German government, in March 1945, to take the final step in reversal of its earlier policy of absolute exclusion of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) from the concentration camps (existing conventions covered POWs, not concentration camp inmates). On March 29, 1945, SS General Kaltenbrunner authorized the ICRC to place one delegate in each camp for the purpose of distributing relief supplies, on the conditions that the delegate remained there until the end of the war.<sup>78</sup> The ICRC organized road transport for relief supplies (use of the railways was out of the question) but its effectiveness was to a degree influenced by the attitudes of individual concentration camp commanders; for example, the reception at Mauthausen on April 23-30 was at first negative. SS Colonel Ziweis claimed that he had not heard of the Kaltenbrunner order.<sup>79</sup>

At Dachau, the ICRC had gotten a relatively warm reception on April 27 (after some coolness on April 26), and a delegate was allowed to establish himself in the camp. By Sunday, April 29, it was found that most of the German officers, guards, and employees had fled, and the effective command of the camp had fallen to a certain SS Lieutenant Wickert who had similar intentions of leading a flight of the remaining guards. Because this raised many dangers, notably violence by prisoners against German civilians of the area and the spread of epidemics, the delegate talked Wickert out of this. They came to an agreement regarding surrender of the camp, which the ICRC delegate was to do his best to have respected. First, guards would remain in the towers to prevent the escape of prisoners.

Second, the soldiers not standing guard would assemble, unarmed, in one of the courtyards.

Third, the garrison would be allowed to withdraw to its own “battle lines,” after the transfer of the camp to the Americans.

The ICRC delegate then affixed a white towel to a broomstick and, taking a German officer with him, left the camp to hunt up some Americans. After a while they encountered an American motorized unit and the delegate presented himself to the American general (not named in the delegate’s report on these events) who, on learning the identities of his new guests, immediately asked that the delegate and the German officer accompany them for the purpose of taking press photos at the camp, particularly of a certain train which was full of dead bodies. Although

<sup>78</sup> Red Cross (1948), vol. 1, 620; vol. 3, 83, 184; Red Cross (1947), 82-84.

<sup>79</sup> Red Cross (1947), 134-137.

the Red Cross delegate had been at the camp for two days, he had apparently been too busy to learn of this train while at the camp and learned of it from the general.

With its mission thus defined, the column set off for the camp. On the way, the delegate was able to ask a Major Every to communicate to the general the agreement for the transfer of the camp, but apparently this attempt to communicate with the general was not successful.

On arrival at the camp, they found that some Americans had already arrived, the German guards in the towers had been replaced and all the Germans had surrendered. The inmates were in great disorder and some were armed; shots were fired at SS guards and this resulted in some killed on both sides. The delegate was finally able to gain the attention of the general to present the plan for the transfer of the camp. The general assented to the plan, but the German prisoners were not allowed to leave anyway, and many of them suffered at the hands of inmates seeking vengeance. As many of the inmates were disarmed as possible, but this did not end the disorders. Some inmates embraced the American soldiers while others tore down barbed wire fences and escaped. Some shots were fired by the Americans over the heads of inmates, and an uneasy calm was finally reached by 10 p.m. There were, however, occasional shots fired during the following night. The following day, April 30, it was possible to pass out adequate food and on the next day, Tuesday May 1, some members of the ICRC legation arrived and, according to the delegate, they visited not only piles of corpses but “equally the execution chamber, the gas chamber, the crematory ovens, etc.”<sup>80</sup>

The preceding is a summary of the report of the Red Cross delegate. It contains no assertions similar to later assertions made independently by former inmates Johann M. Lenz and Nerin E. Gun, both of whom claim that the Americans, on arrival, started killing all SS guards in sight (unquestionably at least an exaggeration).<sup>81</sup> Gun claims that this policy even extended to the dogs in the kennels, while Lenz claims that the general ordered a two hour bombardment of the defenseless town of Dachau (he was eventually dissuaded from this) in retaliation for the bodies which had been found lying around.<sup>82</sup> If there is any truth to these claims, the ICRC delegate made a fairly significant omission in his report.

It is very important to recognize what the Red Cross delegate refers to as the “gas chamber” in his report. The tone of the delegate’s report is tongue-in-cheek and contemptuous at several points, for it was written in defensive awareness of all the drivel that was being given mass circulation in the press. Thus, he remarks, in connection with the bodies found on the train at Dachau, that “many of these men had been killed while the others were probably dead of hunger.” Also, while the delegate is happy to pass along the names of *le lieutenant* Wickert and *le major* Every and others, he refuses to mention the name of the U.S. commander (apparently either Linden or Patek), who is referred to only as “*le general*.”

<sup>80</sup> Red Cross (1947), 144-146, 149-152.

<sup>81</sup> Editor’s note: This massacre was photographed by the U.S. troops, see Fig. 21, bottom right. Compare also Howard A. Buechner, *Dachau*; see also *Dachauer Hefte*, 1985, issue 1: “Die Befreiung”.

<sup>82</sup> Lenz, 270; Gun, 63-64.

There were two types of rooms which were claimed as gas chambers by the U.S. propaganda after the camp was captured, and Gun reproduces the relevant photographs. Here we present Figs. 16 and 22. The former shows an ordinary shower which the U.S. propagandists had the audacity to claim was a gas chamber disguised as a shower. Fig. 19 shows the entrance to this “*Brausebad*” (shower bath).

The second type of room, which was claimed as a gas chamber, was indeed a gas chamber, the door of which is shown as Fig. 22. This door certainly appears to be genuine and not manufactured for the propaganda. To see what is involved, examine Fig. 13 (top). On the left one can perceive the very same door and near the door a heap of dirty prisoner clothing. That “gas chamber” was obviously a chamber for disinfesting clothing; such equipment was necessary and existed at all of the German concentration camps. The interior of the disinfestation room is shown in Fig. 6.

The building shown in Fig. 13 housed disinfestation chambers, the shower bath of Fig. 16, and the crematory of Fig. 17. This building has been maintained and is regularly visited by tourists. It is removed from the main part of the camp, located in a relatively isolated spot. It was perfectly logical to locate both the disinfestation chamber and the crematory in such a way that inmates did not come into frequent contact with such things (the former for reasons of health and the latter for reasons of morale). The shower was necessary, obviously, to decontaminate the people who worked in this building before they returned to the main part of the camp. I do not know whether this shower bath also serviced incoming prisoners, or if a separate shower existed for that purpose. As suggested by Fig. 16 and confirmed by the literature, it was almost always the shower bath, rather than the disinfestation chamber, which served the propaganda as a “gas chamber.”<sup>83</sup> The latter was probably considered too small to represent as a gas chamber, which had claimed countless victims.

Naturally, the “war crimes trials” produced witnesses who claimed gassings at Dachau (e.g. IMT witness Franz Blaha, who also claimed tattooed skin scenes as at Buchenwald<sup>84</sup>). Naturally, the people whose bodies had been found at the camp when it was captured, especially those on the train, were always represented as having been murdered.

The number of bodies on the train at Dachau was approximately 500. Finding dead people on trains in Germany toward the war’s end was not unusual even on ordinary passenger trains; in January 1945, 800 Germans, frozen to death, had been found on a train which had arrived in Berlin.<sup>85</sup> The German rail system was in utter chaos, and conditions in April 1945 are difficult to imagine, but some attempt should be made to see some of these corpse-laden trains in context. Some thought might also be given to the possible conditions of people as they started their journeys on these trains. It is entirely possible that the typical individual concentration camp commander, presented with what he considered insane orders

<sup>83</sup> M. J. Smith, 94-95.

<sup>84</sup> IMT, vol. 5, 167-173; Rassinier (1962), 78.

<sup>85</sup> Burney, 107; Red Cross (1947), 151.

to “transfer” N inmates to X camp, reasoned that putting the half dead on the train had the double merit of minimizing numbers of deaths and also getting some of the dying off his hands. However, such problems are not of essential or central interest here.

The truth about Dachau was not long in coming out, but did not receive wide publicity. The causes for the dead bodies, which were found at the camp when it was captured, were described in a 1948 publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. As the U.S. Army advanced into Germany, it encountered the sorts of conditions, which its medical services had anticipated and for which they had prepared counter-measures:<sup>86</sup>

*“Germany in the spring months of April and May was an astounding sight, a mixture of humanity traveling this way and that, homeless, often hungry and carrying typhus with them. [...] The more territory that was uncovered, the greater was the number of reported cases; for Western Germany in the areas of the American advance was rather uniformly seeded with typhus. To be sure, there were heavily involved communities and others lightly affected. There were great accumulations of cases in the concentration and prison camps, and in nearby small communities.*

*As estimated 35,000-40,000 prisoners were found in [Dachau], living under conditions bad even for a German camp of this kind and worse than any other that came into American hands. Extreme filthiness, louse infestation, and overcrowding prevailed throughout the camp buildings. Several car-loads of human bodies were found packed in box cars in the railroad yards adjacent to the camp, the vestiges of a shipment of prisoners from camps further north who were transferred to Dachau in the late days of the war to escape the advancing United States troops.*

*The number of patients with typhus fever at the time the camp was first occupied will never be known. Days passed before a census of patients could be accomplished. Several hundreds were found in the prison hospital, but their number was small compared with the patients who continued to live with their comrades in the camp barracks, bed-ridden and unattended, lying in bunks 4 tiers high with 2 and sometimes 3 men to a narrow shelflike bed; the sick and the well; crowded beyond all description; reeking with filth and neglect – and everywhere the smell of death.”*

It is not surprising that Dachau had experienced catastrophes very similar to those at Belsen. Since the beginning of 1945, there had been an estimated 15,000 prisoner deaths from typhus, mostly in the final two months.<sup>87</sup>

The Americans brought the camp under control, and it served, as we have seen, as an American camp and center of “war crimes trials.” An American lawyer, Stephen S. Pinter, who was stationed there and evidently disapproved of what had been carried out there in the name of the United States, wrote in 1959:<sup>88</sup>

*“I was in Dachau for 17 months after the war, as a US War Department*

---

<sup>86</sup> Gordon, 23-25.

<sup>87</sup> Red Cross (1947), 150.

<sup>88</sup> Letter by Pinter in Catholic weekly *Our Sunday Visitor* (Jun. 14, 1959), 15.

*Attorney, and can state that there was no gas chamber at Dachau. What was shown to visitors and sightseers there and erroneously described as a gas chamber, was a crematory. Nor was there a gas chamber in any of the other concentration camps in Germany. We were told that there was a gas chamber at Auschwitz, but since that was in the Russian zone of occupation, we were not permitted to investigate, since the Russians would not permit it.*

*[...] uses the old propaganda myth that millions of Jews were killed by the national socialists. From what I was able to determine during six postwar years in Germany and Austria, there were a number of Jews killed, but the figure of a million was certainly never reached. I interviewed thousands of Jews, former inmates of concentration camps in Germany and Austria, and consider myself as well qualified as any man on this subject."*

In 1960, the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* of Munich, "the paragon of hostility and resistance to Nazism," declared:<sup>89</sup>

*"The gas chamber in Dachau was never completed and put into operation [...] The mass extermination of Jews by gassing started in 1941/1942, and took place [...] with the aid of installations technically designed for this purpose, above all in occupied Polish territory [but nowhere in the Old Reich ...]."*

This is essentially the Dachau myth as it stood in the summer of 1973: the information given the visiting tourist at Dachau correctly identified the disinfection room as such, without any attempt to represent it as a gas chamber for exterminating people. In regard to the shower bath the leaflet explained that

*"This gas chamber, camouflaged as a shower room, was not used. The prisoners selected for 'gassing' were transported from Dachau to the Hartheim Castle, near Linz (Austria) or to other camps."*

So much for Dachau, a close examination of which was necessary in order to evaluate the general credibility of the U.S. propaganda.

## The Industrial Role of Auschwitz

The camps at Auschwitz were, of course, part of the same concentration camp system as the camps we have just discussed. However, the operations referred to with the term "Auschwitz" were really, in many ways, in a class by themselves. This is so much the case that, in order to see the role of Auschwitz clearly, it is necessary to go back considerably in time. It is also necessary, unfortunately, to indulge in a certain amount of discussion that may seem excessively technical at first.

The principal cause of the German defeat in World War I in 1918 had been shortages brought about, chiefly, by the British blockade. Shortages of such things as oil and rubber had been crippling the Army, and near starvation conditions in

---

<sup>89</sup> *Die Zeit* (Engl. Edition, Aug. 26, 1960), 14 (letter by M. Broszat); Rassiner (1962), 79. Rassiner refers to the German edition of *Die Zeit* (Aug. 19, 1960).



Germany had made the internal political situation unpredictable and unstable. Germany capitulated, a victim of, among other things, the twentieth century's first "energy crisis."

The extreme vulnerability of Germany in respect of raw materials had, of course, been realized by the German chemical industry during the war, and after the war the popularity of the concept of "autarky," non-reliance on imports or foreign aid, was partially based on this consideration. The only raw materials that concern us here are oil and rubber, of which there was essentially none in Germany. In Europe, only Romania had significant oil resources, and there was no natural rubber anywhere in Europe. There were, however, huge sources of coal in Germany and elsewhere in Europe.

The great German chemicals company, I. G. Farben, was in 1918 a collection of six smaller companies, which later combined in 1925 to form Farben. The principal predecessor company, *Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik* (BASF) of Ludwigshafen-am-Rhein had, starting early in World War I, been working on processes for producing synthetic oil and synthetic rubber from coal. These investigations continued after the formation of Farben and also after the rise of Hitler in 1933. The Nazi government soon adopted a policy of subsidizing these autarky-oriented developments.<sup>90</sup> Thus, on account of government encouragement, the real need for the synthetics, and the general German scientific-technological pre-eminence of the time, especially in chemistry and chemical engineering, Germany was substantially ahead of the rest of the world in these areas.

Synthetic oil was by far the easier of the two problems. Coal is mainly carbon; the general principle is that coal treated with hydrogen gas at high pressure and temperature ("hydrogenation") resulted in oil. The usual range of chemical products could be made from this oil: dyes, explosives, drugs, etc. Another state of hydrogenation yielded gasoline. The idea was basically simple, although the process was inherently expensive, and most research consisted in a search for the most effective catalysts. During World War II, there were many synthetic oil plants in and around Germany; they produced about 75 percent of the oil available to the Germans; the rest came mainly from Romania.<sup>91</sup>

Synthetic rubber was a different matter; the technical problems in developing a sufficiently economic synthetic rubber suitable for tires were most severe and were not really resolved until approximately the beginning of the war.

The basic steps in making rubber are first making long chains of molecules of some sort, polymerization, and then causing these chains to "cross-stitch" – to join each other at various points – vulcanization. One needed a molecule congenial to polymerization and vulcanization, and it was found that butadiene was particularly suitable. In the late twenties, it had been found that sodium was an excellent catalyst for polymerization of the butadiene, and consequently the synthetic rubber that was being made from butadiene with sodium (Na) as catalyst was called "Buna" rubber. The sodium had been dropped by 1935, but the term "Buna" was retained. By replacing 25 per cent of the butadiene with styrene,

<sup>90</sup> Howard, 3, 11-22, 44, 60-62; NMT, vol. 7, 79-80.

<sup>91</sup> Craven, 172.

“Buna-S” rubber, the type particularly suited for tires, was obtained.<sup>92</sup>

The earliest serious German Buna-S plant, and the largest, was the Schkopau plant, started in 1937 and completed in 1939. It had a capacity of 6,000 tons per month. A second plant was started at Hüls in 1938 and was in operation in August 1940; its capacity was 4,000 tons per month. A third plant was started in January 1941 at Ludwigshafen, Farben research headquarters, and it was producing Buna in March 1943; its capacity was 2,500 tons per month. The fourth, at Auschwitz, was begun in 1941 and was designed for a capacity of 3,000 tons per month.

During all this plant construction, research on new processes continued, and the differences in the processes used in the four plants reflected this. All started from coal, but at Schkopau the butadiene was produced via a classical calcium carbide-acetylene-butadiene sequence; at Hüls the carbide state was replaced by one involving hydrocarbon gases. Ludwigshafen reverted to the classical sequence, but the superior Reppe process was introduced for the acetylene-butadiene state. The Buna plant at Auschwitz also used a version of the classical sequence.<sup>93</sup>

The reason for the appearance of Auschwitz in this context is very simple: Auschwitz was a huge industrial operation.

When Germany annexed a large part of Poland after the partitioning of Poland in 1939 by Germany and Russia, it came into the possession of the great coal fields of Polish Upper Silesia. It was naturally decided to exploit this, and the possibilities for a hydrogenation and Buna plant were examined. It was found that the little town of “Oświęcim” (population 13,000), translated into German as “Auschwitz” (Auschwitz had been a duchy of the Habsburg Empire before World War I), was ideally located, because the three rivers that joined there could provide the necessary water, while a fourth river for carrying off the waste was nearby. In addition, Auschwitz was on the southern border of the Silesian coal fields, the Kattowitz (Katowice) mining region of Poland.<sup>94</sup>

In early 1941, it was decided to build a hydrogenation and a Buna plant at Auschwitz employing both free and prisoner labor. By pure chance, there was already near the town a partisan POW camp holding 7,000 prisoners (it had formerly been a Polish artillery barracks); this camp became the nucleus for expansion via its own enlargement and also the construction of additional camps. It was quickly transformed into, and remained to the last, a camp for political prisoner-workers; it is usually referred to as Auschwitz I. The terms “main camp,” “*Hauptlager*,” and “*Stammlager*” are also sometimes used.<sup>95</sup>

Sometime in 1941, work had begun on a second camp, Auschwitz II, generally referred to as Birkenau (German for birch meadow). It was one to one and a half miles northwest of Auschwitz I and was initially referred to as a POW camp. Part of it was completed by April 1942; Russian POW labor was used for constructing the camp. Its functions will be examined at length.

---

<sup>92</sup> Howard, 35-37.

<sup>93</sup> Dunbrook, 50; Naunton, 107.

<sup>94</sup> DuBois, 154-155.

<sup>95</sup> Reitlinger, 110, 128; NO-034 in NMT, vol. 5, 356-358.

Some 4,000 Jews were moved out of the town to another town to make room for free labor attached to the industries. On November 16, 1941, it was decided to build a third camp, generally referred to as Monowitz, three miles east of the town and close to the Farben plant, for quartering labor working on and in the plant. Russian POW's were again used for constructing the camp.<sup>96</sup> The relative locations of the three camps are shown in Fig. 5.<sup>97</sup>

There was also a large number of smaller camps in the outlying region, most of them within a radius of 25 miles. These "outer camps," of which Raisko and Harmense were two relatively close-in examples, were administered by the Auschwitz camp administration, and the number has been variously given as 13 to 39, depending upon what is considered a single camp. The smaller or outer camps were mainly for those who worked at the five blast furnaces or five coal mines. Monowitz and the collection of all outer camps taken together are sometimes referred to as Auschwitz III. The collection of all camps, Auschwitz I, Birkenau (Auschwitz II) and Auschwitz III, together with the industries which employed the inmates, is usually what is referred to under the blanket term "Auschwitz."<sup>98</sup>

The prisoner population of Auschwitz II was nothing unusual except that there was a significant number of British POWs.<sup>99</sup> The NMT judgment was that the use of British POWs was not contrary to the Geneva Convention, because the Buna factory had an ultimate peaceful purpose.<sup>100</sup> The Red Cross apparently concurred because, although it was specifically aware of this situation, it did not mention the employment of British POWs in its later report on the problems it had encountered during the war in respect to the use of POWs for war-related work.<sup>101</sup>

Typical camp strengths were 20,000 for Auschwitz I, 35,000 for Birkenau (30 to 60 percent women) and 15,000 for Auschwitz III. By a wide margin, Auschwitz was the largest complex of concentration camps in the German system; in August 1943, the second largest was Sachsenhausen with a population of 26,500.<sup>102</sup> There were also many free laborers working and living in the area. For example, less than thirty per cent of the workers at the Farben plant were in the "prisoner" category; more than half were free foreign workers who had enlisted voluntarily for labor and the remaining approximate twenty per cent were ordinary German employees.<sup>103</sup>

Auschwitz I was the administrative center for all SS functions at Auschwitz. These SS functions included the guarding, feeding, clothing, housing, recreation, and disciplining of the prisoners, and also their medical services. The working hours at Auschwitz were those standard for the German concentration camps: eleven hours per day, six days a week, with extra work on Sunday mornings in

---

<sup>96</sup> Reitlinger, 114-115; DuBois, 156.

<sup>97</sup> Central Commission, Figs. 2, 4; Langbein, 929.  
Central Commission, 30; Reitlinger, 492; NO-021 in NMT, vol. 5, 385.

<sup>99</sup> DuBois, 217-218, 223-227; Reitlinger, 115.

<sup>100</sup> NMT, vol. 8, 1183-1184.

<sup>101</sup> Red Cross (1947), 92; Red Cross (1948), vol. 1, 546-551.

<sup>102</sup> Central Commission, 31; Reitlinger, 123, 492; 1469-PS and NO-021 in NMT, vol. 5, 382, 385.

<sup>103</sup> NI-11412-A in NMT, vol. 8, 311-312.

“emergencies.”<sup>104</sup> At Auschwitz there were divers recreational activities: concerts, cabaret performers, movies and athletic contests. There was even a brothel for the prisoners, staffed by professionals recruited for the purpose.<sup>105</sup> Medical services receive further comment later on.

The providing of such extensive services naturally meant that companies using the labor of the prisoners “rented” them from the SS; a typical rate seems to have been RM 4.00-RM 6.00 (\$1.00-\$1.50) per day and up.<sup>106</sup> Thus, the prisoners were at the basis of Himmler’s bureaucratic and economic empire, and accordingly this resource, together with the supporting functions of feeding, clothing, etc. were jealously guarded. Nevertheless, Farben had been big enough to get a special arrangement for those at Monowitz; it was granted full authority for the care of the prisoners there and consequently the payments to the SS were reduced. This led to the expected scraps between the SS and Farben. The SS complained of beatings and other mistreatment such as unsanitary conditions at the Monowitz hospital. Also, one-fifth of the people who had been registered at this hospital were discharged by being sent to Birkenau, at which time the Farben appropriations for their care immediately ceased and they became the responsibility of the SS which, already wounded by not being accorded its customary rights in regard to employable prisoners, was incensed at receiving in return only the unemployable from Monowitz. The SS therefore demanded that the Monowitz hospital, which had only 300 beds, be enlarged, but the reply to this, of course, was that “if they aren’t strong enough to work, they don’t belong on the factory grounds.”<sup>107</sup>

Birkenau, like Auschwitz I, had a responsibility of supplying labor for Farben and for sub-contractors to Farben. It also supplied labor for other enterprises such as the Krupp fuse plant and the Siemens electrical factory. In addition, inmates worked at clearing demolished structures, draining the marshy land, road construction, operating an establishment for the cultivation of special plants (Raisko), building and operating a model farm (Harmense), clothing manufacture, etc.<sup>108</sup> Birkenau had other functions, as will be seen. It will be particularly necessary to examine the claim that at Birkenau a program of mass killings of Jews via gas chambers was in operation, the Jews having been transported to Auschwitz primarily for this purpose.<sup>109</sup>

The rough figures given above for camp populations are only illustrative; the Birkenau figure actually varied a great deal, and in addition, the Birkenau camp was never completed. The projected capacity of Birkenau seems to have been 200,000 prisoners, while Auschwitz I expanded to a capacity of about 30,000 and then stabilized.<sup>110</sup> Thus, on the basis of seniority and also on account of quartering the Auschwitz SS administrative offices, Auschwitz I was indeed the “main

---

<sup>104</sup> NO-1290 in NMT, vol. 5, 371.

<sup>105</sup> Cohen, 180; Christophersen, 34. See also the discussion of the Dachau brothel in Gun, 38-40.

<sup>106</sup> NMT, vol. 9, 121; Central Commission, 37.

<sup>107</sup> DuBois, 164, 220-224.

<sup>108</sup> DuBois, 141; NMT, vol. 6, 207, 233; NMT, vol. 9, 120; US-WRB (1944), pt. I, 1-2; Christophersen, 23-25.

<sup>109</sup> Reitlinger, 115, 157; Hilberg, 565, 574.

<sup>110</sup> Central Commission, 31.

camp,” but Birkenau, designed for the specific requirements of the Auschwitz operations, was clearly intended as the “principal camp” in terms of inmate accommodating functions.

While the Auschwitz-Kattowitz region was ideal from a technical point of view, it was also wretched from a human point of view. The ground was extremely flat with no means of draining away water in many places; it was dotted with stagnant ponds which poisoned the air and caused the area to be constantly muddy. Malaria and typhus were natural, not wartime-created, dangers in this region; the war conditions greatly aggravated matters. It is said that “motor cars were disinfected after each journey carrying prisoners or their clothing.”<sup>111</sup>

After 1942, the hydrogenation plant at Auschwitz produced oil and gasoline and other chemicals, but by the time the camp was evacuated in January 1945, it had not produced any Buna; it was only at the point of producing acetaldehyde from acetylene.<sup>112</sup> This relative slowness in plant construction was no doubt due to the initially virgin character of the area, the use of prisoner labor, and the bad health of many prisoners; the latter had further implications, which will be seen later in proper context.

I do not know whether the Auschwitz Buna plant was to have been essentially the same as the Ludwigshafen plant, an improved version of the latter, or a new generation in Buna plant construction. In any case, if it had been finished, there would have been no more advanced Buna rubber plant in the world at the time.

---

<sup>111</sup> Central Commission, 27-29; DuBois, 130; Friedman, 33.

<sup>112</sup> DuBois, 341; Naunton, 107; Bebb & Wakefield, 945.

## Chapter 3: Washington and New York

### The Rubber Crisis of 1942

The military situation of the Allied powers in 1942 was superficially a desperate one. After the winter of 1941-1942, the German armies continued their advance across Russia. The destruction of most of the American Pacific fleet at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, had made the Pacific a virtual Japanese lake. America was suddenly faced with a problem that was, for her, a strange one: lack of a crucial raw material without which no war effort appeared possible. Japan controlled what had been the source of ninety per cent of America's rubber, Malaya and the East Indies, and the source of the other ten per cent, Central and South America, was hopelessly inadequate.<sup>113</sup>

The manner in which America extricated herself from this grave situation will go down as one of the great ironies of history. America, one would expect, could not resolve this problem because nobody in America had thought in terms of "autarky."

Standard Oil of New Jersey had the essentials of the I. G. Farben Buna rubber process. This was on account of a series of agreements between the two companies, commencing in 1927, covering technical cooperation and mutual licensing arrangements. Standard was quite interested in Buna rubber because it could also be made (more easily) from oil.

The cooperation continued, with the consent of the German government, right up to the outbreak of war and even, to some extent, after the outbreak of war. The American side benefited hugely from these arrangements, but the German side got almost nothing out of them.<sup>114</sup>

The outbreak of war in September 1939 between Germany on the one hand and England and France on the other threw these arrangements between Farben and Standard into a certain amount of legal confusion, which need not be explored here. Farben wished to clarify the confusion, and so a meeting was arranged at the Hague on September 22, at which certain legal arrangements were made. Standard official Frank A. Howard was puzzled by all of this:<sup>115</sup>

*"I could not escape the conviction, however, that the Germans themselves were the only people who could profit from a military standpoint by leaving the relations between Standard and the I. G. in the situation into which the war had thrown them."*

---

<sup>113</sup> Howard, 4-7, 216; U.S. Special Committee, 24.

<sup>114</sup> Howard, chapters 2-9.

<sup>115</sup> Howard, 82-83.

The arrangements that had been made at the Hague soon proved to be inadequate, so it was decided in the spring of 1940 that another meeting was necessary. Howard saw another motivation for an additional meeting:

*"[...] we intended also to ask them to supply some of their detailed designs of manufacturing equipment and technique for Buna. We hoped that I. G. might obtain permission of its government to sell to us the plans for the Buna polymerization plants they had erected in Germany under the government program."*

These hopes were dashed at the conference between Standard and Farben which finally took place in Basle, Switzerland, in mid-April 1940 during the German occupation of Norway, which signaled the end of the *Sitzkrieg*. The new political conditions arising from the German realization that the situation was a serious one brought about at the conference the effective termination of the relations between Farben and Standard. Naturally, Standard got nowhere with its proposals to buy plant designs. However, as Howard explains:

*"One other point was very much on our minds. We wanted to make sure, if possible, that the Germans had not, since the outbreak of the war in Europe, made any radical change in their Buna manufacturing processes or formulas. Direct questions were out of order, since the I. G. men could not discuss any phase of Germany's industrial war effort. But during the settlements of patent transfers and discussions of license definitions needed to implement the Hague agreement, we obtained sufficient data to feel sure that all of the fundamentals of the Buna operation had remained unchanged. This conclusion was later fully confirmed."*

This was the "last direct contact Standard had with the Germans on Buna rubber."<sup>116</sup>

All American knowledge of the Buna processes, which made the American war effort possible, came from these relationships with I. G. Farben, and this is accepted fact in the rubber industry.<sup>117</sup> Nevertheless, Standard later came under some rather stupid criticism and even later legal action on account of them.<sup>118</sup>

The sudden unavailability in 1942 of a source of rubber set off a major political crisis in the United States. There had been a Buna program in existence since mid-1940, when the Rubber Reserve Corporation had been created within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This agency, headed by Jesse H. Jones, supervised the stockpiling of reserve crude rubber and also sponsored the construction of Buna plants, which started in 1941. However, nobody in authority had foreseen the complete loss of the Far East rubber, so the synthetic rubber program had been modest in scope. Consequently, in 1942 there was almost no practical experience with large scale use of the Farben processes.

The emergency had been realized immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor, because three days later, the U.S. government banned the sale of new automobile tires for civilian purposes. General rationing of rubber followed quickly.

---

<sup>116</sup> Howard, 104-108.

<sup>117</sup> Naunton, 104.

<sup>118</sup> DuBois, 284.

Early in 1942 it became realized that, if there was to be any American war effort, a gigantic synthetic rubber industry would have to be created in record time. The apparently dismal prospects for such an achievement were the cause of some amount of panic, and naturally, scapegoats were sought. Jesse Jones was a favorite target, and his claim that 300,000 tons of synthetic rubber would be produced in 1943 and 600,000 tons in 1944 was jeered at (U.S. rubber consumption in 1940 was 648,500 tons). Standard Oil also came in for outrageously unfair abuse by people who interpreted the Farben-Standard agreements as a conspiracy to retard synthetic rubber development in the U.S. Harry S. Truman, chairman of a Senate committee, which investigated war production problems, first became prominent in connection with the rubber crisis of 1942.

The crisis also set off internal political conflicts. The big oil interests had a long lead in the production of Buna-S, but the farm bloc was dominant in Congress. Now, Buna can be made not only from coal and oil, but also from alcohol, an agricultural product. Foreseeing the birth of a major new industry, the farm interests started arguing in favor of making Buna from alcohol (the most expensive method). They cited the fact that the Russians, also long active in the synthetic rubber field, started from alcohol. They also produced a Polish refugee who was supposed to have made some revolutionary invention in connection with making Buna from alcohol.

There was another political bloc tied up with South American interests, which proposed subsidies for plantations. There was also a small farm bloc which pressed for more extensive planting of the guayule plant in the southwest. The effect of these internal political battles was to generate massive confusion and retard the progress of the existing U.S. Buna program.

The rubber crisis filled the press in 1942 and was, in fact, the major crisis the U.S. faced in connection with the war. There was constant lamenting that Germany was well ahead of the U.S. and that the U.S. lacked the vital experience with the processes that the Germans possessed. Methods being used in Germany were cited in connection with discussing the prospects of the U.S. program.<sup>119</sup>

The farm bloc's battle against what it called the "oily interests" achieved a temporary major success in July 1942, when the Congress passed the weird "Rubber Supply Act of 1942." The Act would have established a new agency for rubber production, entirely under the control of Congress and outside the domain of the War Production Board, the Army, the Navy, or any executive agency of the Government. Of course, the Act also specified that the rubber was to be made from grain alcohol. President Roosevelt vetoed this bill on August 6 and announced the appointment of a committee to study the rubber problem and make some recommendations in regard to the organization of an American synthetic

---

<sup>119</sup> As stated, the rubber crisis "filled the press," but the following stories seem to summarize the crisis adequately: *Business Week* (Jan. 31, 1942), 22+; (Mar. 14, 1942), 15+; (May 30, 1942), 15+; (Jun. 20, 1942), 15+; (Aug. 15, 1942), 15+; (Sep. 19, 1942), 15+; (Dec. 19, 1942), 28+; *Newsweek* (Apr. 6, 1942), 46+; (Apr. 13, 1942), 56+; (June 1, 1942), 46+; (Sep. 21, 1942), 58+; *New York Times* (Jan. 11, 1942), sec. 7, 6+; (Jul. 26, 1942), sec. 7, 3+; *Fortune* (June 1942), 92+; *Nature Magazine* (May 1942), 233+; *Harper's* (Dec. 1942), 66+.



rubber program: "probably the most widely acclaimed action on the domestic front in the history of the war program." The members of the committee were Dr. James D. Conant, President of Harvard, Dr. Karl T. Compton, President of MIT, and the financier and political leader Bernard M. Baruch, who served as Chairman. The committee is normally referred to as the Baruch Committee.<sup>120</sup>

These three men were chosen partially because they were not considered connected with any specific interests in the conflict, and also because of their expertise. The appointment of Baruch as chairman of such a technically oriented group may seem peculiar at first, but this is not the case. Besides being a man of diverse talents and important financial, industrial, and political connections, he had chaired the War Industries Board during World War I. Moreover, for a period of more than thirty years, he had been interested in industrial ventures involving rubber and had independently inventoried, with war requirements in mind, American rubber stocks in the spring of 1941. As a consequence, he had gotten into fights with various people, mainly Jesse H. Jones. In addition, unlike the usual chairman of a "name" Washington *ad hoc* committee, Baruch threw all his energy into the work of the Committee. His assistant Sam Lubell also was put to work on the Committee's assignment. Even after the issuing of the final report, Baruch maintained interest: Howard reports that Baruch later expressed a wish to speak to the Standard people and that a meeting was accordingly held, at which the major technical-economic problems were discussed.<sup>121</sup>

The work of the Baruch Committee was completed with remarkable speed and the final report was issued on September 10, 1942; the best explanation for this speed would appear to be Baruch's independent prior involvement in the problem.

We must attempt to see this problem as the Committee must have seen it in 1942. Primarily, it was a political problem requiring the reconciliation of the various interests contending for the synthetic rubber business. Thus, the final report of the Committee recommended the creation of a capacity to produce 100,000,000 gallons of additional grain alcohol per year. A second problem involved the lack of practical American experience with the Buna processes. Technical specifications were at hand, but there existed many questions on many details and quite a few alternative versions of the processes.

Thus, in order to accelerate the American synthetic rubber program, the Baruch Committee saw a need to learn as much as possible of the experiences of others. It made a specific recommendation that an immediate effort be made to learn the experiences of the Russians in the production of synthetic rubber and make use of them in the American program (Jesse Jones had been charged with overlooking this possibility). The effort was made but yielded no results of any value.<sup>122</sup> Under such conditions it is necessary to assume that somebody in America looked into new developments in Germany in as close detail as possible at the time, and the new German development in rubber in 1942 was Auschwitz, the site of the most advanced developments in Buna rubber at that time.

---

<sup>120</sup> Naunton, 108; Howard, 210-213.

<sup>121</sup> Howard, 221-222; Coit, 120-121, 162-222, 513-520.

<sup>122</sup> Howard, 227-228; U.S. Special Committee, 13, 18, 50-51; Dunbrook, 40-46.

## Auschwitz of Great Interest to Americans

The point to be made in our discussion of the American rubber crisis of 1942 is that American intelligence must have known what was going on at Auschwitz in that year.

Clearly, it would be delightful if we could learn exactly what U.S. military intelligence knew about events in and around Germany during the war. However, intelligence agencies are notoriously reluctant to release such information, even many years after the events in question. With respect to World War II intelligence operations, a few sensational episodes are known, but on the whole, the content of Allied intelligence information has not been divulged. The intelligence relative to Auschwitz will be a long, long time in being made public, if it is ever made public.

In attempting to estimate, therefore, what information was possessed by Allied intelligence agencies, one must proceed very much on the basis of common sense. The difficulty is that my common sense may differ very much from another's, and that agreement on such matters may be most difficult to arrive at. Now, my common sense tells me that, quite apart from the rubber crisis, Allied intelligence would have known, in mid-1942, what was happening at the largest German concentration camp. If additionally, as every version of the extermination legend asserts, there had been anything as *outré* as a program of systematic extermination of Jews at Auschwitz in the summer of 1942, then my common sense tells me that it is a certainty that U.S. military intelligence would have known about it.

If another's common sense does not lead him to the same conclusion, it is very doubtful that the disagreement could be settled by discussion. However, with Auschwitz we have the fact that it was of interest not only as a large concentration camp (and also, if the extermination claims were correct, an extermination camp), but also as the site of the most advanced developments in synthetic rubber. In 1942, no location in the German Reich was of greater interest, and no industrial operations of greater strategic importance. Therefore, if one wishes to claim that U.S. (or the closely related British) intelligence did not know what was happening at Auschwitz in the summer of 1942, then I am afraid that one must logically claim the complete ignorance and incompetence of these intelligence agencies.

Auschwitz was of the greatest interest to the U.S. in mid-1942 on account of its enormous technological significance. Above we saw Howard's great interest, in 1940, in any information about possible new developments that could be obtained directly or inferred indirectly. A similar interest on the part of the Americans in 1942 must be assumed. It is a certainty that intelligence had developed the basic facts about the industry at Auschwitz: a plant for hydrogenation and other chemical processes aimed at producing gasoline and rubber. It has been seen that each one of the German Buna rubber plants employed processes differing in important details from the others and that the Auschwitz processes were to be the beneficiary of accumulated experiences with several different versions. We are thus justified in assuming, on account of the peculiar urgency of the rubber problem and the peculiar position of Auschwitz relative to this urgency, that the intel-

ligence had gone into unusual detail in regard to Auschwitz, probably going over every inch via aerial photographic intelligence, and that the assembled information was available to various people in the U.S. The information probably included many details not greatly relevant to the rubber problem, such as the employment of prisoner and POW labor at Auschwitz.

Although concealment of information has been the rule in the area of military intelligence, we can nevertheless assume that the means of gathering intelligence data on Auschwitz included more or less conventional methods: exploitation of contacts with commercial representatives of Farben who were stationed in neutral countries (Portugal, Spain, Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland), aerial photographic intelligence (aircraft used for such purposes may always have longer ranges than bombers on account of their lack of armaments), general knowledge of German industrial and economic matters, spies and informers in German industry and in the German government (*e.g.* Admiral Canaris), and informers in the employ of advantageously situated neutral organizations (such as the Swiss and Swedish diplomatic corps and also firms doing business in Germany). Although all of these means no doubt played a role, photographic intelligence was probably particularly important; the technology of photographic intelligence had attained a respectable level in 1942 so that a "you are there" effect was possible in blown-up aerial photos of even heavily defended positions. There were other channels of information, whose nature and existence are of some particular importance here and which will be discussed in due course.

Not being sufficiently acquainted with the technical problems that were associated with Buna at the time, we have no idea what information the Americans might have been after and how it could be inferred from the intelligence data, any more than we have an understanding of what questions were on the minds of the Standard people at the Basle meeting and how partial answers could be inferred from the legal ritual that took place at that meeting. We can, however, offer one possibility by way of example without any claim that such was the specific case.

We have seen that the first German Buna plant at Schkopau employed a carbide-acetylene-butadiene process and that at the Hüls plant the process was hydrocarbons-acetylene-butadiene. The new plant at Ludwigshafen, nearing completion when the Baruch Committee was meeting, had reverted to making the acetylene from carbide and had modernized the acetylene to butadiene stage. Because either a carbide or a hydrocarbons process was potentially applicable to the processes to be employed in the U.S. (which could have started from oil or grain alcohol), it was no doubt of great interest whether Auschwitz was to employ a carbide process (as was the case), suggesting abandonment of the hydrocarbons version on the basis of the Hüls experience, or was to employ a hydrocarbons or other process, suggesting failure to make a commitment to carbide processes.

Moreover, the carbide *vs.* hydrocarbons question could probably be answered on the basis of aerial intelligence, if necessary.

What was the ultimate value, in terms of the problems the Americans faced, of the detailed information about contemporary German Buna developments, which, we feel certain, they examined closely approximately in middle-late 1942? Per-

haps none, as was the case with most categories of information; it is just that you don't miss a bet in the sort of situation in which the Americans found themselves regarding rubber in 1942.

Consideration of technical matters has been necessary here because it was in a technical context that Auschwitz first became prominent in Washington. However, it is not the technical matters that have been our objective here but simply the fact of prominence, or heavy exposure, in U.S. inner circles in the summer of 1942; this is the only point relevant to our subject. We have no direct evidence of this, but we have reviewed reasons why such exposure may be assumed. It remains to show that events at Auschwitz at this time were such as to suggest an "extermination factory" charge to those in the inner political circles, who were alert to the appearance of semi-factual bases for atrocity stories. The events at Auschwitz in late 1942 – early 1943 will be covered in a second context in the next chapter and hence are not annotated here.

The eeriest aspect that Auschwitz must have presented while the Baruch Committee was meeting was that of the site of a ghost factory; starting around August 1, the Buna plant had been closed. There was no activity to be seen except possibly an occasional watchman. This must have excited great curiosity and no doubt special steps were taken to find out what was going on.

Our ugly old friend typhus was at Auschwitz; an epidemic had shut down the Buna plant for two months, so that work did not resume until late September. By this time, the number of dead must have been a few thousand, although there is a large degree of uncertainty here. The German policy was to cremate the bodies of camp inmates who died, but the epidemic caught the Auschwitz authorities with inadequate crematory facilities. There was a small crematory at Auschwitz I, but more extensive facilities at Birkenau, plans for which existed in January 1942, were still under construction in 1942, and the first complete new unit, consisting of fifteen conventional crematory muffles, was not available until March 1943. It appears that many of the victims of the epidemic were immediately cremated in pits, but it is possible that many were buried, at least temporarily. That the Germans were constructing crematories at Birkenau was probably evident to continued Allied surveillance (which we assume existed) in the autumn of 1942. The buildings housing the Birkenau ovens had certain halls, rooms, or cellars, which the accusations say were the "gas chambers."

Several books offer versions of Fig. 7, which is claimed to be a photograph of gassed victims about to be burned in pits, taken by an Auschwitz inmate in 1944.<sup>123</sup> We have no way of knowing when, where, or by whom it was taken. However, such scenes were common at Auschwitz in 1942, when the camp presumably attained some prominence in Allied intelligence. Indeed, the poor quality of the picture caused some initial speculation on my part that it is an aerial intelligence photograph; the low angle does not rule out the possibility because such angles were frequently attained even with highly defended positions.<sup>124</sup> Also, the

<sup>123</sup> The photograph appears in Schoenberger, 162 (206 in paperback), and in Central Commission, Fig. 39.

<sup>124</sup> C.B. Smith, 166-171 and photographs.

versions I examined in the various books do not have the border material which tends to support the claim that it was taken on the ground. Our Fig. 7 is reproduced from a print obtained in 1973 from the museum operated by the Polish government at Auschwitz, and there remain a number of mysteries concerning it. The version reproduced here is the only one, so far as I know, that is not obviously falsified to some extent.<sup>125</sup> However, such an observation does not settle the matter because of the strange fact that the falsified (or, at least, retouched) versions display more apparently genuine background detail (e.g. the fence and trees).

In any case, Birkenau was, in a very real sense, a “death camp;” dead, dying and sick people were sent there and, after the crematories were built, the dead were disposed of in them. If one is to claim an “extermination camp” when there is none, what better choice is there but a “death camp”?

While the preceding adequately suggests how the Auschwitz lie originated, it is not relevant to the circumstances, under which the more general extermination legend originated. The claims of exterminations of Jews have their origin not in Allied intelligence information but in the operations of the World Jewish Congress, whose leaders were at first either unconcerned with, or uninformed about, the facts pertaining to Auschwitz.

In this connection one must reject two possible fallacious expectations. The first is that Allied propaganda would strive to maximize Auschwitz propaganda after it was realized that the propaganda possibilities were excellent. The second is that the claims made in the Allied propaganda relative to Auschwitz would be almost completely devoid of real fact.

The second fallacious expectation is that American propaganda relative to Auschwitz would be almost free of fact. We have indicated already that this should not be expected. Washington had excellent and accurate information about Auschwitz, as it had about all important phases of German industrial activity, and it has been remarked above that the real facts about Birkenau seemed to invite distortion of interpretation.

If, as is claimed here, there was no German extermination program, but certain propagandists in the U.S. wished the acceptance of the thesis that there was, it would have been a most serious blunder for the propagandists to give maximum emphasis to Auschwitz or any other place as an alleged extermination camp, for this would amount to making a charge that the Germans could answer. If high U.S. officials, such as Roosevelt or his cabinet members, had made specific remarks about exterminations, naming sites where exterminations were taking place under circumstances where their remarks received the wide publicity normally given to public statements by officials of their rank, then both the Germans and the Allies would have been put on the spot on the question, and the truth would not have been long in coming out. On the contrary, as we shall see in Chapter 5, the first period, in which there was a persistence of references to Auschwitz as an

---

<sup>125</sup> Editor's note: There are some reservations about the authenticity of this picture, see Udo Walendy, “Do Photographs Prove the NS Extermination of the Jews?,” in G. Rudolf, *Dissecting the Holocaust*, pp. 253f.

extermination camp, appearing even under obscure circumstances, was immediately after D-Day (June 6, 1944), when nobody was paying any attention to such stories. Later in the summer of 1944, the emphasis shifted to the Lublin camp, which the Russians had just captured. The first reference to emerge from a U.S. government source that was high enough so that it could not be ignored, and which charged exterminations at Auschwitz, came in late November 1944, after the exterminations are supposed to have been terminated.<sup>126</sup> Otherwise, people such as Roosevelt and Churchill and their ministers spoke only in very general moralistic terms about exterminations. It is only if one believed there actually were exterminations taking place at Auschwitz, and one wanted to stop them, that one would have made a specific charge concerning Auschwitz, to which the Germans would have felt obliged to respond. No such challenge ever materialized. Despite the fact that in all versions of the extermination legend the Auschwitz exterminations had certainly started by the late summer of 1942, and despite the fact that U.S. military intelligence must have known whatever it was that was going on at Auschwitz at that time, no specific extermination charges came from any high source until much later.

## The First ‘Extermination’ Claims and Washington

The first “inside” events relative to the extermination propaganda were in the context of a conflict involving the U.S. State and Treasury Departments and the World Jewish Congress (and American Jewish Congress), headed by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. The prominent characters in the story are Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, later the nominal author of the notorious “Morgenthau Plan” for the despoliation of Germany, Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles, who were mildly reluctant to be carried along by the propaganda, and Assistant Secretary of State J. Breckenridge Long, who was very resistant to the propaganda. Also involved are the World Jewish Congress representatives in Switzerland, Gerhard Riegner and Professor Paul Guggenheim, who transmitted stories of supposedly European origin to Wise or to other persons in the U.S., notably to the State Department through the U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, Leland Harrison, or through the U.S. Consul in Geneva, Paul C. Squire. The principal work that has set forth the events surrounding the birth of the extermination legend is Arthur D. Morse’s *While Six Million Died*, a book which is supplemented to some extent by Henry L. Feingold’s *The Politics of Rescue*. Additional material had been contributed by post-war accounts given by Morgenthau, historians J. M. Blum and Anthony Kubek (in interpreting Morgenthau’s papers, the latter for the U.S. Senate publication *Morgenthau Diary*), historian F. L. Israel (in summarizing the papers of J. Breckenridge Long), and J. DuBois, who was at first Chief Counsel of the Treasury’s Foreign Funds Control, involved in these matters chiefly in connection with efforts to extend assistance to refu-

<sup>126</sup> Hilberg, 631; Reitlinger, 493-495.

gees.<sup>127</sup>

The first extermination claim appears to have been made by the London section of the World Jewish Congress in June 1942. It was claimed that one million Jews had been killed in some undesignated and unlocated “vast slaughterhouse for Jews” which had been established in Eastern Europe. The only attempt to provide evidence for this claim was a remark that the Polish government in exile in London had received confirming information. The allegation was carried in the *New York Times* in a story that will be reviewed below.

The evidence for this London claim was obviously too flimsy to serve as effective propaganda, so an effort was made to improve matters slightly. On August 8, 1942, Riegner and Guggenheim approached the U.S. Consulate in Geneva, which had been cooperating with the World Jewish Congress to the extent of allowing it to use diplomatic channels for messages, with a story that some anonymous German industrialist had informed them that he had learned of a decision to kill all non-Soviet Jews under German control. Discussions, which the industrialist had overheard, were being held in the Führer’s Headquarters regarding the methods to be employed. One method under discussion was gassing with Prussic acid (hydrogen cyanide gas) after the Jews had been concentrated at camps in Eastern Europe. This story was forwarded to Washington by the Consulate via U.S. diplomatic channels and to London via British diplomatic channels. The “industrialist” has remained anonymous to this day.

When the U.S. State Department received the message, it was evaluated and it was decided that:

*“[...] it does not appear advisable in view of the [...] fantastic nature of the allegations and the impossibility of our being of any assistance if such action were taken, to transmit the information to Dr. Wise as suggested.”*

The message was accordingly suppressed, but Wise learned of its contents anyway. It is said that he learned from London, but it is also possible that he had composed the message in the first place and learned of its transmission and suppression through his various connections.

Wise immediately contacted Welles, who had approved the decision to suppress, in order to protest the State Department’s handling of the matter. Welles replied that the “information” was somewhat too unsubstantiated to be taken seriously and that some confirmation should be obtained before any public announcement was made. Welles then instructed the U.S. representative in the Vatican to attempt to check the allegations with Vatican sources. At that time, almost nobody in Washington pretended to take these claims seriously, and even President Roosevelt assured Justice Felix Frankfurter that the Jews who had been deported to the East were merely being used to help build fortifications.

In September 1942, two anonymous persons showed up in Geneva claiming to

---

<sup>127</sup> Unless otherwise noted, our treatment of the early extermination propaganda, related developments in Washington and New York, and the conflicts between the State Department, on one hand, and Zionists and the Treasury Department on the other, and the events leading up to the establishment of the War Refugee Board, is based on Morse, 3-99; Feingold, 167-247; DuBois, 183-189; Blum, 207-227; Israel; 173-174, 216-217, 306-337; Morgenthau.

have escaped from German controlled areas. They reported the extermination of Polish Jews and the utilization of the Jewish corpses for the manufacture of fertilizer. This was forwarded to Washington through diplomatic channels, and again an attempt was made to get confirmation by the Vatican (which had thus far ignored the first request for confirmation). At about the same time, Wise had received a message from a World Jewish Congress official in Europe reporting on the “manufacture of soap and artificial fertilizer” from Jewish corpses.

In late September 1942, Riegner came forward with two new documents. The first had, he said, been prepared by an (anonymous, naturally) officer attached to the German High Command and had reached Riegner through several intermediaries. The anonymous officer claimed that there were at least two factories in existence which were manufacturing soap, glue, and lubricants from Jewish corpses and that it had been determined that each Jewish corpse was worth 50 Reichmarks. The second document consisted of two coded letters that had, it was said, been written by a Swiss Jew resident in Warsaw. The anonymous Jew reported wholesale exterminations of Warsaw Jews deported to the East. All of these messages were forwarded to Washington and then filed.

In passing we should note the resemblance of such claims to World War I propaganda and the appalling lack of originality and creativity on the part of the World Jewish Congress. It scarcely requires remarking that the soap and glue factories were a very transient propaganda phenomenon and that the only similar charges made at Nuremberg were made by the Russians. These charges were largely ignored even then, and nobody, to my knowledge, has since come forward with the locations of these factories, the identities of the persons who managed them, or similar information. Reitlinger does not claim the existence of such factories, and Hilberg (page 624) does not believe they existed.

On October 10, the Vatican finally informed the U.S. representatives that it had been unable to confirm the many reports it had heard of severe measures against the Jews.

On October 22, Riegner met with Ambassador Harrison and presented him with more of the same sort of “evidence,” this time reporting “information” provided by yet another anonymous German informant (whose name, however, is said to have been presented to Harrison in a sealed envelope and to have been kept secret from everybody but the Office of Strategic Services, OSS) and also an anonymous official of the International Red Cross. Harrison forwarded this material to Washington, but also wrote two personal letters to Welles in late October, claiming that he knew the name of the German industrialist and also claiming that the anonymous Red Cross official was Carl Jacob Burckhardt, the distinguished Voltaire-Goethe scholar who was prominent in the International Red Cross during the war. He enclosed an affidavit that Guggenheim had deposed before Squire on October 29, in which Guggenheim claimed that he had obtained from an anonymous German informant information confirming Riegner’s claims. The anonymous German informant had gotten his information from an anonymous official of the German Foreign Ministry and from an anonymous official of the German Ministry of War. Moreover, an anonymous Swiss informant, resident in Belgrade,



had also given information to Guggenheim supporting the claims.

In order to confirm the claims, Squire arranged an interview with Burckhardt, which took place in Geneva on November 7. On November 9, Squire communicated to Harrison his memorandum on the interview, in which he had recorded that Burckhardt's information was that Hitler had signed an order that before the end of 1942 Germany must be free of all Jews. Squire's account of the interview explains:<sup>128</sup>

*"I then asked him whether the word extermination, or its equivalent, was employed, to which he replied that the words must be Juden-frei (free of Jews) were utilized. He then made it clear that since there is no place to send these Jews and since the territory must be cleared of this race, it is obvious what the net result would be."*

This, the report of an ambiguous remark, made by an imperfectly informed Swiss citizen, reported by an intermediary who was friendly to the World Jewish Congress and eager to discover a sinister interpretation to such facts as were available, is as solid as this "evidence" ever got. To my knowledge, Burckhardt never spoke out publicly, during or after the war, in connection with these matters. He answered some written questions, which were put to him by Kaltenbrunner's defense during the IMT trial, but these questions relating to Kaltenbrunner's efforts to permit the Red Cross to enter the German camps toward the end of the war were not relevant to our subject. Nobody asked Burckhardt about exterminations.<sup>129</sup>

Late in November 1942, the State Department received "information" from an anonymous Vatican source consisting of a three page description, in French, of events allegedly transpiring in Poland. The document is unsigned, and the only sort of endorsement is a handwritten notation, "from Mr. F. at Vatican City," which appears in an unknown hand on the first page. The document reports, *inter alia*:<sup>130</sup>

*"Farms for the breeding of human beings are being organized to which women and girls are brought for the purpose of being made mothers of children who are then taken from them to be raised in Nazi establishments. [...] Mass execution of Jews continues. [...] They are killed by poison gas in chambers especially prepared for that purpose (often in railway cars) and by machine gun fire, following which the dead and the dying are both covered with earth. [...] Reports are being circulated to the effect that the Germans are making use of their corpses in plants manufacturing chemical products (soap making factories)."*

---

<sup>128</sup> Guggenheim's affidavit is in dispatch no. 49 of October 29, 1942, of the retired files of the U.S. Consulate, Geneva, which are in the archives of the Foreign Affairs Document and Reference Center, Department of State, Washington. Squire's memorandum of his interview with Burckhardt is attached to Squire's personal letter of November 9, 1942 to Harrison, which is in the same file.

<sup>129</sup> The question put to Burckhardt and his answers are IMT document Kaltenbrunner 3, IMT Vol. 40, p. 306.

<sup>130</sup> The statement of the "Vatican source" is in the U.S. National Archives as Department of State file 740.00116 EW/726.

During the late summer and autumn of 1942, Wise had continuously campaigned for the Allied governments to take a public position directly condemning the alleged exterminations of Jews in Europe. On December 8, 1942, Wise led a delegation to the White House and presented to President Roosevelt a twenty-page document entitled *Blue Print for Extermination*, which was based on the sort of “information” we have reviewed. Related Jewish pressures finally brought capitulation to Wise on the mythical exterminations, and on December 17, 1942, the Allies, led by Washington, issued a statement condemning the exterminations. A related statement, released two days later, claimed exterminations at Belzec and at Chelmno, but Auschwitz was not mentioned (the relevant news stories are reviewed below).

Despite this public declaration, the group headed by J. Breckenridge Long continued to resist the propaganda. On January 19, 1943, Riegner gave Harrison the “information” that “in one place in Poland 6,000 Jews are killed daily.” On January 21, Harrison communicated this material to the State Department and also to certain unspecified “private Jewish agencies,” apparently meaning Wise. The message was merely filed, and the Department made no public mention of it. For a time, the private Jewish agencies were also silent about the message. On February 10, Long’s group took a further step in suppression of such propaganda. In a message signed by Welles (who is said to have not read the message) and with particular reference to Harrison’s cable of January 21, it instructed Harrison:

*“in the future, reports submitted to you for transmission to private persons in the United States should not be accepted unless extraordinary circumstances make such action advisable. It is felt that by sending such private messages which circumvent neutral countries’ censorship we risk the possibility that neutral countries might find it necessary to take steps to curtail or abolish our official secret means of communication.”*

Finally, on February 14, the *New York Times* published the story (see below). For explanation of the delay of four weeks in publishing the story, despite its being received by “private Jewish agencies” on January 21, and despite the evident policy of publishing the unsupported claims of such agencies, we can only conjecture that certain unknown persons were hoping that the State Department, given the precedent of the declaration of December 17, would release the “information” so as to confer a greater credibility than would have been granted to the story as it eventually appeared: a claim indistinguishable in terms of authority from the average sort of atrocity claim.

The Treasury (which, because of Morgenthau’s long crusade against Germany, had repeatedly interfered in the conduct of foreign affairs since at least 1936<sup>131</sup>) was soon to come into conflict with State over this suppression. A second and more substantial basis for conflict between the two Departments was also established in February 1943. It was learned that the Romanian government was prepared to transfer 70,000 Jews to Palestine on Romanian ships bearing Vatican insignia (it is unlikely that the Romanians really cared where the Jews were sent, so

---

<sup>131</sup> Hull, 471-473.

I assume that the Palestine destination must have been somehow specified by the Zionists involved in the formulation of the proposals). An important condition was specified by “officials who were in charge in Romania of Jewish interests.” A cost of 250 pounds (about \$1200) per capita was specified. There were other difficulties. The British policy at the time was not to antagonize the Arabs, especially in view of the potentially catastrophic consequences of an Arab uprising in wartime, and thus the British at first refused to consider the admission of so many Jews to Palestine. The British took the position that, if such Jews were to be taken out of Europe, the U.S. should provide camps in North Africa for them. In addition, both the British Foreign Office and the U.S. State Department took the position that there would inevitably be spies in such a large group of people, that the logistical problems involved in transporting and accommodating such numbers were formidable, and that the money demanded might fall into the hands of the enemy (who valued Allied currency for various purposes). The Treasury was eager to get into the business of aiding Jewish refugees, and thus, it sought to overcome such objections. By July 1943, there was said to be bribe money demanded for the Romanian Jews, \$170,000, and the Treasury and the World Jewish Congress proposed that Romanian Jewish businessmen could produce the bribe money, if they could be reimbursed after the war with money to be held in escrow in Switzerland. However, the British objections to admitting Jews to Palestine stood, and efforts to circumvent them by proposing other destinations for the Jews ran into the opposition of various candidate countries and also into U.S. immigration laws.

The State Department, especially J. Breckenridge Long and associates, considered all the talk about “exterminations” to be just wartime propaganda in the same spirit as the stories invented during World War I. They were, after all, continually considering proposals to move these exterminated people out of Europe. As late as January 1944, the Department was taking steps to encourage Jews to leave Poland for Hungary. Long wrote that one danger in supporting the proposals of Wise was that it “may lend color to the charges of Hitler that we are fighting this war on account of and at the instigation and direction of our Jewish citizens.” State considered the whole project pointless and, indeed, in conflict with the requirements of an optimum war effort. Long wrote that:

*“Wise always assumes such a sanctimonious air and pleads for the ‘intellectuals and brave spirits, refugees from the tortures of the dictators’ or words to that effect. Of course only an infinitesimal fraction of the immigrants are of that category – and some are certainly German agents. [...] I did not allude to the Navemar – en route from Lisbon to Havana and New York – a freight boat, passenger accommodations for 15 and 1200 poor Jews above and below decks with no sanitary arrangements, no service, no kitchen facilities, at from \$700 to \$1500 apiece, 4 dead before reaching Bermuda, 6 hospitalized there, 1 of which died, victims of the greed of their fellows – not of Germany or the United States policy. The vessel is a menace to the health of any port where it stops and a shame to the human greed which makes it possible. But I did not allude to it in reply to Rabbi Wise. Each one of these men hates me. I am to*

*them the embodiment of a nemesis. They each and all believe every person, everywhere, has a right to come to the United States. I believe nobody, anywhere has a right to enter the United States unless the United States desires."*

The State Department either procrastinated on the matter or actively sabotaged the proposed project. At the end of the summer of 1943, it was learned that 6,000 Jewish children could be taken out of France, and this possibility got involved in the problem.

The people from the Treasury and the World Jewish Congress kept pressing for the proposed projects and continually asserted, with apparent complete seriousness, that the only alternative was the death of the people in question at the hands of Hitler. It was even openly charged that the failure to approve the projects was "acquiescence of this Government in the murder of the Jews." Pressure was also put on the British by various people. Long had become a whipping boy both publicly and within government circles, and he wrote bitterly that

*"the Jewish agitation depends on attacking some individual. Otherwise they would have no publicity. So for the time being I am the bull's eye."*

As a result of this campaign, Wise and Morgenthau achieved a breakthrough in December 1943, when arrangements were finally made for the evacuation of Romanian Jews and money was put into a Swiss account controlled by Riegner and the U.S. Treasury. Moreover, in December 1943, Romania put out peace feelers and was assured it would be treated well if it treated its Jews well; Romania immediately decided to repatriate Jews it had resettled by the Sea of Azov in Russia.

This Morgenthau victory had been achieved at a December 20 meeting of Hull, Long, Morgenthau, and John Pehle, chief of the Treasury's Foreign Funds Control. Morgenthau had evidently decided on a showdown with State over the entire matter, for at that meeting he casually requested a copy of the complete text of the February 10 message from Welles to Harrison (the suppression instruction). The State Department complied, but deleted the reference to Harrison's message of January 21, thereby causing the message of February 10 to appear utterly routine. In thus editing the message, State was obviously unaware that the complete contents of this correspondence had already been leaked to DuBois in the Treasury by Donald Hiss of the State Department (brother of Alger Hiss and later identified in Bentley-Chambers testimony as a Communist, although he denied it), who had acquired copies of the messages only with great difficulty and, in complying with DuBois' request, nevertheless cautioned the latter that the messages were "none of Treasury's business" and that Hiss could lose his job for the leak.<sup>132</sup>

When Morgenthau received the edited message, he knew that he had another weapon to use against Long and associates, and thus, he brought on a collision by charging editing of the message and demanding to see the unedited files, which were produced shortly later, exposing State's clumsy attempt at concealment. The State Department people were now very much on the defensive, and further examination of the State Department files (which the Treasury was now in a position

---

<sup>132</sup> *Morgenthau Diary*, 6.

to insist on) revealed that, in response to a request by Wise, Welles had cabled Harrison in April to meet with Riegner and transmit new information that Riegner was supposed to have obtained. The confused Harrison did as requested (Riegner's information had to do with proposals to assist Jewish refugees in France and Romania) and also remarked to Welles that such material should not be subjected to the restriction imposed by the February 10 message.

Morgenthau was victorious in the State-Treasury collision; Roosevelt, drawn into the issue, sided with him by establishing in January 1944 the so-called War Refugee Board consisting of Morgenthau, Hull, and Secretary of War Stimson. However, the executive director was "Morgenthau's fair haired boy," John Pehle, and Josiah DuBois was the general counsel. It was thus Morgenthau's Board. The WRB naturally acquired the powers that had been held by the three Government Departments that were involved in the proposed projects for taking Jews out of Europe. Thus, the State Department became committed to appointing special attachés with diplomatic status on the recommendation of the Board (the UNRRA – United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration – set up the previous November, was to have a similar function but only after the war ended).<sup>133</sup>

In order to completely grasp the nature of its development and its import in terms of our subject, we should go beyond noting the obvious fact that the WRB was to serve, to a great extent, simply as an instrument of the World Jewish Congress and other Zionist organizations. The Communist apparatus was also through one of the directors involved, for the person to whom Morgenthau had delegated all of the Treasury's powers in the areas relevant to the WRB was Harry Dexter White, later exposed as a Soviet agent. White became a member of Morgenthau's inner circle in the spring of 1938. A week after Pearl Harbor, Morgenthau announced that "on and after this date, Mr. Harry D. White, Assistant to the Secretary, will assume full responsibility for all matters with which the Treasury Department has to deal having a bearing on foreign relations [...]." The extreme generality of the wording of this order, especially the phrase "having a bearing on," were to create grand opportunities for White in the years ahead. In early 1943, Morgenthau amplified White's responsibilities:

*"Effective this date, I would like you to take supervision over and assume full responsibility for Treasury's participation in all economic and financial matters [...] in connection with the operations of the Army and Navy and the civilian affairs in the foreign areas in which our Armed Forces are operating or are likely to operate. This will, of course, include general liaison with the State Department, Army and Navy, and other departments or agencies and representatives of foreign governments on these matters."*

White, who became an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in early 1945, took full advantage of these powers, especially in connection with occupation policy in Germany. It is also evident that, because the WRB was to a large degree an arm of the Treasury, its operations fell into White's domain. It is also worth remarking that the general counsel of the WRB, DuBois, was "closely associated" with the

<sup>133</sup> *New York Times* (Jan. 22, 1943), 6; (May 13, 1943), 8; (Sep. 5, 1943), 7; (Sep. 6, 1943), 7.23, 1944), 11.

Communist agent William L. Ullmann and was also a witness of White's will.<sup>134</sup>

Long had mixed and, as it developed, prescient thoughts about the implications of these developments:

"[...] it will be only a few more days now before I relinquish jurisdiction in connection with refugees and let somebody else have the fun. And it has been a heavy responsibility – domestic as well as foreign, because there are 5 million Jews in the country, of whom 4 million are concentrated in and around New York City. And we have no Arab or Moslem population, but we do have increasingly important commercial interests – principally oil – in the Moslem countries. In addition our ally England has hardly any Jewish citizenship but a very large political interest in the Near East. So our policy is increasingly based in part – a large part – on a domestic situation, while England's is based entirely on a foreign affairs base – and the two are hard to reconcile [...] it is good news for me [...] this ensures me staying out. What they can do that I have not done I cannot imagine."

Long miscalculated on the last point, for the WRB eventually did a considerable amount of Jew relocation, and its acts on behalf of refugees are of great importance in this book and are discussed in Chapter 7. In the final weeks of the war, it also aided concentration camp inmates through the Red Cross.<sup>135</sup> As an instrument of Wise and other Zionists, the WRB also did considerable propagandizing,<sup>136</sup> and its most consequential propaganda achievement was a booklet, *German Extermination Camps: Auschwitz and Birkenau*, Executive Office of the President, Washington, November 1944. The booklet is hereafter referred to as the WRB report.

The WRB report constituted the formal birth of the "official" thesis of exterminations via gas chamber at Auschwitz. In it all of the essentials and many of the details of the later Auschwitz hoax are found. The Nuremberg charges grew out of the WRB report. There does not seem to have been any particularly strong reaction, one way or the other, to the WRB report at the time that it was issued. However, an American journalist, Oswald F. Schuette, wrote a critical letter to Stimson (one of the signers of the report), but Schuette did not get a satisfactory reply.<sup>137</sup>

Of course, the WRB report failed to change the opinions of the State Department people who had scoffed at the extermination propaganda from the very beginning. In private with DuBois, they were blunt in their opinion of the WRB report:

"Stuff like this has been coming from Bern ever since 1942. [...] Don't forget, this is a Jew telling about the Jews. [...] This is just a campaign by that Jew Morgenthau and his Jewish assistants."

The WRB report was said to have been transmitted from Bern to Washington. The report will be discussed in depth after we have surveyed a key part of the

---

<sup>134</sup> *Morgenthau Diary*, 6-9.

<sup>135</sup> DuBois, 198-199; Red Cross (1947), 20, 23, 59-60; US-WRB (1945), 9-10, 56-61.

<sup>136</sup> US-WRB (1945), 45-56.

<sup>137</sup> *Morgenthau Diary*, 805-810; Aretz, 366-368.

wartime propaganda in its public aspect. First, however, we should point out that some otherwise keen observers misinterpret the role of Auschwitz in the extermination legend. The distinguished American journalist and historian Harry Elmer Barnes wrote in 1967 that the extermination<sup>138</sup>

“[...] camps were first presented as those in Germany, such as Dachau, Belsen, Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen, and Dora, but it was demonstrated that there had been no systematic extermination in those camps. Attention was then moved on to Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belzec, Chelmo, Jonowska, Tarnow, Ravensbruck, Mauthausen, Brezozna, and Birkenau, which does not exhaust the list that appears to have been extended as needed.”

The basis for Barnes’ misunderstanding, of course, is that at the end of the war the mass media, for the sake of sensation mongering, did indeed seize on the scenes found in the German camps as proof of exterminations, and it is also true, as we indicated in the previous chapter, that these scenes have served as the mass propaganda “proof” of exterminations. However, our analysis shows that Auschwitz had been carefully chosen in 1944 as the core for the extermination hoax. This point will be supported by material to be reviewed below and also in Chapters 4 and 5. By publishing the WRB report in November 1944, Washington committed itself to a specific form of the hoax. That form was maintained in the trials in Nuremberg, and even today, the form of the hoax does not differ in any significant respect from the WRB report.

After his WRB victory, Morgenthau busied himself with other things, particularly with the policies to be followed in occupied Germany. He found that existing plans actually paid regard to the Hague and Geneva Conventions, to which the United States was signatory, and which prohibited such things as the seizure of private personal property of no military significance, the detaining of POWs long after the end of hostilities, and the needless imposition of starvation rations. He therefore campaigned for the harsher policies, which later became known as the Morgenthau Plan and of which many were actually adopted and put into practice. David Marcus in the CAD sponsored Morgenthau’s objectives there and kept him informed about his opponents. Colonel Bernard Bernstein, long associated with Morgenthau, performed a similar function for him at Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces (SHAEF) in London. Baruch also helped out.<sup>139</sup>

## The First ‘Extermination’ Claims and New York

The thesis of this book is that the story of Jewish extermination in World War II is a propaganda hoax. Obviously, therefore, we must examine the origins of the hoax in wartime propaganda. We have already discussed many of the “inside” aspects, and the public aspects remain to be examined.

The enormity of the task plus the “controversial” nature of the subject seem to

---

<sup>138</sup> Barnes, quoted in *Anonymous*, 3.

<sup>139</sup> Blum, 343, 383.

have discouraged a thorough study of the propaganda. There have been studies of special aspects. John T. Flynn, in *While You Slept*, surveyed the propaganda in respect to communist and pro-communist influences, especially in regard to Asia. James J. Martin made a study of the manner, in which the American media treated the Soviet Union, the negotiated peace question, and the Allied terror bombings during the war.

It is out of the question to survey all of the atrocity and extermination propaganda pertaining to the European theater in World War II. Here we may economize on the magnitude of the survey to be undertaken by noting that we are interested only in the Jewish extermination question and only in what important people were doing. We will therefore find that examination of stories concerning alleged Jewish extermination that appeared in the *New York Times*, spring 1942 through 1943, together with a summary of 1944 propaganda, which will be presented in Chapter 5, is all that is required to get a satisfactory conception of the propaganda. Therefore, we start here with spring 1942 stories.

Concurrent commentary will be made. In many cases there is a story involved – allegedly originating in Europe – claiming mass killings, and the matters of particular interest in such cases are the source of the story, the location of the alleged killings, and the method of killing allegedly employed. It should also be kept in mind that the post-war extermination legend claims only three varieties of mass exterminations: gassing at six sites in Poland, “gasmobiles “ in Russia, and mass shootings in Russia.

*“REPORTS NAZI SLAUGHTER OF JEWS*

*April 6, 1942, p. 2 Kuibyshev, Russia, April 5 (AP) – The Anti-Fascist Jewish Committee reported today that the Germans have killed 86,000 Jews in and around Minsk, 25,000 at Odessa and ‘tens of thousands’ in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. In Estonia, the report said, the entire Jewish population numbering 4,500 was wiped out.”*

*“NAZIS BLAME JEWS FOR BIG BOMBINGS*

*June 13, 1942 Berlin, June 12 (From German broadcast recorded by the United Press in New York) – Propaganda Minister Joseph Goebbels said tonight that Germany would carry out a mass ‘extermination’ of Jews in reprisal for the Allied air bombings of German cities which, he acknowledged, have caused heavy damage.*

*Dr. Goebbels, in an article in the publication The Reich, said the Jews would be exterminated throughout Europe ‘and perhaps even beyond Europe’ in retaliation against the heavy air assaults.”*

Goebbels’ remark was directed against the Jewish controlled press, which he regarded as largely responsible for the propaganda atmosphere which made the terror bombings possible. His remark in *Das Reich* was:

*“In this war the Jews are playing their most criminal game, and they will have to pay for that with the extermination (Ausrottung) of their race in Europe and perhaps far beyond. They are not to be taken seriously in this conflict, because they represent neither British nor American, but exclusively Jew-*



ish interests.”

Now this is indeed an extermination threat, because the primary meaning of the term “*Ausrottung*” is “extermination” (the English “uprooting,” to which the word is related etymologically, is only a secondary meaning). Similar totally public utterances were also made occasionally by Hitler. Examples are “the result of this war will be the destruction of Jewry,” and “it will not be the Aryan peoples that will be annihilated but it will be Jewry.”<sup>140</sup>

In reaction to this, one should observe that (a) extreme statements were a pervasive feature of Nazi oratory and rhetoric, (b) the extermination mythologists find it necessary to claim that the exterminations were carried out in the most extreme secrecy, which makes it somewhat untenable to take such occasional references in the public declarations of Nazi leaders as evidence of exterminations, (c) it is necessary to fully grasp the specific circumstances of the Goebbels remark, *i.e.* it was a reaction to Allied terror bombings, (d) people can say heated things in wartime, and bloodthirsty statements were made by supposedly responsible people on both sides during the war, and (e) it is often the case that a complete understanding of context is necessary when interpreting the specific meaning of a reference to “extermination” or “annihilation” (or, in German, “*Ausrottung*,” “*Vernichtung*,” respectively). Moreover, the German word for “Jewry,” *das Judentum*, is ambiguous in meaning. Let each of these five points be examined in order.

(a) It is well known that Nazi oratory and rhetoric tended to have a provocatively inflammatory character whose origins go well back into the days when the Nazis were a minor party in Weimar Germany. It appears that this was a result of a deliberate and studied policy, for in 1931 Hitler explained the reasons for it in a private interview:<sup>141</sup>

*“What some madman of an editor writes in my own press is of no interest to me. [...] We can achieve something only by fanaticism. If this fanaticism horrifies the bourgeoisie, so much the better. Solely by this fanaticism, which refuses any compromise, do we gain our contact with the masses.”*

Put more simply, he often found that he could get attention by making wild statements.

Naturally, all of the Nazi leaders, especially Goebbels, were infected with this attitude to some degree. It is true that, after the Nazis came to power and assumed responsibility for ruling Germany, their public declarations became much more moderated in tone, but the tendency never entirely departed from them, and of course the war and the problem of attempting to reach public opinion in the Allied countries revived the feature somewhat. Under the circumstances, it is actually remarkable that Hitler and Goebbels only rarely made such declarations.

(b) We shall see in following chapters that the extermination mythologists are forced to take the position that the Nazis went to extremes to preserve the secrecy of their killing program of continental scope and did in fact preserve this secrecy to a most remarkable extent. What is known of the behavior of European Jews during those days, for example, despite the claims of some individual authors and

<sup>140</sup> *Das Reich* (Jun. 14, 1942), 2; Jaeckel, 62-63.

<sup>141</sup> Calic, 34-35. Hitler also made relevant remarks in *Mein Kampf*.

the indubitable fact that there were all sorts of rumors current, shows that the Jews were not conscious of any extermination program. When they were told to pack up for transport, they did just that, and went without resistance. On p. 140 we shall note Theresienstadt Jews *volunteering* for transport to Auschwitz as late as August 1944, for the Jews at Theresienstadt knew nothing of any extermination program at Auschwitz or anywhere else. On p. 262 we shall note that the Nazis were allegedly even unwilling to commit anything to confidential documents for, we are told, 'the drafting of circumspect minutes was one of the major arts of Hitler's Reich.' Because this is the case put forward by the extermination mythologists, then it is not merely that occurrences of the sort of remarks under consideration do not support their case; the problem becomes that of explaining such occurrences.

(c) The Goebbels remark should be seen for what it was: a professional propagandist's reaction to the Allied bombings, which obsessed German policy in various ways from May 1940 on. Because the facts in this connection, although well established, are not well known, they are very briefly summarized here, but in order to avoid an inexcusably long digression, the summary is indeed brief. The reader interested in more thorough treatment is referred to Veale and to Colby.<sup>142</sup>

At the outbreak of war in 1939, German air doctrine viewed the bomber as a form of artillery and thus a weapon to be used in support of ordinary ground operations. It was in this connection that the well-publicized bombings of Warsaw in 1939 and Rotterdam in May 1940 took place: only after these cities had actually become the scenes of military operations and the laws of siege applied. "Strategic bombing," as we understand the term, played no role in German combat operations (although of course it had been and was under study by German military planners).

This was not the case in Britain, however, for at the time that the Germans were using their bombers as artillery in the Netherlands, the British made the "splendid decision" to bomb German civilian targets, knowing perfectly well that Hitler had no intention or wish to engage in warfare of this sort (Hitler, indeed, did not want war with Britain at all).

There was a moderate amount of German bombing of targets in England during the early summer of 1940, but only specifically military targets were attacked, even while such cities as Hamburg and Bremen were undergoing general attack. It was only after three months of this, and with the greatest reluctance, that Hitler felt himself forced to reply in kind, and in this way the well publicized "Blitz" hoax was established. The British people were not permitted to find out that their government could have stopped the German raids at any time merely by stopping the raids on Germany.

The British raids on Germany, while of no military significance in 1940, had put the German government on the spot in German popular opinion, because the German people naturally thought that their government should be able to do something about them. The only reason the Germans adopted retaliatory bombing

---

<sup>142</sup> Frederick J. P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, and Benjamin Colby, *'Twas a Famous Victory*.

was as a last resort. In announcing the policy, Hitler declared in a *Sportpalast* speech of September 4, 1940:<sup>143</sup>

*"If the British Air force drops two or three or four thousand kilograms of bombs, we will drop a hundred and fifty, a hundred and eighty, two hundred thousand, three hundred thousand, four hundred thousand kilograms and more in a single night."*

This was a gross exaggeration of his capabilities relative to the British, for his bombers were designed for support of troops and not for the "strategic bombing," for which the British bombers were equipped, although at the time Germany's bombers were numerically superior to the British. Nevertheless, violent words are cheap, and after the Luftwaffe, which was never more than a nuisance for the Allied bombing operations, violent words (sometimes coupled with promises of secret new weapons) were about all Hitler and Goebbels were able to come up with in 1940 or at any subsequent time to oppose the bombings. It is in this context that the Goebbels remark should be grasped.

(d) There were bloodthirsty remarks made on both sides during the war. In the U.S. there were many examples of wild views earnestly put forward by apparently civilized persons, which were received with apparently thoughtful reactions of approval by equally respected persons. Because there were so many such people, it will suffice to remark only on Clifton Fadiman, the well known author and critic who, at the time, was the book review editor of the *New Yorker* weekly magazine.

Fadiman was the principal luminary of the Writers War Board, a semi-official government agency that did volunteer writing for government agencies in connection with the war. The Board was chaired by Rex Stout. The thesis that Fadiman and Stout carried to the writers' community in 1942 was that writings on the war should seek "to generate an active hate against all Germans and not merely against Nazi leaders." This generated some heated controversy, and writers and observers took sides in what became a debate hot enough for Fadiman to declare that he knew of "only one way to make a German understand and that's to kill them and even then I think they don't understand."

These were not isolated outbursts, for Fadiman welcomed the opportunity to set down his views on Germans in a more organized context through his column in the *New Yorker*. In April 1942, he had found the juvenile concept he needed in a book by de Sales, *The Making of Tomorrow*. Taking for granted the reader's concurrence that the Nazis were at least the worst scourge to come along in centuries, he wrote that de Sales'

*"argument is simply that the present Nazi onslaught is not in the least the evil handiwork of a group of gangsters but rather the final and perfect expression of the most profound instincts of the German people. 'Hitler is the incarnation of forces greater than himself. The heresy he preaches is two thousand years old.' What is the heresy? It is nothing more or less than a rebellion against Western civilization. Mr. de Sales traces five such German rebellions, beginning with Arminius. At first you are inclined to be skeptical of the au-*

---

<sup>143</sup> Hitler, 848.

*thor's grand indictment – his anti-Germanism may conceivably stem from his French ancestry – but as you follow his argument it becomes more and more cogent and the true proportions of this war emerge with great clarity."*

His reviews of books on the war expressed the historical concept that he had found in de Sales' nonsense. Scoffing at Howard K. Smith's claim that "If we can offer (the Germans) a real alternative to extermination, the nation, though it may not succumb to actual revolution, will fall into our hands," Fadiman wrote:

*"The world has been appeasing the Germans ever since their human wolf packs broke out of their forest lairs in the time of Arminius. The result is a Europe on the verge of suicide."*

This was followed by his obvious approval of "Hemingway's extraordinary [...] suggestion that 'the only ultimate settlement' with the Nazis is to sterilize them. He means just that, in a surgical sense." Of course, Fadiman also saw no distinction between Nazis and other Germans and ridiculed Dorothy Thompson's "passionate argument" for such a distinction as well as her conviction "that our postwar efforts must be directed toward the construction of a European federation of states, with Germany, under democratic leadership, occupying a leading position." Although Fadiman never advocated the killing of all or most Germans, at least not in so many words, this was the clear sense of his declarations. After all, what else can be done with "wolf packs who broke out of their forest lairs," who are now trying to enslave the rest of the world, and who "understand" only if you "kill them" and must not be given "a real alternative to extermination?"<sup>144</sup>

Clifton Fadiman was only a very prominent and semi-official example of a "school of thought" that existed among leaders of opinion in the U.S. during the war. James J. Martin and Benjamin Colby have published longer studies of Allied propaganda based on hatred of all Germans, the latter presenting a particularly thorough study of the Writers War Board.

The climate of wartime opinion in Britain, of course, was about the same and, on account of England's earlier entry into the war, of longer standing. In reacting to Hitler's Berlin *Sportpalast* speech on the initiation of German air raids on British cities (quoted above), the London *Daily Herald* gloated that Hitler had made "a frantic effort to reassure his raid-harassed people" who "are in an extremely nervous condition and stay awake even when there is no alarm." The same issue of the *Herald* goes on to present the recommendations of the Reverend C. W. Whipp, vicar of St. Augustine's Leicester:

*"The orders ought to be, 'wipe them out,' and to this end I would concentrate all our science towards discovering a new and far more terrific explosive.*

*These German devils (that is the only word one can use) come over our cities and turn their machine-guns on women and children.*

*Well, all I hope is that the RAF will grow stronger and stronger and go over and smash Germany to smithereens.*

*A Minister of the Gospel, perhaps, ought not to indulge in sentiments like*

<sup>144</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 29, 1942), 20; *New Yorker* (Apr. 18, 1942), 62; (Sep. 12, 1942), 53; (Oct. 24, 1942), 64f; (Nov. 28, 1942), 82; (Dec. 5, 1942), p. 82.

these.

*I go further, and I say quite frankly that if I could I would wipe Germany off the map.*

*They are an evil race and have been a curse in Europe for centuries.*

*There can be no peace until Hitler and all those who believe in him are sent to hell which is their place of origin and their final home."*

The *Herald* remarked that Whipp "has aroused considerable local controversy," so it is evident that in Britain, as in the U.S., there were many people who kept their heads despite the Fadiman types.

The peculiar *ad hoc* philosophy of history enunciated by de Sales and promoted by Clifton Fadiman also made its apparently independent appearance in England. An article by Reginald Hargreaves in the June 1941 issue of the respected journal *National Review* (not to be confused with the *National Review* that was founded in the U.S. in 1955) proposed as a war aim (as distinct from an unavoidable consequence of the war) that "at least three million Nazi soldiers (be) put permanently out of action," it being:

*"[...] an absolutely vital prerequisite to the laying down of arms that a sufficient number of the present-day corrupted, brutalized and delirious young dervishes of Nazidom should be left dead upon the field."*

The necessity for this arose from the consideration that:

*"[...] throughout her whole history Germany has shown herself as utterly uncivilized and worthy of nothing but detestation and disgust. From the very beginning the behavior of the Teutonic peoples had qualified them for the role of pariahs – the outcast mad dogs of Europe. [...] Our real war aim must be, not only military triumph in the field, but the reduction of the German people to such a shrunken and delimited condition that never again will they be in such a position to 'start anything' to the detriment of generations yet to come. Our conflict, despite mushy affirmations to the contrary, is with the German people; a race so savage, so predatory, so unscrupulous and so utterly uncivilized that their elimination as a major power is the only hope for a world that has no choice but to take the surgeon's knife and cut out this cankerous growth from its body-politic, thoroughly, relentlessly, once and for all."*

Such declarations seem even more extraordinary when one considers that they came from a nation noted for *understatement*.

The point of this discussion is not that there had grown up any consensus in the U.S. and Britain that all Germans are by nature monsters and should be killed or at least sterilized. Everybody would agree that no such consensus existed (and even the extermination mythologists would agree, I think, that no consensus favoring extermination of the Jews existed in Germany). Moreover, as we all realize, the genocidal policies advocated or implied by many leaders of opinion in the U.S. and Britain were not, in their literal form, within the bounds of the possible; the American and British people would never have permitted such deeds to be done in their names. The point is that during the heat of wartime the most extraordinary things were said. For the most part (unfortunately, one can only say for the *most* part) such lunacies were not realized in events, but they were expressed nev-

ertheless.

Murderous things were said on both sides, and in my opinion and dim recollection of the times, the rhetoric in the U.S. (especially in regard to the Japanese) seems to me to have been more violent than anything that now seems to have been current in Germany during the war, although such a comparison is difficult and perhaps should not be attempted in regard to degree, on account of the very different roles played by “public opinion” and by the statements of political leaders in the two political systems involved.

On the Axis side, one should also note that Fascist Italy had various anti-Jewish laws that were however very mild in application and certainly never approached murder. Nevertheless, the anti-Jewish rhetoric in the Fascist press was at least as violent as anything generated in Germany, and assuming the *New York Times* (October 22, 1941) reported accurately, it even advocated that all Italian Jews be “annihilated as a danger to the internal front,” because “this is the moment to do away with half-way measures.”

(e) A final point is that one must use some common sense and a feeling for the context in interpreting references to “extermination” and “annihilation” properly. In the American Civil War, many wanted Lincoln to “annihilate” the South, and it is not inaccurate English to say that Lincoln did just that, but it was understood, then as now, that the killing of all Southerners was not contemplated.

Naturally, the same observation may be made in connection with public declarations of Nazi leaders, but there is an additional point to be made in this connection. Very often the Jews were referred to via the German word *das Judentum*, one of whose correct translations is “Jewry,” but which can also mean “Judaism” or even “Jewishness” or “the idea of Jewishness.” Thus, a Hitler reference to “*die Vernichtung des Judentums*,” if lifted out of context and interpreted in a purely literal way, can be interpreted as meaning the killing of all Jews, but it can also be interpreted as meaning the destruction of Jewish influence and power, which is what the politician Hitler actually meant by such a remark, although it is true that he could have chosen his words more carefully. Alfred Rosenberg made specific reference to this ambiguity in his IMT testimony, where he argued that “*die Ausrottung des Judentums*,” a term he had used on occasion, was not a reference to killing in the context in which Rosenberg had used it.

The lengthy digression made necessary by Goebbels’ “*Ausrottung*” remark being concluded, we return to the survey of stories in *The New York Times* for 1942-1943.

June 14, 1942, p. 1: “258 JEWS REPORTED SLAIN IN BERLIN FOR BOMB PLOT AT ANTI-RED EXHIBIT

by George Axelsson – by telephone to the *New York Times* Stockholm, Sweden, June 13. At the Gross Lichterfelde Barracks in the western suburbs of Berlin 258 Jews were put to death by the SS on May 28, and their families deported, in retaliation for an alleged Jewish plot to blow up the anti-Bolshevist ‘Soviet Paradise’ exhibition at the Lustgarten. [...] If there were any bombs, they evidently were discovered before they had time to explode. [...] The SS

wanted the executions to be published. [...] Instead [...] leaders of the Jewish colony were called in.

Observers are inclined to see a link between the Berlin executions and the massacre at Lidice, in Czechoslovakia, after the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich.”

June 30, 1942, p. 7: “1,000,000 JEWS SLAIN BY NAZIS, REPORT SAYS

London, June 29 (UP) [...] spokesmen for the World Jewish Congress charged today.

They said Nazis had established a ‘vast slaughterhouse for Jews’ in Eastern Europe. [...] A report to the Congress said that Jews, deported en masse to Central Poland from Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia and the Netherlands were being shot by firing squads at the rate of 1,000 daily.

Information received by the Polish Government in London confirmed that the Nazis had executed ‘several hundred thousand’ Jews in Poland.”

No such “slaughterhouse” where executions were by “firing squad” is claimed today. As noted above, this was the start of the World Jewish Congress’ campaign of extermination propaganda. It is quite possible that this first story was inspired by Goebbels’ then recent “*Ausrottung*” remark.

July 22, 1942, p. 1: “NAZI PUNISHMENT SEEN BY ROOSEVELT

[...] President Roosevelt declared last night in a message read to 20,000 persons at Madison Square Garden [...]

*President’s Message*

*‘The White House*

*‘Washington*

*‘July 17, 1942*

*‘Dear Dr. Wise:*

*‘[...] Citizens [...] will share in the sorrow of our Jewish fellow-citizens over the savagery of the Nazis against their helpless victims. The Nazis will not succeed in exterminating their victims any more than they will succeed in enslaving mankind.*

*The American people [...] will hold the perpetrators of these crimes to strict accountability in a day of reckoning which will surely come. [...]*’

*Text of Churchill Message*

*‘[...] you will recall that on Oct. 25 last, both President Roosevelt and I expressed the horror felt [...] at Nazi butcheries and terrorism and our resolve to place retribution for these crimes among the major purposes of this war. [...]*’”

Such vague statements of the wartime leaders, while devoid of any specific charges, carried more weight among the public than any of the more specific stories that the leaders may have seemed, by their statements, to be endorsing. We shall see that the specific claims of the time, at least for several months, did not very much resemble the claims made at the later trials. Nevertheless, the politics of the situation, as perceived by Roosevelt and Churchill, made it opportune for

them to “go along,” at least to the extent of making vague public statements supporting the propaganda.

September 3, 1942, p. 5: “50,000 JEWS DYING IN NAZI FORTRESS

*London, Sept. 2 (UP) – Fifty thousand Jews from Germany and Czechoslovakia have been thrown into the fortress at Terezin and several thousand who are ill or charged with ‘criminal’ acts are in underground dungeons where they are ‘dying like flies’ a Czech Government spokesman said tonight.*

*‘All hope for them has been abandoned,’ the spokesman said. [...] The spokesman said the Germans had launched a campaign to exterminate Jews from the protectorate and that of 40,000 Jews formerly in Prague only 15,000 remain. Pilsen and Bruenn have been cleared of Jews, he said, many of them being sent to Terezin, largest concentration camp in Nazi-controlled Europe.*

*A European observer said the Germans planned to exterminate the Jews not only in Europe, but throughout the world. He declared the Nazis had executed 2,000,000 Jews in the past three years [...].”*

The only truth in this story lies in the fact that the death rate of Jews was rather high at Terezin (Theresienstadt) due to the German policy of sending all Reich Jews over 65 there. Another category at Theresienstadt was the “privileged” Jews – the war veterans – especially those with high decorations. There were other Jews, many of whom were eventually moved out, but if they suffered, it was not at Theresienstadt. The place was visited by the Red Cross in June 1944, and the resulting favorable report angered the World Jewish Congress.<sup>145</sup> There will be more to be said about Theresienstadt in subsequent chapters. While it was not the “largest concentration camp in Nazi-controlled Europe,” it nevertheless plays an important role here.

September 5, 1942, p. 3: “US REBUKES VICHY ON DEPORTING JEWS

*Washington, Sept. 4 – The State Department has made the ‘most vigorous representations possible’ to the French Government through the American Embassy in Vichy over the mass deportation of Jews from unoccupied France, it was announced today by the American Jewish Committee.*

*The protest followed representations by four Jewish organizations, and the action was communicated to them in a letter by Sumner Welles, Under-Secretary of State. [...] Mr. Welles said: ‘I have received your communication of Aug. 27, 1942, enclosing a letter [...] in regard to the mass deportation of Jewish refugees from unoccupied France.*

*‘I am in complete agreement with the statements made concerning this tragic situation, which provides a new shock to the public opinion of the civilized world. It is deeply regretted that these measures should be taken in a country traditionally noted for adherence to the principles of equality, freedom and tolerance.*

*‘The American Embassy at Vichy [...] has made the most vigorous representations possible to the highest authorities at Vichy [...].’*

---

<sup>145</sup> Reitlinger, 176-186.



[...] *The letter of the four organizations to the Secretary of State follows:*

*‘On behalf of the organizations we represent [...] the undersigned respectfully request our government to transmit to the government of France a solemn protest against the action taken recently by that government to turn thousands of refugees over to the agents of the Nazi government for deportation to Poland and to other Nazi-occupied regions in Eastern Europe.*

*‘Reports reaching us [...] stating] that the government of France is permitting the [...] deportation by the Nazis of Jewish refugees who have been interned in a number of camps in the south of France. This action began about Aug. 8, when a total of 3,600 men, women and children were rounded up, loaded on trains and sent off without any word regarding their destination.*

*‘The reports agree that these 3,600 were the first contingent of a total of 10,000 Jewish refugees which the French government has agreed to deport to eastern territories [...]*

*‘[...] Mass deportations of Jews from Germany and from territories under German occupation have been going on ever since the conquest of Poland. In accordance with the announced policy of the Nazis to exterminate the Jews of Europe, hundreds of thousands of these innocent men, women and children have been killed in brutal mass murders. The rest are being herded in ghettos in Eastern Europe under indescribably wretched conditions, as a result of which tens of thousands have succumbed to starvation and pestilence.’”*

We should only note at this point that even the four Jewish organizations are not completely secure in claiming exterminations, because they allow themselves an “out” by referring to those being “herded in ghettos.” Welles’ reply, while “in complete agreement” with the letter, avoids direct endorsement of the extermination claim.

November 24, 1942, p. 10: “*HEBREW PAPERS MOURN*

*JERUSALEM, Nov. 23 (UP) – The Hebrew press appeared today with black borders around reports of mass murders of Jews in Poland. The reports, received by the Jewish Agency, asserted that systematic annihilation of the Jewish population was being carried out by a special German ‘destruction commission’ [...] on the former frontier between German and Russian Poland, thousands were thrown into the Bug river and drowned.”*

December 13, 1942, p. 21: “*TARDY WAR REPORT HELD AID TO FAITH*

*[...] Rabbi Israel Goldstein declared: ‘Authenticated reports point to 2,000,000 Jews who have already been slain by all manner of satanic barbarism, and plans for the total extermination of all Jews upon whom the Nazis can lay their hands. The slaughter of a third of the Jewish population in Hitler’s domain and the threatened slaughter of all is a holocaust without parallel.’”*

December 18, 1942, p. 1: “*11 ALLIES CONDEMN NAZI WAR ON JEWS*

*Special to the New York Times Washington, Dec. 17 – A joint declaration by members of the United Nations was issued today condemning Germany’s*

'bestial policy of cold-blooded extermination' of Jews [...]. The declaration was issued simultaneously through the State Department here, and in London. [...]

*Text of Declaration*

"[...] From all the occupied countries Jews are being transported in conditions of appalling horror and brutality to Eastern Europe. In Poland, which has been made the principal Nazi slaughterhouse, the ghettos established by the German invader are being systematically emptied of all Jews except a few highly skilled workers required for war industries. None of those taken away are ever heard of again. The able-bodied are slowly worked to death in labor camps. The infirm are left to die of exposure and starvation or are deliberately massacred in mass executions. The number of victims of these bloody cruelties is reckoned in many hundreds of thousands of entirely innocent men, women and children."

This was the beginning of the State Department involvement in the extermination legend, and that it came from such a seemingly official source was the basis for special comment in the *Times* editorial of the same day:

December 18, 1942, p. 26: "HITLER'S TERROR

*Despite all that has been written about Nazi persecution of the Jews, the facts in the joint statement issued yesterday in Washington, London and Moscow in the name of the United Nations will come as a shock to all civilized people who have preserved a modicum of human decency. For this statement is not an outcry of the victims themselves to which many thought it possible to close their ears on the ground that it might be a special plea, subject to doubt. It is the official statement of their own governments, based on officially established facts. [...]"*

Clearly, it was believed that atrocity claims apparently coming from the State Department were more credible than claims coming from such groups as the World Jewish Congress, which is no doubt what is meant by the "victims themselves." However, we have seen that Wise was also behind the "joint declaration." The December 17 statement marked the start of U.S. and British government complicity in the extermination legend. The German government did not see the event as laden with import, and von Stumm of the Foreign Office's press section flippantly explained to the neutral press that the Allied declaration was for the purpose of helping the Christmas sales of the Jewish department stores of New York and London.<sup>146</sup>

December 20, 1942, p. 23: "ALLIES DESCRIBE OUTRAGES ON JEWS

*What is happening to the 5,000,000 Jews of German-held Europe, all of whom face extermination, is described in a statement released yesterday by the United Nations Information Office. [...]*

*[...] Novel methods of mass execution by shooting and lethal gas are cited in the main body of the report, which states that this destruction of the Jews is*

---

<sup>146</sup> Reitlinger, 439.

*not 'isolated in one country but is continent-wide. Early in December 1942 the State Department in Washington gave some figures showing that the number of Jewish victims deported and perished since 1939 in Axis-controlled Europe now reached the appalling figure of 2,000,000 and that 5,000,000 were in danger of extermination. [...]*

*The document concludes:*

*'The means employed in deporting from the ghetto all those who survive murders and shooting in the street exceeds all imagination. In particular, children, old people and those too weak for work are murdered. Actual data concerning the fate of the deportees is not at hand, but the news is available – irrefutable news – that places of execution have been organized at Chelmno and Belzec, where those who survive shootings are murdered en masse by means of electrocution and lethal gas.'*

The alleged electrocutions at Belzec appeared a few times in the propaganda and will be discussed again on p. 183. They are one of the versions of exterminations that were quickly forgotten about after the end of the war. Nevertheless, we can see, at this point, a clear tendency of the propaganda to resemble the claims which have become the fixed features of the legend, the gas chambers and the approximate 6,000,000 killed during the course of the war. We will have more to say a bit later on the origin of the six million figure.

December 28, 1942, p. 21: "*DEMAND JEWS BE SAVED*

*Albany, Dec 27 (AP) – Dr. Wise, president of the American Jewish Congress and the World Jewish Congress [... urged] formulation of an Allied program to halt the Nazi slaughter of civilians."*

Jan. 8, 1943, p. 8: "*93 CHOOSE SUICIDE BEFORE NAZI SHAME*

*Ninety-three Jewish girls and young Jewish women, the pupils and the teacher of a Beth Jacob School of Warsaw, Poland, chose mass suicide to escape being forced into prostitution by German soldiers, according to a letter from the teacher, made public yesterday by Rabbi Seth Jung of the Jewish Center of New York City."*

February 7, 1943, VI, p. 16: "*IN THE VALLEY OF DEATH*

*[magazine article by Sholem Asch...] gas chambers and blood poisoning stations which are established in the outlying countryside, where steam shovels prepare community graves for the victims."*

February 14, 1943, p. 37: "*TYRANNY OF NAZIS SHOWN*

*Warsaw is being subjected to a deliberate Nazi pattern of death, disease, starvation, economic slavery and wholesale elimination of population, the Office of War Information states in a twenty-four page pamphlet, 'Tale of a City,' published today.*

*Declaring that Warsaw has been the testing ground for Nazi plans of world conquest [...]*

*'[...] there is no way of telling at this time exactly how many Poles have been murdered by the Nazis in Warsaw.' The execution spot is now Palmiry,*

*near Warsaw, where mass shootings occur either at dawn or during the night.”*

February 14, 1943, p. 37: “*EXECUTION ‘SPEED-UP’ SEEN*

*Mass executions of Jews in Poland on an accelerated tempo was reported by European representatives of the World Jewish Congress in a communication made public by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, president of the American Jewish Congress.*

*In one place in Poland 6,000 Jews are killed daily, according to the report, dated Jan. 19. Jews left in Poland are now confined in fifty-five ghettos, some in the large towns and some in the smaller towns that have been transformed into ghettos.”*

This was the propaganda story involved in the conflict between State and Treasury. As noted in connection with the remarks on the *Times* editorial of December 18, if this story had managed to emerge from the State Department, greater credibility would, apparently, have been attached to it. Unfortunately for the propaganda inventors at the time, they had to settle for Rabbi Wise as ostensible source.

February 16, 1943, p. 7: “*NAZIS SHIFT 30,000 JEWS*

*Geneva, Switzerland, Feb. 15 (ONA) – All the aged and feeble [from Czestachowa, Poland] were sent to Rawa-Russka, in Galicia, for execution by the Nazis, sources from inside Poland said.”*

February 23, 1943, p. 23: “*ATROCITIES PROTESTED*

*Thirty-five hundred children [...] held a solemn assembly of sorrow and protest against Nazi atrocities in Mecca Temple, 133 West Fifty-fifth Street. [...] Six refugee children related their experiences at the hands of the Nazis.”*

March 2, 1943, pp. 1, 4: “*SAVE DOOMED JEWS, HUGE RALLY PLEADS*

*Immediate action by the United Nations to save as many as possible of the five million Jews threatened with extermination [...] was demanded at a mass demonstration [...] in Madison Square Garden last night.*

[...Rabbi Hertz said] ‘*appalling is the fact that those who proclaim the Four Freedoms have so far done very little to secure even the freedom to live for 6,000,000 of their Jewish fellow men by readiness to rescue those who might still escape Nazi torture and butchery. [...]*’

[...Wendell Wilkie said] ‘*Two million human beings, merely because they are Jews, have already been murdered by every fiendish means which Hitler could devise. Millions of other Jews [...] face immediate destruction [...]*’

[...Chaim Weizmann said] ‘*Two million Jews have already been exterminated. [...]*

*‘The democracies have a clear duty before them. [...] Let them negotiate with Germany through the neutral countries concerning the possible release of the Jews in the occupied countries. [...] Let the gates of Palestine be opened to all who can reach the shores of the Jewish homeland [...]*’”

March 7, 1943, p. 30: "600 JEWS SENT TO SILESIA

*Stockholm, Sweden, March 6 (Reuter) – Nearly 600 Norwegian Jews [...] are now known to have reached Polish Upper Silesia. Most of the men have been sent to work in the mines near Katowice."*

March 10, 1943, p. 12: "40,000 HERE VIEW MEMORIAL TO JEWS

*Forty thousand persons listened and watched [...] last night to two performances of 'We Will Never Die,' a dramatic mass memorial to the 2,000,000 Jews killed in Europe. [...] The narrator said 'There will be no Jews left in Europe for representation when peace comes. The four million left to kill are being killed, according to plan.'"*

April 1, 1943, p. 2: "FRENCH JEWS SENT TO A NAZI OBLIVION

*Wireless to The New York Times London, March 31 – A system of 'death convoys' under which French Jews are being rounded up [...] and then shipped out to various points in Eastern Europe, after which they are no longer heard from, was described here today by the British section of the World Jewish Congress, which charged that the 'full force' of the Nazi and anti-Jewish terror now was being concentrated in France.*

*Basing its report on first hand information supplied by a prominent French Jew who has escaped to a neutral country, the Congress declared the last 'convoy' left France about Feb. 20. It involved 3,000 Jews of all classes and ages, and all that was known about its eventual destination was that it was somewhere in the East.*

*In mid-February, the Congress added, the Gestapo raided the Lyon headquarters of the General Union of French Jews, arrested the entire staff, removed them to the Drancy concentration camp and since has shipped them, too, to some 'extermination center' on the other side of Europe."*

Reitlinger (page 327) tells us that "less than a tenth of the Jews who were deported (from France) possessed French nationality." By his figures that is perhaps 5,000 of the 240,000 French Jews, suggesting that maybe the 5,000 enlisted for work voluntarily or were actually "politicals" or partisans.

April 12, 1943, p. 5: "NAZIS ERASE GHETTOS IN TWO POLISH CITIES

*London, April 11 (AP) – The Polish Telegraph Agency said tonight that the Germans had erased the ghetto at Krakow in a three-day massacre that started March 13, and also had eliminated the ghetto in Lodz.*

*The fate of the Jews in the latter city was unknown, but the agency said it was believed they also were killed."*

April 20, 1943, p. 11: "2,000,000 JEWS MURDERED

*London, April 19 (Reuter) – Two million Jews have been wiped out since the Nazis began their march through Europe in 1939 and five million more are in immediate danger of execution. These figures were revealed in the sixth report on conditions in occupied territories issued by the Inter-Allied Information Committee.*

*[...] The report said lethal gas and shooting were among the methods be-*

*ing used to exterminate the Jews.”*

April 20, 1943, p. 11: “*RESCUE OF JEWS URGED*

*The Jewish Agency for Palestine, in a memorandum addressed to the Bermuda Refugees Conference yesterday, urged that measures of rescue be launched immediately on behalf of 4,000,000 Jews estimated to be still surviving in Nazi occupied countries.*

*The Agency, headed by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, is recognized in the Mandate for Palestine as a body to advise and cooperate with the Government of Palestine on matters affecting the establishment of the Jewish National Home.*

*The memorandum declares that ‘should the announced policy of the enemy continue unchecked, it is not impossible that by the time the war will have been won, the largest part of the Jewish population of Europe will have been exterminated.’”*

April 25, 1943, p. 19: “*SCANT HOPE SEEN FOR AXIS VICTIMS*

*Special Cable to the New York Times Hamilton, Bermuda, April 24 – The large scale movement of refugees is impossible under wartime conditions, and neither the United States nor Great Britain, alone or jointly, can begin to solve the refugee problem. These two concrete impressions have emerged after almost a week’s discussion of the refugee problem by the American and British delegations here.”*

Because almost all Jews outside the Continent, particularly those in the U.S., believed the extermination claims, they brought political pressures which resulted in the Bermuda Conference. It was believed,<sup>147</sup> correctly, that the Nazis wished the emigration of the Jews from Europe (under appropriate conditions), and this put the British and American governments, on account of the propaganda basis for their war, into an awkward position, around which they were obliged to continually double-talk.<sup>148</sup> We have described the conflict between State and Treasury in this regard. The British had, at that point, no intention of opening Palestine, and both the British and Americans had no intention of providing the resources, in the middle of the war, for massive operations undertaken for reasons that were valid only to the degree that their propaganda was taken seriously. No sane modern statesmen believe their own propaganda. This is the dilemma, which J. Breckenridge Long and other State Department officials felt themselves facing.

Another point that should be made here before proceeding with the survey of the propaganda is that the six million figure had its origin apparently in the propaganda of 1942-1943. An examination of the problem of the origin of the six million figure could easily lead to the conclusion that it had its origin at the IMT, where the indictment mentioned a figure (supplied by the World Jewish Congress) of 5,721,800 “missing” Jews and Wilhelm Höttl of the SD signed an affidavit, 2738-PS, asserting that he had gotten a figure of six million from Eichmann. According to Höttl, Eichmann had visited his Budapest office in a depressed mood because he was convinced that the war was lost, thought that the Allies would punish

<sup>147</sup> DuBois, 197.

<sup>148</sup> *New York Times* (Nov. 1, 1943), 5; (Dec. 11, 1943), 1; (Dec. 13, 1943), 11; (Jan. 3, 1944), 9.

him as a major war criminal, and then declared, with no other witnesses present, that four million Jews had been killed in extermination camps and that two million had met death in various other ways, mainly through executions carried out by the *Einsatzgruppen* in Russia.

Here we offer a different theory regarding the origin of the six million figure. Its very first appearance seems to be Rabbi Goldstein's statement of December 13, 1942, followed by the story of December 20 to the same effect, except that it specified a potential seven million in danger of being exterminated, rather than the six million implied by Goldstein's statement. However, it could correctly be argued that one must not infer the origin of the six million figure purely on the basis of these stories.

However, the appearances of the two million killed – four (or five) million to be killed – extermination claim at the public affairs reported on March 2 and 10, 1943, must be taken much more seriously. More information about the latter affair can be extracted from an advertisement that also appeared on March 10 (page 10), reporting that the show had been organized by the “Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews,” headed by Senator Johnson of Colorado. The advertisement makes the same extermination claim (two million killed, four million to be killed) and also lists the sponsors of the organization, which included many members of Congress and other notables. The same organization had also run a full page advertisement on February 16 (page 11), specifying two million killed and four million to go (and also claiming that the only Arabs who objected to massive Jewish immigration into Palestine were Nazi agents). The two stories of April 20 suggest rather widespread usage of the two million killed – four (or five) million to be killed – form of the extermination claim in early 1943. We therefore have very general usage of the six (or seven) million figure, long before the end of the war, by the political establishment that wrote the charges at Nuremberg: Thus, I believe that we can take late 1942/early 1943 propaganda as the origin of the six million figure. The complete independence of that figure of any real facts whatever is reflected in Reitlinger's elaborate apologies for his belief that he can claim only 4.2 to 4.6 million Jews, almost all East European, who perished in Europe during World War II, one third of them dying from “overwork, disease, hunger and neglect.”<sup>149</sup> However, Reitlinger's figures are also mostly independent of any real facts, but that matter will be discussed in Chapter 7.

It is not at all remarkable that after the war somebody could be found to declare at Nuremberg that the propaganda figure was correct. Höttl, indeed, was a completely appropriate choice, because he was one of those stereotype “operators,” with which the world of intelligence work is plagued. Born in 1915, he entered the SD in 1938 and soon acquired a reputation for mixing official business with personal business deals. His teaming up with a Polish countess friend in a Polish land deal led to an SS investigation of his activities in 1942. The report of the investigation characterized him as “dishonest, scheming, fawning [...] a real hoaxer,” and concluded that he was not even suitable for membership in the SS,

---

<sup>149</sup> Reitlinger, 533, 545, 546.

let alone a sensitive agency such as the SD. He was accordingly busted down to the ranks, but then the appointment in early 1943 of his fellow Austrian and Vienna acquaintance Kaltenbrunner to head the RSHA seems to have reversed his fortunes, and he rose to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel by the end of the war and played a responsible role in foreign intelligence work. After the war, he worked for the U.S. Army Counter-Intelligence Corps until 1949 in lining up ex-SS personnel to give information. It is said that he managed to make this job rather lucrative. After 1949, he immersed himself in the snake pit of Vienna cold war politics, maintaining links with neo-Nazis, Soviet agents, and nearly everybody else. He had a particularly close relationship with one Soviet agent Kurt Ponger, a naturalized U.S. citizen whom he had met when Ponger was employed as a translator at the IMT (in addition a Kurt Ponger, probably the same person, was a prosecution lawyer in NMT Case 4). Höttl consequently became suspect in the Verber-Ponger espionage case of 1953 and was arrested by U.S. authorities in March in Vienna but released a few weeks later. In the mid-Fifties, he published two books on his wartime experiences. In 1961, he signed a prosecution affidavit for Eichmann's trial (substantially the same as his IMT affidavits).<sup>150</sup>

Authors on my side have written that Höttl was an Allied agent during the war. This is not correct. The only real fact that is involved in this claim is that Höttl was in touch with Allen Dulles of the OSS in Switzerland toward the end of the war. This was a part of his duties: the RSHA was attempting to arrange a favorable conclusion of the hostilities, and Höttl was one of the persons involved in the secret contacts with the western Allies.

No doubt, during the very last weeks of the war many of these intelligence officers started acting with their personal interests in mind, and also without doubt, Höttl would have been delighted to have been enlisted as an Allied agent at this juncture of the war and may even have volunteered some favors to Dulles with this development in mind. However, these contacts are no more evidence that Höttl was an Allied agent than they are that Dulles was an Axis agent (Dulles is even said to have peppered his conversation with anti-Semitic remarks when he was trying to win the confidence of some German contacts<sup>151</sup>). If Höttl had been an Allied agent, it would seem that he would boast about this in one of his two books (*The Secret Front* and *Hitler's Paper Weapon*), but he makes no such claim. In addition, Ian Colvin, who knows as much about these matters as anybody, wrote the Introduction for *The Secret Front*, and makes no remarks in this connection.

April 27, 1943, p. 10: "*NORWEGIAN DEPORTEES DIE*

*Stockholm, Sweden, April 26 (ONA) – Reports from Oslo said today that most of the Norwegian Jewish women and children deported from the country [...] had died of starvation.*

*Transport of deportees that left Oslo in November and February were re-*

<sup>150</sup> *Time* (Jul. 12, 1954), 98, 100; *New Republic* (Dec. 20, 1954), 22; *New York Times* (Apr. 7, 1953), 20; (Apr. 12, 1953), 33; Eichmann, session 85, A1-L1; IMT, vol. 11, 228.

<sup>151</sup> R. H. Smith, 214-215.



*moving them toward an ultimate destination in the Silesian mining region around Katowice. [...]"*

May 3, 1943, p. 12: "*BRITAIN SCORED ON JEWS*

*An audience of 1,500 persons [...] heard Pierre van Paassen [...] assert that Palestine presented the only solution to the refugee problem.*

*[...] Mr. van Paassen said that Great Britain had made a 'hollow mockery' of the refugee conference in Bermuda by excluding discussion of Palestine among the possible solutions.*

*'Britain feels that the modernization of Palestine by the Jews endangers the pillars of her empire. [...] That is the real reason many more Jews face death because Britain wants to keep the doors of Palestine shut to them.'*

May 20, 1943, p. 12: "*EDEN TIES VICTORY TO REFUGEE HOPES*

*Special Cable to the New York Times London, May 19. [...] Eden [...] insisted that it was not fair to accuse the British Government of utterly ignoring the situation.*

*[...] he disclosed that the war Cabinet had approved the [Bermuda Conference] report [...]*

*[WJC DISAPPOINTED WITH BERMUDA CONFERENCE]*

*London, May 19 (Reuter) – The World Jewish Congress [...] expressed deep disappointment with the results of the Bermuda Conference.*

*The note [...] pointed out that the way to Palestine is now also free."*

May 22, 1943, p. 4: "*JEWS LAST STAND FELLED 1,000 NAZIS*

*Wireless to the New York Times London, May 21 – Nearly 1,000 Germans were killed or wounded in the battle in the Warsaw ghetto in the last two weeks when the Nazis undertook the final liquidation of the ghetto.*

*[...] More news of the anti-Jewish campaign in Poland was picked up today from SWIT, the secret Polish radio station. It said the Nazis had started liquidating the ghetto of Cracow and Stanislawow [...] shooting Jews wherever they were found or killing them in gas chambers."*

June 7, 1943, p. 15: "*'RALLY OF HOPE' IS HELD*

*Six thousand children [...] participated yesterday in a 'Rally of Hope' [...]. [...] Jewish children and their parents are tortured and put to death by a barbarous enemy. [...]"*

June 9, 1943, p. 3: [*DEPORTATIONS OF JEWS*]

*"London, June 8 (Reuter) – No fewer than 3,500 Jews have recently been deported from Salonika, Greece, to Poland, it was stated here today. Men, women and children were herded indiscriminately into cattle trucks, which were then sealed, it was added."*

June 13, 1943, p. 8: "*NAZI GAS KILLINGS OF REFUGEES CITED*

*By Telephone to the New York Times Stockholm, Sweden, June 12 – More than 10,000 Jews were killed since last October in the Brest-Litovsk district*

[...] according to the Swedish language Jewish Chronicle published in Stockholm.

*Thousands were gassed to death in hermetically sealed barns and others have been shot in groups of sixty in adjoining woods, the paper says.*

[...] *When Dr. Robert Ley, chief of the German Labor Front, recently spoke at Koenigsberg, Bialystok and Grodno he said: 'The Jews are the chosen race, all right – but for extermination purposes only.'*"

June 15, 1943, p. 8: "NAZIS DEPORT 52,000 BELGIANS

*London, June 14 (AP) – The Belgian Government in exile said today that the Germans had removed nearly all 52,000 Belgian Jews to concentration camps in Germany, Poland and occupied Russia."*

Reitlinger reports for Belgium the same situation as in France. Among the Jews deported from Belgium, "virtually none" were Belgian Jews. It is worth remarking that essentially the same held for Italy and Denmark.<sup>152</sup>

June 21, 1943, p. 2: "BERMUDA PARLEY SCORED

*A resolution condemning the 'inaction' of the Bermuda Conference and another calling upon President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill to open the doors of Palestine to refugees were adopted unanimously yesterday by the order of the Sons of Zion [...] at the Hotel Pennsylvania."*

June 21, 1943, p. 3: "ROMANIANS BLAMED FOR KILLING OF 5,000

*Berne, Switzerland, June 20 (UP) – Swiss newspapers said tonight that 5,000 bodies reported by Axis propagandists to have been buried near Odessa were those of Romanian Jews killed by the Romanian secret police.*

*The Romanian press announced the discovery of the mass tomb on April 22, claiming the bodies were those of Romanians killed by the Russians after the latter occupied Bessarabia and Bukovina in 1940."*

June 23, 1943, p. 8: "NETHERLAND JEWS OUSTED BY NAZIS

*London, June 22, (UP) – All Jews in Amsterdam have been deported by the Germans to Poland, thus completing the removal of the entire Jewish population of the Netherlands, the Aneta news agency said today."*

This story is not true. Nevertheless, the majority of Dutch Jews were deported. The reasons for the great differences in policy in the Netherlands (and Luxembourg) on the one hand and in Belgium and France and other countries on the other will be seen on page 265. It will be shown that the ultimate, as distinct from immediate, destination of the Jews deported from the Netherlands was most probably not Poland. Of the 140,000 Dutch Jews, about 100,000 were deported.<sup>153</sup>

June 28, 1943, p. 8: [ARYANIZATION OF JEWISH PROPERTY]

*"London, June 27 (Reuter) – A German radio broadcast tonight quoted Premier Nicholas von Kallay of Hungary as stating that all remaining property of Jews in Hungary would pass into 'Aryan' hands at the end of this year.*

<sup>152</sup> Reitlinger, 367, 370-371, 378.

<sup>153</sup> Reitlinger, 352.

*This property will be distributed among those who have distinguished themselves in the war and families with many children, it is said."*

June 29, 1943, p. 6: "*NAZIS EXECUTE 150 JEWS*

*London, June 28 (Netherlands News Agency) – The Germans have launched mass executions of Netherlands Jews deported to Poland, it was reported tonight.*

*[...] 150 Jews in the village of Turck had been mowed down with machine gun fire. [...] At Socky [...] 340 Netherlands Jews were machine-gunned, and 100 women and children were slain near Potok. [...] They were among the thousands of Jews who had been transported from the Netherlands to the notorious Treblinka concentration camp."*

It seems odd to transport people out of an extermination camp and then kill them. Whoever composed this story was evidently not only uninformed on what Treblinka was supposed to be, but also on the order of magnitude of the numbers that were supposed to be thrown around.

July 21, 1943, p. 13: "*QUICK AID IS ASKED FOR EUROPE'S JEWS*

*Immediate action to rescue the Jews of Nazi-dominated countries was demanded last night by speakers at the opening session of the Emergency Conference to Save the Jews of Europe, held at the Hotel Commodore.*

*[...] Representative Rogers pointed out that some 3,000,000 of Europe's 7,000,000 Jews already have perished and insisted that 'this is a problem which cannot be solved through the exercise of vocal cords and routine protests.'*

*[...] 'Certainly there are enough open spaces and unpopulated areas to accommodate 4,000,000 tortured human beings,' he said. 'Palestine is the logical place. It is nearer and over land instead of over water [...]'*

*[...] Count Sforza voiced the hope that Jews and Arabs would be able to cooperate in the future in the building of a great Near East federation, with Palestine as a member."*

August 2, 1943, p. 10: "*16,000,000 MADE REFUGEES BY AXIS*

*Washington, Aug. 1 – A survey of the European refugee problem, published today by the Foreign Policy Association, said that only a collective effort on the part of the great powers or an international organization could deal effectively with the situation that would follow the end of the war.*

*[...] On the basis of reports from the governments in exile and other informants, the report said, it was estimated that of the Jews who in 1939 inhabited European countries now held by the Axis, two million already have been deported or had perished from various forms of mistreatment or deliberate extermination."*

The Foreign Policy Association does not seem to be very secure in asserting exterminations, because it gives the impression that most of the Jews had been "deported," even though by this time other propagandists were speaking of three million dead Jews.

August 8, 1943, p. 11: "2,000,000 MURDERS BY NAZIS CHARGED

*London, Aug. 7 – Polish Labor Fights, a publication issued here today, printed an account of a house maintained by the Germans at Treblinka, Poland, for the extermination of Jews. In this place alone, it is said, the Germans have killed 2,000,000 persons.*

*[...] 'When the cells are filled they are closed and sealed. Steam is forced through apertures and suffocation of the victims begins. At first cries can be heard but these gradually subside and after fifteen minutes all is silent. The execution is over.*

*[...] 'Often a grave digger is too weak to carry two bodies, as ordered, so he ties arms or legs together and runs to the burial ground, dragging them behind him.'*"

Of course, the post-war story was that the bodies were burned, not buried: these millions of buried Jewish bodies simply did not exist.

August 27, 1943, p. 7: "REPORT BARES FATE OF 8,300,000 JEWS

*[...] a 300-page survey made public yesterday by the [...] American Jewish Congress and the World Jewish Congress.*

*More than 3,000,000 Jews have been destroyed by planned starvation, forced labor, deportations, pogroms and methodical murders in German-run extermination centers in eastern Europe since the outbreak of the war in 1939, according to the report, while 1,800,000 Jews have been saved by migration into the interior of the Soviet Union and 180,000 have succeeded in emigrating to other countries.*

*[...] The survey [...] declares that 1,700,000 Jews have been victims of organized massacres and pogroms, [...] that 750,000 Jews perished as a result of starvation and its consequences, and that 350,000 died in the process of deportation.*

*[...] A table showing how the process of extermination has been carried out [...] follows:*

<i>Germany</i>	<i>110,000</i>	<i>Belgium</i>	<i>30,000</i>
<i>Poland</i>	<i>1,600,000</i>	<i>Holland</i>	<i>45,000</i>
<i>USSR</i>	<i>650,000</i>	<i>France</i>	<i>56,000</i>
<i>Lithuania</i>	<i>105,000</i>	<i>Czechoslovakia</i>	<i>64,500</i>
<i>Latvia</i>	<i>65,000</i>	<i>Danzig</i>	<i>250</i>
<i>Austria</i>	<i>19,500</i>	<i>Estonia</i>	<i>3,000</i>
<i>Romania</i>	<i>227,500</i>	<i>Norway</i>	<i>800</i>
<i>Yugoslavia</i>	<i>35,000</i>		
<i>Greece</i>	<i>18,500</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>3,030,050"</i>

August 27, 1943, p. 7: "DELIBERATE NAZI MURDER POLICY IS BARED BY ALLIED OFFICIAL BODY

*London, Aug. 26 (UP) – The Inter-Allied Information Committee [...] tonight accused Germany, Italy and their satellites of [...] a deliberate program of wholesale theft, murder, torture and savagery unparalleled in world history.*

*[...] Poland: Exhaustion, torture, illness and executions have created a life*

*expectancy of only nine months from the time an individual is thrown into a concentration camp. Conditions are particularly severe at the Oswiecim camp, where 58,000 persons are believed to have perished.*

*At least 1,000,000 Jews have been slaughtered, starved or beaten to death in Poland during the past three years. In Warsaw food rations permit only 23.4 per cent of the calories necessary to keep a human being alive.”*

This was one of the very few pre-1944 specific references to the Auschwitz concentration camp (although the stories of March 7 and April 27 were oblique references). The interesting thing about this reference to Auschwitz is that it is essentially correct, as shall be confirmed in the next chapter, although one cannot be confident of the accuracy of the 58,000 figure and “torture” and “executions” should not be included as causes of the high death rate. The important point is that this story implicitly rejects the post-war extermination claims which assert that thousands were killed at Auschwitz almost every day, starting at the latest in the summer of 1942 and continuing to the autumn of 1944.

October 8, 1943, p. 5: “*ALL-EUROPE PURGE OF JEWS REPORTED*

*Stockholm, Sweden, Oct. 7 – Well-informed circles here said today that a decree had been issued in Berlin ordering the removal of all Jews from Europe before the end of the war. The source said that the order was issued by Adolf Hitler himself.*

*[...] The power behind the Nazi persecution of Danish Jews is the so-called ‘Jew Dictator,’ Storm Trooper Eighman [sic...] who was born in Palestine of German emigrants and brought up there [and] is known for his sadistic hatred of Jews. He engineered all the extermination action against Jews in Germany and the occupied territories. [...]*”

This seems to be Eichmann’s debut in the propaganda and, probably, the source of the myth that he was raised in Palestine (he was born in Solingen, Germany, and raised in Linz, Austria).

November 23, 1943, p. 4: “*WIFE OF MIKOLAJCZYK HOSTAGE OF GERMANS*

*The 43-year-old wife of Premier Stanislaw Mikolajczyk of Poland is being held by the Germans as a hostage in the Oswiecim concentration camp and may be facing imminent execution, the Polish Telegraph Agency reported from London yesterday.*

*[...] Oswiecim is the most notorious German prison in Poland, where thousands of helpless victims have been tortured to death. [...]*

*The names of the Germans chiefly responsible for the massacre of Polish Jews were given in a Polish statement in London. [...]*

*‘There are ten of them, headed by Ludwig Fischer, the Nazi Governor of the Warsaw area. [...] A member of the Polish National Council said that most of the Jews in Poland had already been wiped out.’”*

November 29, 1943, p. 3: “*50,000 KIEV JEWS REPORTED KILLED*

*By W. H. Lawrence.*

*Kiev, Russia, Oct. 22 (Delayed) – Kiev authorities asserted today that the*

*Germans had machine-gunned from 50,000 to 80,000 of Kiev's Jewish men, women and children in late September, 1941 and, two years later – when Kiev's recapture by the Red Army seemed imminent – had forced Russian prisoners of war to burn all the bodies completely destroying all the evidence of the crime.*

*[...] On the basis of what we saw, it is impossible for this correspondent to judge the truth or falsity of the story told to us. [...]*

December 6, 1943, p. 10: “*CAPTIVE KILLINGS LAID TO GERMANS*

*London, Dec. 5 (UP) – Evidence that Russian prisoners of war were executed and cremated in German concentration camps has been offered to the emigre Czech Government by a Czech Army officer who spent several years in a German prison camp before he escaped to England.*

*[...] The officer's teeth had been kicked out when he was struck on the mouth, he was deaf in one ear from a blow on the head and on his body was the scar of a swastika that he said had been carved by Germans to whom he went for treatment of an infection.*

*Jews were chosen at random from those in the camp and shot, he said. [...]*”

This completes the survey of relevant *New York Times* stories for the period of spring 1942 through 1943. Selectivity on my part was, of course, necessary, but I believe that an adequate picture has been given of the sort of stories that were in circulation in supposedly intelligent circles.

What cannot be recaptured is the hysterical atmosphere of the time. The unusually critical reader will have noticed the rather high page number of many of the stories cited, especially those which report specific instances of mass killings. In practical politics only page one counts, and these things seldom appeared on page one. If Roosevelt said something, it was normally printed on page one, but only because he said it, not because he said anything interesting or significant. The allegations of exterminations of Jews do not appear to have had great importance to the public during the war, if one judges from the lack of any prominence given to such stories. Another way to express it is to say that if one spends some time examining the newspapers of the time, a high degree of hostility to the Nazis is obvious, but the specific basis of the hostility is virtually impossible to distinguish. Thus, there is something of an emotional nature missing from our survey, but this is unavoidable.

Two principal observations should be made in regard to the extermination propaganda. First, the legend has its origin among Zionists and, second, Auschwitz was not claimed as an extermination camp until very late in the war.

We have seen that the first extermination claims were not based on one scrap of intelligence data. Zionists, principally the World Jewish Congress, merely presented their nonsense to the Allied governments, in particular to the U.S. government, demanding endorsement of their nonsense. The first reactions in Washington were to scoff at the claims but, on account of various political pressures, and only on account of those pressures and not because corroborating information had

been procured from military intelligence, official Washington eventually cooperated with the extermination propaganda to the extent of having high officials make vague public declarations in support of it, and of having propaganda agencies make more specific declarations of an obscure nature. The early propaganda had features which are retained in the legend to this day, such as the six million figure, and also features which were quickly forgotten, such as the soap factories, although both features were authored by the same Zionist circles.

In regard to our terminology, it should be remarked that the word "Zionist" is not being employed here as a code word for "Jewish;" the evidence shows that, while the hoax is certainly a Jewish hoax, in the sense of having been invented by Jews, it is also a Zionist hoax, in the sense of having been invented by Jews who were Zionists, on behalf of Zionist ends. The Zionist character of the propaganda is quite clear; note that, as a rule, the persons who were pressing for measures to remove Jews from Europe (under the circumstances a routine and understandable proposal) coupled such proposals with demands that such Jews be resettled in Palestine, which shows that there was much more in the minds of the Zionist propagandists than mere assistance to refugees and victims of persecution.

We have also noted that Auschwitz was absent from the extermination propaganda in 1942 and 1943 although, if there had been exterminations at such a prominent site, military intelligence and others would certainly have learned of it. To be sure, Auschwitz appeared in the propaganda, but the specific claims, bearing on a high death rate due to more or less normal causes, were in their essentials true, however amplified their content. There were no claims of gas chambers or exterminations. Naturally, I make the reservation that this statement is based on the fact that, after a reasonably thorough study, I have not noted Auschwitz in the 1942-1943 extermination propaganda; Treblinka, Belzec, and Chelmno appeared in the newspaper extermination stories, but not Auschwitz.

This view is confirmed by the periodicals and books of the period that I have examined. Three periodical publications are of particular interest. The issue of *Commonweal* for June 4, 1943, carried an article by Jacques Maritain, which summarized what he, evidently after some investigation, believed to be the chief features of the extermination program. Auschwitz is not mentioned, although exterminations via "poison gases, electrocution, mass piling into enclosed spaces where asphyxia takes place by degrees, suffocation [...] in sealed freight cars" are mentioned, and particular reference is made to Chelmno.

The *New Republic* for August 30, 1943, was a special issue devoted to the plight of the Jews in Europe and made no reference to Auschwitz. A two page advertisement, placed by the Jewish Labor Committee (New York), mentions only Treblinka, Belzec, and "hermetically sealed cars where Jews are being poisoned."

*Survey Graphic* for April 1943 carries a two page article by William L. Shirer. The subject is the whole range of alleged German atrocities and thus Auschwitz (Oświęcim) is mentioned, but only in connection with an alleged high death rate of 250 Poles per day, due to "executions, inhuman treatment, hunger, and epidemics." Shirer claims exterminations of Jews at Belzec.

The Shirer story cites a March 7 report from the Polish government in London as the source for the statements about Auschwitz. This is the earliest reference that I know of to Auschwitz in the propaganda. The only candidate for an earlier claim that I know of appears in *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*, J. Apenszlak, ed., 1943. Pages 56 and 59 tell of reports in the “*East London Observer*” in early 1942 that the ashes of Jews who had been sent to Auschwitz were being returned to their relatives (contradicting post-war propaganda). However, as far as I have been able to determine, the *East London Observer* did not exist. *The Black Book* does not claim exterminations at Auschwitz but speaks of exterminations via gasmobile at Chelmno (pages 115-117, in agreement with later claims); via electrocution in baths at Belzec followed by burial (page 131, not in agreement); through being left in freight cars for days near Belzec followed by burning (pages 137-138, not in agreement); via steam baths at Treblinka followed by burial (page 143, not in agreement; the Diesel engine whose exhaust gases were used for killing in later versions of the story is used for digging the graves in *The Black Book*).

There remains one source which conveys the impression that Auschwitz appeared in the extermination propaganda early in 1943 or even earlier. This is the book *The Devil's Chemists* by Josiah DuBois, whom we have encountered as a wartime Treasury official. At the NMT after the war, DuBois was the chief prosecutor in the Farben trial, and his book is his account of the trial and such other matters that he considered relevant. According to him, a message dealing with Auschwitz crossed his desk in November 1942. The message transmitted the contents of a note, a “crumpled testament of despair,” which had allegedly been written by a worker-inmate at Auschwitz and then passed along underground in hand-to-hand relay to Bern:

*“We worked in the huge ‘Buna’ plant. [...] There was a chain of sentry posts overlooking every 10 square meters of workers, and whoever stepped outside was shot without warning as ‘having attempted to escape.’ But attempts were made every day, even by some who tried to crawl past the sentries because they could no longer walk.”*

The note also applied to Farben’s Ter Meer “stereotyped images of swastika and riding crop and fixed sneer.” (which had not characterized Ter Meer at any time during his life). The claimed origin and history of the note make the whole thing appear rather silly, but one should note the strong element of fact in the note: at approximately this time, many workers at Auschwitz were indeed not in a condition to work or even walk. Thus, this message was not really extermination propaganda, and we cannot be certain that it really existed, but if it did, all it suggests is that the propagandists were well aware, in late 1942, of what was happening at Auschwitz.

DuBois then proceeds to misinform his reader that the two messages of January and April 1943 from Harrison to the State Department, discussed above, dealt with Auschwitz, *i.e.* it was at Auschwitz that 6,000 were allegedly being killed every day. In reporting this, DuBois is simply passing along misinformation. His motive seems to be that, as the prosecutor in the Farben case, he was attempting to



maximize the significance of Auschwitz in every respect possible, and has thus read in the record something that simply is not there.<sup>154</sup>

## German Reactions

It is of passing interest to comment on what the Germans were saying about the Allied propaganda stories. We have seen that von Stumm of the press section of the German Foreign Office ridiculed the extermination claim when it was first made by the Allied governments, but that was a rare reference on the part of the German government to any specific Allied propaganda concoction. The weekly newspaper *Das Reich*, published by the Goebbels Ministry, and the *Völkischer Beobachter*, the daily newspaper of the Nazi Party, had much comment of a general sort on the “*Greuelpropaganda*,” but there were few references to specific propaganda claims. The usual situation was one of no commentary on the Jewish extermination claim as well as on other specific propaganda claims, *e.g.* starvation and torturing of American and British POWs and the various gruesome inventions of Hollywood, such as the draining of the blood of children in occupied countries for the use of the Wehrmacht.

The reason for this relative silence on specific propaganda claims was no doubt that there was no need, from the German point of view, to review its content. They had seen it all before, during World War I. Thus, the German press treatment of the “*Greuelpropaganda*” was on a higher level, and rather than concern itself with the specific contents of the stories, it concerned itself with such questions as the nature of the political interests that were served by the propaganda and the extent and means of Jewish influence in the Allied press (*e.g.* *Das Reich* for December 20, 1942).

## The War Refugee Board Report: Birth of the Auschwitz Legend

The high level Washington commitment to the claim that Auschwitz was an extermination camp came in November 1944, after the claimed termination of the killing program, in the form of the WRB report (the claim had appeared many times in the propaganda earlier in 1944; those stories are reviewed in Chapter 5). The issuing of the report was carried by the *New York Times* on November 26, 1944, (page 1) and some excerpts were given.

The WRB report is described as two reports, one written by “two young Slovakian Jews” and the other by “a Polish major,” all of whom had been inmates at Auschwitz from the spring of 1942 until the spring of 1944, when they escaped

---

<sup>154</sup> DuBois, 137-138, 186-188.

(the two Jews on April 7).

There is an additional short supplement said to be written by two other young Jews who escaped on May 27, 1944, and made their way to Slovakia (under German domination until 1945) to make their report, which is said to have been received in Switzerland on August 6, 1944. The authors are completely anonymous, and this anonymity is duly apologized for “whose names will not be disclosed for the time being in the interest of their own safety.”

Sections 1, 2, and 3 constitute the first part of the report and section 4 the second part. The first section is the major part of the report. It is said to have been written by a Slovakian Jew who arrived at Auschwitz on April 13, 1942, and was given a registration number (tattooed onto his left breast) in the neighborhood of 29,000. He eventually became registrar in the Birkenau infirmary. The feature of this first section is a detailed record, for the period April 1942 to April 1944, of the transports which arrived at Auschwitz, together with the registration numbers assigned. About 55 groups of transports (sometimes more than one transport are in a group) are reported, and the (admittedly approximate) registration numbers assigned to the people in each group are given. The numbers start at 27,400 and run to 189,000 in the consecutive numbering system in which a number was not used twice. For each group the nationalities represented as well as other information is given (Jewish or Aryan, political prisoners or other, occasional names of individuals, numbers “gassed” instead of registered, etc.). The WRB report, if it is approximately correct in these matters (interpreting the people “gassed” as either never having existed or having been sent on to another destination), is one of the few known sources of significant amounts of such information (another is the referenced set of Netherlands Red Cross reports, which is the subject of Appendix C).

Almost all of this information is given by the author of the first section of the WRB report, but after he escaped, the authors of the third, supplemental section of the report kept an account of this information for the period April 7 – May 27 and have contributed it to the report.

The second section of the report is said to be written by a Slovakian Jew who arrived at the Lublin camp around June 4, 1942, but was sent to Auschwitz around June 30, 1942. According to the first section of the report, he then would have received a registration number around 44,000, which was tattooed onto his left forearm (the tattooing system had changed). The two authors of the first two sections of the report are the two young Slovakian Jews who escaped together on April 7, 1944. The third section of the report is the short supplement and the fourth section is the contribution of the “Polish major.”

The anonymity of the authors of the report is certainly a vulnerable feature, but the major implausibility is simply the contents of the WRB report. Examination shows that the information given in the report, which is most likely true to semi-true, is the sort of thing that could have been built up from intelligence data, not from reports of “two young Slovakian Jews and a Polish major” who “escaped.” This is exactly as one should expect; Germany’s enemies had certain means of gathering information about German camps and about events in Europe and sim-

ply used information gathered by such conventional methods, plus a considerable amount of invention, to compose the WRB report. It is just not believable that intelligence agencies were in such a primitive position with respect to, of all things, the industrial center Auschwitz that they were obliged to depend for information on miraculous escapes by unusually well informed prisoners. This point will be amplified below. Of course, such an observation does not rule out the possible use of reports of former employees or inmates, escaped or otherwise, as part of the data.

The report presents the following information (or estimates, or guesses, or claims, or inventions):

1. The number of prisoners at Auschwitz I in the month of April 1942, the predominant nationalities present, and the main causes of internment. Description of the inmate registration number system and the "star system" of inmate insignia. A list of various factories in the area (pt. I, 1-2).
2. An accurate map of the area, comparable to our Fig. 5 (pt. I, 4).
3. Dimensions related to the Auschwitz I camp size, its fences and its guard towers. Ditto for Birkenau. Description of barracks (pt. I, 5-7).
4. In the case of a natural death of a prisoner, a death certificate was made out and sent to Oranienburg central camp administration. If the inmate was gassed, his name was entered in a special register and marked "S.B." (*Sonderbehandlung*, special treatment) (pt. I, 9).
5. Four buildings, referred to as Crematories I, II, III, and IV, were in use in spring 1944 at Birkenau; use of at least one of them had started in February 1943. Each building contained: (A) a furnace room of ovens; (B) a large hall; (C) a gas chamber. The first two buildings each contained 36 muffles and the other two 18 each. Three bodies are put in one muffle at a time and the burning took an hour and a half. Thus, one could dispose of 6,000 bodies per day. This was considered, at the time, an improvement over burning in trenches (the method previously employed) (pt. I, 14-15).
6. The specific product used for generating the gas for the gas chamber was a powder called "Cyklon," manufactured by a Hamburg concern. When exposed, it released cyanide gas, and about three minutes were required to kill everybody in the gas chamber. The containers for the Cyklon were marked "for use against vermin" (pt. I, 16).
7. Prominent people from Berlin attended the inauguration of the first crematory in March 1943. The "program" consisted in the gassing and burning of 8,000 Cracow Jews. The guests (no names given) were extremely satisfied with the results (pt. I, 16).
8. A detailed breakdown of the numbers and classifications of the inmates at Birkenau in April 1944 (pt. I, 23-24).
9. In the camp, each block has a "block eldest" who "has power of life and death." Until February 1944, nearly 50 per cent of the block eldests were Jews, but this was stopped by order of Berlin. Under the block eldest is the block recorder, who does all the clerical work. If the recorder has noted down a death by mistake, as often occurs, the discrepancy is cor-

- rected by killing the bearer of the corresponding number. Corrections are not admitted (pt. I, 25).
10. A passage strikingly similar to the November 1942 “crumpled testament of despair”:  
*“We worked in the huge buna plant to which we were herded every morning about 3 AM. [...] As our working place was situated outside the large chain of sentry posts, it was divided into small sectors of 10 x 10 meters, each guarded by an SS man. Whoever stepped outside these squares during working hours was immediately shot without warning for having ‘attempted to escape.’ [...] Very few could bear the strain and although escape seemed hopeless, attempts were made every day.”* (pt. I, 30).
  11. A “careful estimate of the numbers of Jews gassed in Birkenau between April 1942 and April 1944,” summarized in a tabular form. The numbers showed up in the published record of the IMT trial and are presented here as Fig. 25 (pt. I, 33).
  12. Great excitement prevailed as a consequence of the escape of the two young Slovakian Jews (this is supposedly written by the authors of the supplementary section 3), and the friends and superiors of the two escapees were closely questioned. Because the two had held posts as “block recorders,” all Jews exercising such functions were removed for punishment and as a precautionary measure. This, of course, contradicts the implication of the “Foreword” of the WRB report that the Germans did not know the identity or even registration numbers of the two escapees, because it withholds such information “in the interest of their own safety.” (pt. I, 34).
  13. Starting May 15, 1944, Hungarian Jews started arriving at Birkenau at the rate of about 15,000 per day. Ninety per cent were killed immediately and, because this exceeded the capacity of the ovens, the method of burning in trenches, which had existed earlier, was reverted to. The ten percent who were not killed were also not registered at Birkenau but sent eventually to camps in Germany: Buchenwald, Mauthausen, Gross-Rosen, Gusen, Flossenbürg, Sachsenhausen, etc. (pt. I, 36-37).
  14. A new inmate registration number system was also put into effect in the middle of May 1944. At about the same time, a visit by Himmler to nearby Cracow was reported in the Silesian newspapers. These newspaper reports apparently omitted to mention, however, that on this trip Himmler had also visited Birkenau, and that his party made a special visit to Crematory I (pt. I, 37-38).
  15. In the late summer of 1943, a commission of four distinguished Dutch Jews had visited Auschwitz for the purpose of inspecting the condition of the Dutch Jews (who were then specially prepared by the Germans with new clothes, better food, etc.). The commission saw only a part of the Dutch Jews sent to Auschwitz but were told that the others were in similar camps. The commission was satisfied with this and signed a declaration

- that everything had been found in good order at Auschwitz, but after signing, the four Jews “expressed a desire to see the camp of Birkenau and particularly the crematoria about which they had heard some stories. [...] The commission was then taken to Birkenau [...] and immediately to Crematorium No. 1. Here they were shot from behind. A telegram was supposedly sent to Holland reporting that after leaving Auschwitz the four men had been victims of an unfortunate automobile accident.” (pt. I, 38).
16. The area around Auschwitz, within a radius of 100 kilometers, had been evacuated, and the buildings not to be taken over by the camp were to be demolished (pt. II, 6).
  17. Description of the Auschwitz I hospital and its procedures. In the autumn of 1942, the hospital mortality rate was so high that Berlin requested an explanation. An investigation uncovered that the “camp doctor” had been administering lethal injections to weak and sick people, certain prisoners condemned to death, and some teenagers considered to be orphans. For “punishment,” the camp doctor was simply sent to the same job at the Buna plant (probably meaning Monowitz; the SS continued to provide some services to the camp administered by Farben) (pt. II, 8-10).
  18. As a result of bad treatment, a Jew could not last more than two weeks, irrespective of his physical condition (pt. II, 12).
  19. In the summer of 1942, Jews were being gassed in the birch forest (*Birkenwald*, where Birkenau was located) in special sealed buildings giving the impression of showers. Because the crematories were not completed, the bodies were buried in mass graves, causing putrefaction. In the autumn of 1942, the four crematories were completed, and many bodies were exhumed and burned (this is the Polish major’s account, contradicting that of the two young Slovakian Jews, who said that part of the new crematories were put into operation in February 1943 and that prior to that date bodies were burned in trenches) (pt. II, 16-17).
  20. Details on how it was decided exactly when to execute somebody already condemned to death (pt. II, 16-17).

The foregoing is effectively illustrative of the contents of the WRB report. It is a mixture of truth, guess-work, and invention, the factual part of which could have been, and obviously was, put together on the basis of inside information available in 1944.

The contradiction in the two accounts of exterminations serves to enhance the credibility of the claim that these are unsolicited reports of escaped inmates, but it is not clear that such increased credibility was the motivation for composing the report thus. The first version, that large crematories were in operation at Birkenau in early 1943 and that mass cremations took place in trenches before that date, is the one subsequently put forward (and the correct one in regard to the date of availability of the crematories) but the second version of mass graves might have some truth in it also, because there had been a typhus epidemic in the summer, at a time when inadequate crematory facilities existed.

Reitlinger uses the WRB report as a source. This is not entirely justified, but it

is not entirely without justification either. One must assume that much of the material in the report is true. As will be elaborated below, there is no question of the competence of the authors of the report. However, one must be careful in this regard, obviously, and accept only that, which seems corroborated by either common sense or independent evidence. Given the protagonistic and propagandistic role of the report, but recalling that a well organized hoax necessarily contains much valid fact, this is perfectly reasonable.

One can be rather specific about the routes, by which information flowed out of the camps. In cases where there was significant industrial activity, the inmates inevitably came into contact with many people who were not camp inmates (company employees, railroad employees, etc.), and these contacts were the basis for an extensive system of clandestine channels of communication. Auschwitz, of course, furnished numerous and excellent opportunities for such contacts, and on account of the communist organization, there were very effective channels to outside underground centers, especially in nearby Cracow. Information about the camp, including, it is claimed, copies of orders received from Berlin or Oranienburg, flowed constantly out of Auschwitz. These channels were also used to send such things as money, medicine and forged papers into the camp. In addition, as discussed in another connection on page 143, the Communists in all of the camps were highly organized for illegal radio listening. If they had receivers, they no doubt also had transmitters. There has been witness testimony to possession of radio transmitters by camp inmates, and Reitlinger believes that Auschwitz inmates had transmitters.<sup>155</sup>

In order to grasp completely the nature of the information and propaganda channels that existed, one should take special note of the War Refugee Board and the OSS. The WRB maintained constant contact with events in Hungary even after the German occupation in March 1944. For example, it had its agent, Raoul Wallenberg, in the Swedish diplomatic corps, and there were other links through Jewish organizations. Jewish leaders in Budapest were in constant contact with those in Slovakia, and the Slovakian Jewish leadership was in contact with Polish Jewry, particularly in Cracow.<sup>156</sup>

Possibly more important than the WRB, although its role in the hoax is not nearly as obvious, was the Office of Strategic Services, OSS, the predecessor of the CIA. The OSS was set up early in World War II under the leadership of General William Donovan. Its mission was intelligence of a political nature and related matters (e.g. sabotage, propaganda, guerilla warfare) as distinct from the more conventional forms of military intelligence, to which its operations were related somewhat as the operations of the German SD were related to those of the *Abwehr*, although high-placed Washington observers complained that the OSS seemed to enjoy unlimited funds and knew no bounds on its authority.

With only a few exceptions, the OSS was not staffed by military people but by

<sup>155</sup> NMT, vol. 5, 820; Reitlinger, 466; Borwicz, 66-76.

<sup>156</sup> US-WRB (1945), 24-33. For contacts of Slovakian Jews with Poland, especially Cracow, and with Budapest, see Neumann's book and also the testimony of Freudiger: Eichmann, session 51, Ww1-Eee1; session 52, A1-Bb1. Wallenberg discussed in Poliakov and Wulf (1955), 416-420.

persons recruited from private life. Thus, it included many political types, ranging from Communists to émigré monarchists. On account of their organization, the Communists were naturally a significant force in the OSS, irrespective of their numbers.

The OSS was deeply involved with propaganda. The OWI (Office of War Information), the most prominent U.S. wartime propaganda agency, had been the propaganda division of the "Office of the Coordinator of Information" (Donovan) when it split off from the OSS in 1942, and the remainder of Donovan's organization was renamed the OSS. Despite this separation, the OSS remained active in the propaganda field, and when the Anglo-American PWB (Psychological Warfare Branch) was set up in Eisenhower's headquarters, it drew its American personnel from both the OWI and the OSS.

Another propaganda operation of the OSS, one which employed a large number of "progressive writers," was the MO (Morale Operations) Branch. The mission of MO was "black propaganda," *i.e.* MO specialized in manufacturing propaganda presented in such a way that it would appear to have come from within the ranks of the enemy. MO thus distributed forged newspapers and military orders among enemy personnel, operated clandestine transmitters that purported to be broadcasting from within enemy territory, and started rumors in the Axis and Axis occupied countries. Its staff included "liberals and communists alike, all dedicated to the idealist interpretation of the fight against fascism."

A particularly relevant facet of the OSS operations was that they had enlisted the cooperation of the Jewish Agency in Palestine (which was really the unofficial Israeli government of the time). The Jewish Agency, on account of extensive and elaborate contacts with Jews in Europe, especially in the Balkans, was able to undertake many important missions for the OSS. Thus, the channels to Jews in Hungary, Slovakia, and beyond were open.

Finally, it is of interest that the OSS was very significant on the prosecution staff at the IMT trial, especially in the early stages.<sup>157</sup>

The point to be made in this discussion of the WRB report is certainly not that it was invented in the OSS or the WRB. I do not know the identity of the authors and do not believe that the question is of great significance. The main point is that two "internationals," the Communist and the Zionist, played important roles in the intelligence, propaganda, and refugee assistance programs of the U.S. The WRB, effectively taking its orders from Harry Dexter White, Henry Morgenthau Jr., the World Jewish Congress, and other Zionists, and the OSS, with its staff of Communists and its Jewish Agency allies, show that the situation was perfectly suitable for the manufacture of a Jewish extermination propaganda lie, built about Auschwitz, which, as a precaution, contained enough real facts to suggest to the unreflective that the allegations were true.

The interior of the Auschwitz camp was not, by any exercise of the imagination, isolated from the Allies. The world's most efficient intelligence organization, the Communist Party, could transmit any information desired to any destination

---

<sup>157</sup> R. H. Smith, 2, 12, 23, 62, 125, 239; Kimche & Kimche, 108.

whatever, and the situation was such that the ubiquitous Zionist International was in a position to manufacture and transmit whatever items seemed appropriate for the occasion. Even if the contents of the WRB report were entirely true, an escape by inmates would not have been at all necessary to get the “facts” into the hands of the Allies. Note that we are told that the *entire* contents of the WRB report are due to *three independent* escapes by remarkably informed inmates. In view of what we know about the channels of communication that existed, this is silly in the extreme.

The authors of the WRB report remained anonymous for quite a bit more than “the time being.” The report became a prosecution document at Nuremberg under the number 022-L. The descriptive material accompanying the document, dated August 7, 1945 (the “staff evidence analysis”), seems distressed at the anonymity of the authors. It tells of a certain Dr. Joseph Elias, “Protestant Pastor of Jewish ancestry, organizer of Jewish resistance in Hungary, head of Jo’Pasztor Bizottsag, who interrogated the first two Slovak Jews after their escape.” Then it tells of “Dr. G. Soos – Secretary of Hungarian underground movement MFM, who brought the first report (of the first two Slovak Jews) to Italy.” The organization “Jo’Pasztor” was real, but of the activities of Elias or Soos in connection with these matters nothing, it seems, is known. Of the origins of the parts of the report attributed to the other three people we are told nothing. It is said that R. D. McClelland, Bern representative of the WRB, forwarded the report to Washington in early July 1944 (the supplemental part was presumably not included).

The WRB report was put into evidence at the IMT as document 022-L by Major Walsh on December 14, 1945.<sup>158</sup> There was no defense objection, at the IMT, to the acceptance of the report into evidence. At the Farben trial, the prosecution submitted the report (Document Book 89) as evidence, but the defense objected, and this objection “as to the competence and materiality of each and every document in the book” was sustained by that court. The result of the ensuing legal argument was that the court agreed to taking a certain very ambiguous “judicial notice” of the documents.<sup>159</sup>

Anonymity was maintained for several more years, because the first edition (1953) of Reitlinger’s *The Final Solution* considers the authors anonymous. In considering the beginnings of the gassings, reference is made to “the very reliable report of the Birkenau infirmary registrar or *Blockschreiber*, who escaped to Hungary in April 1944” (page 110). In connection with information about Theresienstadt Jews transported to Auschwitz, “we are indebted to a Slovak Jewish doctor, who escaped to Hungary in April 1944. This man, who was in charge of the Birkenau infirmary records [...]” (pages 169-170). In discussing the WRB report, Reitlinger told us that “the most important document is that of the anonymous Slovak Jewish doctor who escaped to Hungary in April 1944” (page 540). In all three cases Reitlinger was referring to the author of the first section of the WRB report, who, the report says, was the Slovakian Jew who arrived on April 13, 1942, and was given a registration number around 29,000. Reitlinger refers to him

<sup>158</sup> IMT, vol. 3, 568.

<sup>159</sup> DuBois, 173-175.



as a doctor, but the report actually does not make it clear what he was; it appears that he was supposed to be an “intellectual” or a “clerk.”

The next development seems to have been the publication in 1956 in Israel of the book *Im Schatten des Todes*, by J. Oskar Neumann. Neumann had been one of the leaders of the various Jewish councils and resistance organizations in Slovakia. In his account, Rabbi Michael Dov Ber Weissmandel (or Weissmandl), originally a Hungarian Jew resident in a part of Hungary that was annexed by Czechoslovakia after World War I, was the leader of Jewish resistance in Slovakia. In Neumann’s story the two young Slovakian Jews appear on schedule in Slovakia, as does the Polish major (actually, the WRB report does not say where the Polish major escaped to). Neumann gives the impression that he actually met these people: “Yet here sit eye-witnesses, who have told the whole truth.” His account does not mention the two authors of the third, supplementary, section of the WRB report, and he does not tell us the names or tattooed registration numbers of the escapees. Since they were in great danger of being found by the Gestapo, which was looking for them, they “were sent to an outlying mountainous area to rest.” Rabbi Weissmandel communicated the report to Budapest, Switzerland, and other destinations, in order to warn other Jews and to bring help.<sup>160</sup>

Weissmandel emigrated to the United States after the war and set up an orthodox Talmudic seminary in New York State. He died in November 1957. However, his war memoirs were published posthumously in 1960, unfortunately in Hebrew, which I am not able to read. The WRB report is a major subject of his book. I have assumed that his story is essentially similar to Neumann’s, because the two authors were similarly situated and had the same connections. However, I could be wrong.<sup>161</sup>

## Rudolf Vrba

It appears that the next event involved Reitlinger. The anonymity of the authors of the WRB report is a striking and disturbing feature of the first edition of Reitlinger’s book, as I am sure he realized. This no doubt bothered him, for it appears that he set out to locate the authors of the report, for he writes in his second edition, published in 1968, that Rudolf Vrba, the author of the “most important” part of the WRB report, *i.e.*, the first section, was “in hospital practice in Cardiff in 1960.” Reitlinger’s contact with Vrba in 1960, thus, would appear to be the first appearance of an alleged author of the report in any sort of historical record. Vrba was apparently produced as a consequence of Reitlinger’s investigations. The town of Cardiff in south Wales is incidentally only about 150 miles from Reitlinger’s home in Sussex. Reitlinger does not mention the name of any of the other authors. He considers a stencil book by Silberschein, Riegner’s World Jewish Congress colleague in Switzerland, as including the “complete version” of the re-

---

<sup>160</sup> Neumann, 178-183.

<sup>161</sup> *New York Times* (Nov. 30, 1957), 21; *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 16, 418-419.

port.<sup>162</sup>

Both authors of the first two sections of the WRB report (the first two young Slovakian Jews) acquired identities at Eichmann's trial in 1961. Two witnesses testified regarding the report, and it was offered in evidence with the explanation that the first two young Slovakian Jews were Alfred Wetzler (or Wezler) and Rudolf Vrba (ex Rosenberg or Rosenthal, then resident in England). The document was rejected on the grounds that certain contradictions in the figures offered required further explanation. Therefore, late in the trial, the prosecution produced an affidavit by Vrba. The affidavit explains how Vrba arrived at the impressively detailed figures regarding the transports to Auschwitz, which are the main feature of the WRB report. His affidavit gives the impression that, while he got assistance from various people, he was solely responsible for drawing up the figures, and he does not give the name of or even mention his companion who supposedly escaped with him in April 1944. He mentions a Philip Müller, who helped him somewhat with his figures, because Müller "is apparently the only survivor alive at present." Vrba's affidavit was rejected by the court on the grounds that there was no excuse for the prosecution not bringing him to Jerusalem to testify.<sup>163</sup>

Vrba appeared again at the Auschwitz trial in Frankfurt in 1964; his book *I Cannot Forgive* (with Alan Bestic), also appeared in 1964, shortly before his Frankfurt appearance. Vrba's companion in his supposed escape appeared, too; Alfred Wetzler was said to have been the other young Slovakian Jew. Wetzler was (in 1964) a 46-year-old civil servant in Czechoslovakia, who had arrived at Auschwitz on April 13, 1942, and been given registration number 29,162. He had been a block registrar at Birkenau. Vrba was identified as a 40-year-old biochemist living in England, who had arrived at Auschwitz on June 30, 1942, and been given registration number 44,070. He had also been a block registrar at Birkenau. They had, they said, escaped on April 7, 1944, and made their way to Bratislava, Czechoslovakia, where they made their report to the Jewish elders and also to the Papal Nuncio. The report was smuggled to Budapest by Rabbi Weissmandel.<sup>164</sup>

The 1964 story differs, therefore, from that which was told to the authors of the IMT staff evidence analysis in 1945. The most serious apparent contradiction, however, is in the credit for the reporting of the figures related to the transports to Auschwitz. Vrba, in his 1961 affidavit (which did not mention Wetzler) and also in his Frankfurt testimony, presented himself as being primarily responsible for the figures. The WRB report, on the other hand, while it attributes the figures to both men, present the figures in the first section of the report, whose author is supposed to be Wetzler.

Vrba does not explain, in his 1964 book, why he waited 16 years to talk about his escape from Auschwitz and his delivery of the statistics that were eventually published by Washington. His book follows roughly the story of the WRB report with a few contradictions of varying degrees of importance. For example, in the

<sup>162</sup> Reitlinger, 115n, 182, 590-591.

<sup>163</sup> Eichmann, session 52, M1, N1, W1-Aal; session 71, Ff1; session 72, I1-M1; session 109, J1-L1, R1, S1. The affidavit is reproduced by Vrba & Bestic, 273-276.

<sup>164</sup> Naumann, 290-291; Langbein, vol. 1, 122-125; vol. 2, 968, 971.

book (page 128) Vrba writes that the girls working in the “Canada” area were in very good health, but in the WRB report (part I, page 31) these women were “beaten and brutalized and their mortality was much higher than among the men.” Other oddities in his book are his claim to have helped build the crematories (page 16, not mentioned in the WRB report) and his description of an Allied air raid on April 9, 1944, of which there is no record (page 233; he says that he and Wetzler hid in a woodpile for three days at Auschwitz after their April 7 escape. The possibility of an Allied air raid in April is discussed below on page 188). Wetzler just barely manages to get mentioned in Vrba’s book. Vrba says nothing about the Polish major or the two Jews who supposedly escaped later on to supplement the Auschwitz transport figures. In the book the other prisoners refer to him as “Rudi,” although his original name, and the name by which he was supposedly known at Auschwitz, is supposed to have been Walter Rosenberg (a point Vrba’s book does not bring up but is claimed elsewhere, e.g. in *They Fought Back*, edited by Yuri Suhl, and in *Fighting Auschwitz* by Jozef Garlinski). Vrba says nothing about resting in a mountain retreat after escaping.

Just as conclusive, in our evaluation of Vrba’s story, as the various contradictions of either the WRB report or known fact, is the general tone of the book and his description of how various people behaved at the camp. Although the book presents utterly incredible material in this connection from beginning to end, the best example is Vrba’s description of an alleged visit by Himmler on July 17, 1942 (pages 9-15, not mentioned in the WRB report). The prisoners were drawn up for inspection, and the orchestra was in readiness to play when Himmler arrived. As they waited, the leader of the orchestra:

*“[...] stood, baton raised, motionless, poised to weave music for the honored guest.*

*And then it happened. The catastrophe that every actor dreads. The moment of horror that only great occasions merit. The crisis that seems to dog every moment of truth.*

*In the tenth row outside our Block, the Block senior found Yankel Meisel without his full quota of tunic buttons.*

*It took some seconds for the enormity of the crime to sink in. Then he felled him with a blow. [...]*

*Out of sight, [...] they beat and kicked the life out of him. [...]*

*[...] Himmler’s suite was twenty yards away. The baton moved [...] and the orchestra followed [...] with an excerpt from Aida.*

*It was ‘The Triumph March.’ [...]*

*He lined us up and rapped: ‘I am the Reichsführer. Let’s see how you behave in front of me.’*

*Slowly he marched down the ranks, a little killer aping a big killer, glaring at each of us in turn. If he found dirty finger nails or wooden shoes not properly blacked, he howled abuse at the offender and thumped him with his heavy bamboo cane. He even inspected us, nursery fashion, behind the ears and then went prowling through the barracks, searching for blankets which had not been folded with precision.”*

Vrba mentions a second Himmler visit (pages 15-19; the visit seems to correspond to the March 1943 visit of dignitaries from Berlin) in January 1943 to witness the gassing of 3,000 Polish Jews. The event was scheduled for 9 AM, but Himmler took until 11 AM to finish breakfast, so the 3,000 Jews had to wait two hours in the gas chamber. Himmler finally witnessed the gassing in a cheerful and relaxed mood, chatting with the commandant and others, occasionally throwing a glance through the peep-hole to observe the Jews being gassed.

The book manages to maintain this utterly incredible tone throughout, as you can verify by reading it, if you can stand it.

Reitlinger does not cite Vrba's book in any connection in the second edition of his book. He still writes of Vrba as the author of the "most important" part of the WRB report, the first section, although the data offered shows that this role should be attributed to Wetzler. It does not appear important or relevant to Reitlinger that Vrba was only 18-years-old when, as he claims, he started collecting the numerical and other data concerning the transports to Auschwitz with the intention of making this information available to the outside world.

There has been no claimed break, so far as I know, in the anonymity of the Polish major. In an article in Suhl's book, Erich Kulka of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem offers names for the two authors of the supplementary section (Czeslaw Mordowicz who changed his name to Petr Podulka and Arnost Rosin who changed his name to Jan Rohác), but I know nothing of these people other than that they remained quiet about their heroic exploits for an even greater number of years than Vrba and Wetzler did. Moreover, neither Elias, nor Soos, nor Vrba (as Vrba or as Rosenberg), nor Weissmandel appeared as witnesses in any of the Nuremberg trials, despite the sometimes contested role played by Document 011-L at those trials.

The records of the International Tracing Service in Arolsen, West Germany, report that two Jews named Wetzler and Rosenberg did escape on April 7, 1944, and this agrees with the *Kalendarium* published by the Polish government in 1964 as number 7 of *Hefte von Auschwitz*, which also declares that two Jews named Mordowicz and Rosin escaped on May 27, 1944. Because there were many successful escapes from Auschwitz during this period (many, many more than Vrba seems to think there were – compare page 217 of Vrba with Garlinski's remarks about escapes), this data may well be correct, but it still does not authenticate the authorship of the WRB report, especially because we are told today that after escaping the four Jews adopted aliases for concealment purposes and that three of the four retained these different names after the war rather than reassume their real names.

The details behind the manufacture of the WRB report will probably never be completely uncovered, but it is entirely possible that its creators went to great lengths in simulating a report miraculously smuggled to Slovakia and then to Switzerland. If it was written in Slovakia, then it seems clear that Rabbi Weissmandel should be credited with at least co-authorship. It is also possible that, as claimed, the report was given to the Papal Charge d'affaires in Slovakia, Giuseppe Burzio, and that it was forwarded by him to Rome. It is clear that Burzio was

contacted by Jewish propagandists and that he forwarded at least some of their “information” to Rome. Examples that Burzio transmitted to the Vatican were March 22 claims that the Germans were taking young Jewish women from their families to make them prostitutes for German soldiers on the eastern front (a complete fantasy) and an early 1943 letter from a Bratislava priest claiming that both Jewish and responsible German sources had told him of soap factories supplied with the bodies of gassed and machine-gunned Jews. Whether Burzio forwarded such material purely as routine procedure or because he gave credence to it is hardly relevant, although the latter appears to be the case. The Vatican received and filed many such reports during the war, but never gave any credence to them. Its present position is that, during the war, neither it nor the “Jewish agencies were aware that the deportations were part of a general mass annihilation operation” (see also Appendix E).<sup>165</sup>

In any case it is obvious that the WRB report is spurious. The data given in the report is not the sort of information that escapees would carry out; the claim that two more Jews escaped later on to supplement this data is more than doubly ridiculous. Instead of coming forward immediately after the war with ostensible authors of the report in order to lend more support to the lie, it appears that it was assumed that the whole thing was irrelevant until, for some reason (probably Reitlinger’s curiosity), an author was produced sixteen years after the event. That person’s story is not credible.

Thus was born the Auschwitz legend.

---

<sup>165</sup> *New York Times* (Apr. 27, 1974), 7. *Actes et documents*, vol. 8, 476, 486-489; vol. 9, 40, 178n.

# Chapter 4: Auschwitz

## Structure of the Legend

We now consider the specific Auschwitz “extermination” story that we are offered.

The trials that generated the evidence on which the extermination claims are based took place in a prostrate, starving Germany whose people were in no position to do anything but that which the occupying powers wished. This was the political reality of the situation. By the record, the “Zionist International” organized the specific extermination claims that were made, which were given no credence by high and knowledgeable Washington officials. The leading personality in setting up the legal system of the war crimes trials was none other than the American prosecutor at the IMT trial. At that trial the judges had previously expressed themselves on the obvious guilt of the defendants, and the findings of the trial were formal legal constraints on subsequent trials. The most important of the subsequent trials were those organized by the arch-Zionist David Marcus, future hero of Israel, and then head of the U.S. War Crimes Branch, an agency that had engaged in torture of witnesses in connection with certain trials. The “honor” of the states conducting the trials was committed to the thesis of extraordinary Nazi brutality. Under such conditions it is difficult to see how one could fail to expect a frame-up; this and the following chapter shows that the Auschwitz charges are what one should expect.

It must first be asked: what is the essential attribute, the “trademark” of a hoax on this scale? No sane author of such a thing would present a story which is untrue in every or in most details; ninety nine percent valid fact can be present in a story whose major claim has no truth whatever to it and recognition of this leads the author of the hoax to the maximally safe approach to his deed: distort the meaning of valid facts.

This is the basic structure of the Auschwitz extermination legend. It is shown here that every real fact contained in the story had (not could have had, but had) a relatively routine significance, having nothing to do with exterminations of people. Thus, those who claim extermination must advance a thesis involving a dual interpretation of the facts, but by then the impartial reader, in consideration of what has just been noted, should be on my side; the need for a dual interpretation of fact, the trademark of the hoax, has emerged.

Another trademark, not so obvious at this point, will be suggested by the analysis.

Also, facts which contradict the extermination claims will be noted, and for

those who still believe the claims these facts are “mysteries.” The inconsistencies and implausibilities and obvious lies will appear and finally the crushing blow, a fact contradicting the claims, so huge in significance that there can be no mumbling about “mysteries.”

## The Höss ‘Confession’

The commandant of Auschwitz from May 1940 to late 1943 was SS Colonel Rudolf Höss. During the IMT trial he had signed some affidavits for the prosecution, the most noted being signed on April 5, 1946.<sup>166</sup> In accord with a common IMT and NMT practice, he was then called by the Kaltenbrunner defense on April 15, 1946.<sup>167</sup> The major content of his testimony was in his assenting, during cross-examination, to his affidavit of April 5, and also in certain points of supporting testimony.

Höss is universally considered the star prosecution witness and, despite the origins of the Auschwitz hoax in the WRB report, the extermination mythologists essentially treat the Höss affidavit as the Auschwitz extermination story or, more precisely, the framework for the story. All pleaders of the Auschwitz extermination legend present a story that is the Höss affidavit, with only numerical variations, as supplemented by the IMT, NMT, and similar evidence. None of the principal extermination mythologists gives prominence to the WRB report, and only Reitlinger seems to perceive a problem of some sort of importance in connection with it.

Thus, it is convenient to allow the Höss affidavit to act as framework for our analysis also. It is presented in full here, and then the individual points are reviewed with due regard for the supplemental and additional evidence. The fateful duality will emerge as an undeniable feature. The contradictions, inconsistencies, wild implausibilities, and lies will appear. The analysis will reveal something of the psychological context of the trials.

Due regard is also given to verifiable interpretation of sources, including instances where it is deemed better to reference Hilberg or Reitlinger rather than an original document, to which the reader is not likely to have convenient access.

*“I, RUDOLF FRANZ FERDINAND HÖSS, being first duly sworn, depose and say as follows:*

*1. I am forty-six-years-old, and have been a member of the NSDAP since 1922; a member of the SS since 1934; a member of the Waffen-SS since 1939. I was a member from 1 December 1934 of the SS Guard Unit, the so-called Deathshead Formation (Totenkopf Verband).*

*2. I have been constantly associated with the administration of concentration camps since 1934, serving at Dachau until 1938; then as adjutant in Sachsenhausen from 1938 to May 1, 1940, when I was appointed commandant*

---

<sup>166</sup> 3868-PS

<sup>167</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 396-422.

of Auschwitz. I commanded Auschwitz until December 1, 1943, and estimate that at least 2,500,000 victims were executed and exterminated there by gassing and burning, and at least another half million succumbed to starvation and disease, making a total dead of about 3,000,000. This figure represents about 70% or 80% of all persons sent to Auschwitz as prisoners, the remainder having been selected and used for slave labor in the concentration camp industries. Included among the executed and burnt were approximately 20,000 Russian prisoners of war (previously screened out of Prisoner of War cages by the Gestapo) who were delivered at Auschwitz in Wehrmacht transports operated by regular Wehrmacht officers and men. The remainder of the total number of victims included about 100,000 German Jews, and great numbers of citizens, mostly Jewish from Holland, France, Belgium, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Greece, or other countries. We executed about 400,000 Hungarian Jews alone in the summer of 1944.

3. WVHA [Main Economic and Administrative Office], headed by Obergruppenführer Oswald Pohl, was responsible for all administrative matters such as billeting, feeding and medical care, in the concentration camps. Prior to establishment of the RSHA, Secret State Police Office (Gestapo) and the Reich Office of Criminal Police were responsible for arrests, commitments to concentration camps, punishments and executions therein. After organization of the RSHA, all of these functions were carried out as before, but pursuant to orders signed by Heydrich as Chief of the RSHA. While Kaltenbrunner was Chief of RSHA, orders for protective custody, commitments, punishment, and individual executions were signed by Kaltenbrunner or by Müller, Chief of the Gestapo, as Kaltenbrunner's deputy.

4. Mass executions by gassing commenced during the summer 1941 and continued until fall 1944. I personally supervised executions at Auschwitz until the first of December 1943 and know by reason of my continued duties in the Inspectorate of Concentration Camps WVHA that these mass executions continued as stated above. All mass executions by gassing took place under the direct order, supervision and responsibility of RSHA. I received all orders for carrying out these mass executions directly from RSHA.

5. On 1 December 1943 I became Chief of AMT I in AMT Group D of the WVHA and in that office was responsible for coordinating all matters arising between RSHA and concentration camps, under the administration of WVHA. I held this position until the end of the war. Pohl, as Chief of WVHA, and Kaltenbrunner, as Chief of RSHA, often conferred personally and frequently communicated orally and in writing concerning concentration camps. On 5 October 1944 I brought a lengthy report regarding Mauthausen Concentration Camp to Kaltenbrunner at his office at RSHA, Berlin. Kaltenbrunner asked me to give him a short oral digest of this in complete detail. This report dealt with the assignment to labor of several hundred prisoners who had been condemned to death [...] so-called 'nameless prisoners.'

6. The 'final solution' of the Jewish question meant the complete extermination of all Jews in Europe. I was ordered to establish extermination facili-



ties at Auschwitz in June 1941. At that time there were already in the general government three other extermination camps, BELZEC, TREBLINKA and WOLZEK. These camps were under the Einsatzkommando of the Security Police and SD. I visited Treblinka to find out how they carried out their exterminations. The Camp Commandant at Treblinka told me that he had liquidated 80,000 in the course of one-half year. He was principally concerned with liquidating all the Jews from the Warsaw Ghetto. He used monoxide gas and I did not think that his methods were very efficient. So when I set up the extermination building at Auschwitz, I used Cyclon B, which was crystallized Prussic Acid which we dropped into the death chamber from a small opening. It took from 3 to 15 minutes to kill the people in the death chamber depending upon climatic conditions. We knew when the people were dead because their screaming stopped. We usually waited about one-half hour before we opened the doors and removed the bodies. After the bodies were removed our special commandos took off the rings and extracted the gold from the teeth of the corpses.

7. Another improvement we made over Treblinka was that we built our gas chambers to accommodate 2,000 people at one time, whereas at Treblinka their 10 gas chambers only accommodated 200 people each. The way we selected our victims was as follows: we had two SS doctors on duty at Auschwitz to examine the incoming transports of prisoners. The prisoners would be marched by one of the doctors who would make spot decisions as they walked by. Those who were fit for work were sent into the Camp. Others were sent immediately to the extermination plants. Children of tender years were invariably exterminated since by reason of their youth they were unable to work. Still another improvement we made over Treblinka was that at Treblinka the victims almost always knew that they were to be exterminated and at Auschwitz we endeavored to fool the victims into thinking that they were to go through a delousing process. Of course, frequently they realized our true intentions and we sometimes had riots and difficulties due to that fact. Very frequently women would hide their children under their clothes but of course when we found them we would send the children in to be exterminated. We were required to carry out these exterminations in secrecy but of course the foul and nauseating stench from the continuous burning of bodies permeated the entire area and all of the people living in the surrounding communities knew that exterminations were going on at Auschwitz.

8. We received from time to time special prisoners from the local Gestapo office. The SS doctors killed such prisoners by injections of benzine. Doctors had orders to write ordinary death certificates and could put down any reason at all for the cause of death.

9. From time to time we conducted medical experiments on women inmates, including sterilization and experiments relating to cancer. Most of the people who died under these experiments had been already condemned to death by the Gestapo.

10. Rudolf Mildner was the chief of the Gestapo at Kattowicz and as such

was head of the political department at Auschwitz which conducted third degree methods of interrogation *from approximately March 1941 until September 1943. As such, he frequently sent prisoners to Auschwitz for incarceration or execution. He visited persons accused of various crimes, such as escaping Prisoners of War, etc., frequently met within Auschwitz, and Mildner often attended the trial of such persons, who usually were executed in Auschwitz following their sentence. I showed Mildner throughout the extermination plant at Auschwitz and he was directly interested in it since he had to send the Jews from his territory for execution at Auschwitz.*

*I understand English as it is written above. The above statements are true; this declaration is made by me voluntarily and without compulsion; after reading over this statement, I have signed and executed the same at Nürnberg, Germany on the fifth day of April 1946.*

*Rudolf Höss”*

By “NSDAP” is meant the Nazi Party, *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (National Socialist German Worker’s Party).

Some points of information, which have not been included in the affidavit, although some might consider them relevant, are that Höss, as a nationalist brawler in the twenties, had committed a political killing, for which he served five years in prison,<sup>168</sup> and that he started in the concentration camps at Dachau as a corporal in 1934. He may seem to have risen unusually quickly because in 1945, during the final weeks of the war, he was a colonel and was negotiating concentration camp matters with the Red Cross and representatives of neutral countries.<sup>169</sup> Most probably, his low rank in 1934 was due to artificial limitations on the size of the SS, imposed for political reasons. His rapid advance was probably the result of the expansion of the SS after the SA-Röhm purge of June 1934 and the greater expansion, which took place after the war began.

We now analyze the significant points of the affidavit. The plan of Birkenau is shown in Fig. 29; it is based on information gathered at the “Auschwitz trial” of 1963-1965, but the WRB report presents a similar plan.<sup>170</sup>

## Contradictions at the Outset

### Paragraph 2

It would have been helpful in putting things into slightly better focus and perspective if Höss had briefly indicated what the nature of the “concentration camp industries” at Auschwitz was and the enormous importance this industry had for the Germans. In the entire transcript of IMT testimony there appears to be only one specific reference to the nature of the industry at Auschwitz. It is in the testimony of political prisoner Marie Claude Vaillant-Couturier where she makes

<sup>168</sup> Hilberg, 575; Reitlinger, 113.

<sup>169</sup> Reitlinger, 113, 502, 516-517; Red Cross (1947), 95, 98, 103-104.

<sup>170</sup> Langbein, vol. 2, 930-931; Naumann, 19 opp; US-WRB (1944), pt. 1, 22.

passing reference to an “ammunition factory” (no doubt the Krupp fuse plant) and to a “large Buna factory, but as [she] did not work there [she did] not know what was made there.”<sup>171</sup> There are other references, especially in the documents, but they are buried quite deeply.

Not even Höss clung to the figure of 2,500,000 victims gassed; in private at the time of his testimony and also at his own trial in 1947 in Poland (he was hanged), he used a figure of 1,135,000. The lowest figure to be claimed by those who claim that gassings took place is 750,000.<sup>172</sup> The Russians claimed 4,000,000, including some killed by “injections, ill treatment, etc.,” but the highest figure claimed seems to be 7,000,000.<sup>173</sup>

The remark about 400,000 Hungarian Jews was in accord with a strange emphasis in the legend on the Hungarian Jews. This emphasis existed well before the Höss affidavit, and it has persisted to this day. It was on May 5, 1944, that Eichmann was supposed to have proposed, through the intermediary Joel Brand, a “trucks for Hungarian Jews” swap with the Western allies.<sup>174</sup> The continued emphasis on the Hungarian Jews seems to be a result of the focus, since 1960, on the activities of Eichmann. For the initial emphasis, the only explanation I can offer is that the problems of the Hungarian Jews started in March 1944 with the German occupation of Hungary, which was simultaneous with the beginnings of the functioning of the War Refugee Board, which had been established in January.

Much of the attention of the WRB was thus directed toward Hungary.<sup>175</sup> The problem of the Hungarian Jews is given special attention in the next chapter.

#### Paragraph 4

Höss places the commencement of the gassings in the summer of 1941. He gets promoted in December 1943 to the Inspectorate of Concentration Camps at Oranienburg but knows “by reason of [his] continued duties” there that “these mass executions continued.” To claim knowledge of significant events at Auschwitz, while with the Inspectorate, seems very reasonable, but in his testimony he said that in the summer of 1941 he, Höss, had been summoned to report directly to Himmler and that during the interview the concentration camp commandant had received directly from the Reichsführer-SS the order to begin exterminating the Jews, with the stipulation that he should maintain the “strictest secrecy,” not allowing even his immediate superior Glücks to find out what he was doing. “Glücks was, so to speak, the inspector of concentration camps at that time and he was immediately subordinate to the Reichsführer.”<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> IMT, vol. 6, 211.

<sup>172</sup> Reitlinger, 119.

<sup>173</sup> 008-USSR; Friedman, 14.

<sup>174</sup> Reitlinger, 472-478; US-WRB (1945), 39-40.

<sup>175</sup> US-WRB (1945), 49-50.

<sup>176</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 398.

## When Did It Start?

### Paragraph 6

It will be seen in Chapter 7 what the “final solution” of the Jewish question meant. Höss claims that he “was ordered to establish extermination facilities at Auschwitz in June 1941.” Thus, he reaffirms the date given in paragraph 4 and his testimony in support of the affidavit reaffirmed this date again; there seems no doubt that Höss was knowingly and deliberately given the summer of 1941 as the start and that no slip is involved here. Also, Höss testified that, at the time of the Himmler order, the Inspectorate (Glücks) was “immediately subordinate” to Himmler. This could only have been true prior to March 1942, at which time Oswald Pohl, chief of the WVHA (paragraph 3), took over the Inspectorate and Glücks started reporting to Pohl, who reported to Himmler. Prior to March 1942, the Inspectorate seems to have been an orphan organization and may have reported to Himmler, although it had connections with both Heydrich and Jüttner’s Operational Main Office (*Führungshauptamt*). Höss, of course, was familiar with these administrative arrangements, because in late April 1942 Pohl had held a meeting of all camp commanders and all leaders of the Inspectorate for the specific purpose of discussing them.<sup>177</sup>

Despite all this, Reitlinger insists that Höss meant the summer of 1942, not 1941, for certain reasons that will be seen later and also for other reasons. First, an obvious implicit claim of Höss’ affidavit is that the visit to Treblinka took place after large deportations of Warsaw Jews to that camp. Höss confirmed this point explicitly in another affidavit. That puts the Treblinka visit in 1942. Second, according to Reitlinger’s sources, the first large transports (2,000) of Jews to Birkenau date from March 1942, when “the small gassing installation in Birkenwald had only started to work.”<sup>178</sup> Actually, such arguments only increase the confusion, if we are also told that Höss received the extermination orders in the summer of 1942.

These are simply the sorts of contradictions that one should expect to emerge from a pack of lies. However, for the sake of discussion we should accept that Höss really meant the summer of 1942 and continue on to other matters. By any interpretation, however, Höss says that there were three other extermination camps at the time of the Himmler order, that he had visited Treblinka and that this camp had been exterminating for one half year. That puts the beginning of the gas chamber exterminations in early 1942 if we accept Reitlinger’s point.

## The Alleged Gassings and Zyklon

One must agree that gassing with carbon monoxide is inefficient. The source of the carbon monoxide was supposed to have been the exhausts of a diesel en-

<sup>177</sup> Hilberg, 556-560; Reitlinger, 107ff; documents R-129, NO-719 and 1063(F)-PS in NMT, vol. 5, 298-303.

<sup>178</sup> Reitlinger, 109, 115.

gine at Belzec and of captured Russian tanks and trucks at Treblinka!<sup>179</sup>

One must also agree that Zyklon (Zyklon) B was more efficient because it consisted of crystals which, when exposed to air, sublimated into “Prussic acid” (hydrogen cyanide gas). There was no deadlier gas and, in fact, Zyklon was a well-known and widely used insecticide developed by the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Schädlingsbekämpfung* (DEGESCH), German Pest Control Co. It had been marketed world-wide before the war as an insecticide;<sup>180</sup> the word Zyklon means “cyclone,” *i.e.* the product was a “cyclone” for pests. It was used throughout the German armed forces and camp system during the war, and it was thus used as an insecticide at Auschwitz. The ordering and receiving of Zyklon at Auschwitz was done by the so-called *Referat für Schädlingsbekämpfung* (Pest Control Office).<sup>181</sup>

The constant menace of typhus as carried by lice has been noted, and the calamitous results of a complete breakdown of disinfection measures at Belsen have been seen. In view of the particular hospitability of the Auschwitz-Kattowitz operations to the typhus-bearing louse, in view of the fact of epidemics at Auschwitz that actually forced work stoppages, and in view of the tremendous importance of the Auschwitz industry to the German war effort, it is not surprising that Zyklon was used in liberal quantities at Auschwitz, and in the surrounding regions, for its intended purpose. It is this chemical product, known to be an insecticide and known to be used at Auschwitz as an insecticide, which, in the WRB report but starting even earlier, was claimed and continues to this day to be claimed as the source of the gas used to exterminate Jews at Auschwitz.

It is not correct to say that the insecticide role of Zyklon has been concealed; the WRB report mentions the anti-parasite role of Zyklon and a dual role for Zyklon at Auschwitz is explicitly claimed in the IMT transcript.<sup>182</sup> We must be careful at this point to note the significance of the legend’s Zyklon B allegation. Here we have, on a major point, the main attribute of a hoax as we begin to examine the details of the Auschwitz extermination claims: the fact requiring a dual interpretation. This is not discussed or, apparently, even appreciated in the “final solution” literature. Hilberg merely utters the completely irrelevant assertion that “very little was used for fumigation” and then cites unconvincing authority. Reitlinger does no better.<sup>183</sup>

The most typical use of Zyklon was in disinfection rooms and barracks. Everything was sealed and then the necessary amount of Zyklon, which came in green cans (Figs. 27, 28), was emptied in. After the proper time interval, it was assumed that all the lice and other insects and pests were dead, and the enclosure was aired out. Zyklon could be used for disinfecting clothing by employing an “extermination chamber”; such were marketed by the German “extermination” industry, although at that time steam baths were also used for the disinfecting of clothing, es-

---

<sup>179</sup> Reitlinger, 147ff.

<sup>180</sup> DuBois, 213. Some of the chemistry of Zyklon (“Cyclon”) is discussed in the article on CYANIDE in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* for 1943.

<sup>181</sup> Hilberg, 567-571.

<sup>182</sup> IMT, vol. 6, 225-332.

<sup>183</sup> Hilberg, 570 Reitlinger, 154-156.

pecially at permanent installations. The “extermination chambers” were preferred in connection with highly mobile or special conditions. The U.S. Army, which also had insect control problems during the war, had correspondingly similar devices and had devised a “field chamber.” Because the U.S. came into the war late, it had time to adopt the newly developed chemical DDT for the functions that Zyklon performed for the Germans.<sup>184</sup> Naturally, the Americans employed DDT in their “camps,” concentration or otherwise. As a more advanced insecticide, DDT was more versatile for various reasons, *e.g.* it was not nearly as lethal for human beings as Zyklon, which was quite lethal and in its commercial form contained a “warning stuff,” an irritant that was noticed much easier than the almost odorless cyanide gas. It is common to leave out frills in military versions of products, and thus the irritant was absent from the Zyklon employed in concentration camps.

The dual role of Zyklon was asserted at the IMT on January 28, 1946, in the testimony of a witness called by French prosecutor DuBost. On January 30, DuBost submitted as evidence document 1553-PS, consisting of a number of invoices from DEGESCH, addressed to SS 1st Lieutenant Kurt Gerstein, for various quantities of Zyklon sent to Oranienburg and to Auschwitz, plus a lengthy “statement” attributed to Gerstein. After some hesitation over certain legal technicalities, both parts of the document were accepted in evidence, notwithstanding the claims of Rassiner and Reitlinger to the contrary that the “statement” was rejected.<sup>185</sup> Two invoices are printed in the IMT volumes, and part of the “statement” is printed in one of the NMT volumes.<sup>186</sup> The invoice samples printed in the IMT volumes include one invoice for 195 kg of Zyklon sent to Oranienburg and one for the same sent to Auschwitz. It is probable that the Oranienburg Zyklon was ultimately destined for other camps and that the Zyklon sent to Auschwitz was to be shared with all the smaller camps of the region and possibly also with the coal mines.

The case of Kurt Gerstein shows that there is no limit to the absurdities that intelligent people can attain once they have accepted falsehood as truth. This is the same Gerstein who appears as a major character in Rolf Hochhuth’s play, *The Deputy*.

Gerstein’s title in the SS was Chief Disinfestation Officer in the Office of the Hygienic Chief of the Waffen-SS,<sup>187</sup> and as such it was his responsibility to supervise the deliveries of disinfestation supplies to all the camps administered by the SS. Two versions of what happened to him at the end of the war are offered. In the one he encountered American interrogators by chance in a hotel in Rottweil, Black Forest, to whom he related that he had obtained a responsible post in the Nazi Party while operating as a secret agent for the sometimes anti-Nazi Reverend Niemöller, that he had been involved in operating gas chambers, and that he

<sup>184</sup> Hardenbergh, 252-254, 257-259; Knipling.

<sup>185</sup> IMT, vol. 6, 211, 225, 360-364; Rassiner (1962) 80, 224; Rassiner (1964), 105n; Rassiner (1965), 38-48; Reitlinger, 161n.

<sup>186</sup> NMT, vol. 1, 865-870; IMT, vol. 27, 340-342.

<sup>187</sup> Hilberg, 570.

was prepared to act as a witness in any court. He handed them a seven-page document, typed in French, together with a note in English and some Zyklon invoices, and then vanished.<sup>188</sup> In the other, he somehow found himself in Cherche-Midi military prison in Paris, composed a document in his own hand in French, added the Zyklon invoices, and then hanged himself in July 1945.<sup>189</sup> In either case neither he nor his body has ever been found. He vanished, allegedly leaving a “statement” and some Zyklon invoices that became document 1553-PS. The former version of the Gerstein story is the one claimed in the descriptive material accompanying the document.

Even if we were not presented with such an obviously fishy story concerning Gerstein, we would doubt the authenticity of the “statement” merely on the grounds of its contents, for it is ridiculous in the story it presents, e.g. that Gerstein took his position in the SS in order to attempt to sabotage the exterminations (“a man who had penetrated hell with the sole intention of bearing witness before the world and aiding the victims”<sup>190</sup>). The text of the “statement,” including the part published by the NMT, is included here as Appendix A; the “statement” plays no great role in the analysis, but the reader should examine it sometime. It is absolutely insane. It is no marvel that people who can take this story seriously have remarked on the “ambiguity of good” and feel “a certain malaise, an inability to arrive at a full explanation of Gerstein as a person.”<sup>191</sup> *The Deputy* opens with “Gerstein” forcing his way into the reception room of the Papal Legation on the Rauchstrasse in Berlin, breathlessly relating the story of his “statement” to the Papal Nuncio!

It is thoroughly unforgivable that Hilberg and Reitlinger use such an obviously spurious “statement” as a source, and without apology. Reitlinger, however, points out that Hitler never visited Lublin, as the “statement” asserts.<sup>192</sup>

DEGESCH was not the only firm involved in the “extermination” business. The firm of Tesch and Stabenow supplied customers with Zyklon and also with equipment for “extermination chambers” that were of typical volume ten cubic meters and smaller. On page 65, we saw that there apparently existed such “gas chambers” at Dachau which were, of course, represented as murder chambers in the early phases of the propaganda, although today no attempt is made to claim they are anything other than “disinfestation chambers.” Tesch and Weinbacher, officers of the firm of Tesch and Stabenow, who had sold some “extermination chamber” equipment to the camp at Gross-Rosen, were hanged for their role in the extermination business, their plea that they did not know that their merchandise was to be used for purposes other than disinfestation and their alternate plea that an order of the SS could not be refused having been rejected by the British military court.<sup>193</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> Reitlinger, 161; 1553-PS.

<sup>189</sup> Friedlaender, vii-xii.

<sup>190</sup> Friedlaender, xi.

<sup>191</sup> Friedlaender, x.

<sup>192</sup> Reitlinger, 162f. See also *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (Apr. 1953), 189n, which is cited in an article in *Nation Europa* (May 1963), 50+ (q.v.).

<sup>193</sup> Hilberg, 567; Reitlinger, 155-156; documents NO-4344 and NO-4345 in NMT, vol. 5, 362-364.

## Lines of Authority

### Paragraph 7

According to affidavits given by Höss and Friedrich Entress in 1947,<sup>194</sup> the first gas chambers put into operation in the summer of 1942 (now contradicting the affidavit of 1946), were makeshift affairs consisting of two old peasant houses made air tight, with windows sealed up. At the “Auschwitz trial” in 1963-1965 it was held that the “bunker” in Fig. 29 was one of these early gas chambers.<sup>195</sup> The nature of later “gas chambers” is examined below.

This is a good point at which to raise objections regarding lines of responsibility and authority in these operations. Höss says he received his order directly from Himmler during – we have agreed to pretend – the summer of 1942. This means that Himmler not only bypassed Glücks, but also Pohl in giving this order directly to the camp commandant, specifying that Glücks was not to learn what was going on. Himmler reached three levels or more down to give the order and specified that Höss was to maintain an impossible secrecy. Most irregular.

That is not all. The story we are offered by the Höss affidavit and testimony and all other sources is that (except for certain later developments to be discussed) the German government left the means of killing, and the materials required, a matter for the judgment and ingenuity of the local camp commandant. Höss decides to convert two old peasant houses. Höss found the Zyklon kicking around the camp and decided that it offered a more efficient method of solving the Jewish problem than that employed at Treblinka, where they had scrounged up some captured Russian tanks and trucks to use for exterminations.

All of this is idiotic, and Reitlinger is obviously uncomfortable with the “problem” of the responsibility of the Zyklon decision but gets nowhere with the difficulty except to make it graver by suggesting that Hitler (!) finally decided on Zyklon “with misgiving.”<sup>196</sup>

## Transports to Auschwitz

We are told that those Jews not fit for work were gassed immediately upon arrival (and hence do not appear in any written records, for the most part), but an account directly in conflict with this claim appears even in the WRB report.

According to that report, a transport of four to five thousand Jews from Theresienstadt, traveling as families, arrive at Birkenau in September 1943. They kept their baggage and were lodged as families in the camp sector designated in Fig. 29. They were allowed to correspond freely, a school was set up for the children, and the men were not obliged to work. They were considered to be in six months quarantine. It is said that they were gassed on March 7, 1944, and that “the young

<sup>194</sup> Hilberg, 565; Reitlinger, 158n.

<sup>195</sup> Langbein, vol. 2, 930-931; Naumann, 19 opp.

<sup>196</sup> Reitlinger, 155-158.



people went to their deaths singing.” The relatives of these Jews got mail from them dated March 23 or 25, but it is claimed that the mail had been written on March 1 and post-dated, in obedience to German orders.

This procedure was repeated with another group of Jewish families, 5,000 people who arrived from Theresienstadt in December 1943 and whose quarantine was due for expiration in June 1944. Some men were put to work. According to what are said to be surviving records, in May 1944 two thousand were on the employment list, 1,452 were still in quarantine, and 1,575 were considered “in readiness for transport” (“*Vorbereitung zum Transport*”), which Reitlinger considers to mean in reality “waiting for the gas chambers.” This was repeated a second time with a group of Theresienstadt families which arrived in May 1944.<sup>197</sup> Since these people were put into “quarantine,” it is a certainty that their quarters had been disinfested with Zyklon just prior to their moving in and perhaps at periods while they were living there. Now we are asked to believe that the Germans planned to kill them with the same chemical product later on!

Essentially the same story was repeated in IMT testimony.<sup>198</sup> The presence of such material in the WRB report is no mystery. Whatever was happening to the Theresienstadt Jews in 1943-1944 was fairly well known in Europe. In October 1943, when 360 Jews were deported from Denmark, they were sent to Theresienstadt, “where the Danish king could be assured of their safety.”<sup>199</sup> We noted on page 99 the Red Cross visit of June 1944; the Red Cross involvement with Theresienstadt receives further treatment in the next chapter. In a 1945 visit, the Red Cross reported transfers to Auschwitz in 1944, adding no sinister interpretations.

To describe the Theresienstadt Jews as “in readiness for transport” just before their quarantine was to expire was perfectly logical, because it is known that many Theresienstadt Jews were being deported East. A source sponsored by the Israeli government, who had been at Theresienstadt, reports that from 1941 to 1944 the Germans were transporting Jews to such places as Minsk in Russia and Riga in Latvia. One must have passed by quite a few “extermination camps” to travel from Theresienstadt to those cities. The source also reports that young Theresienstadt Jews were eager to volunteer for transports to Auschwitz as late as August 1944.<sup>200</sup> Rabbi Leo Bäck has claimed that somebody escaped from Auschwitz in August 1943 and made his way back to Theresienstadt, where he told Bäck of gassings. Bäck has explained why he told nobody else of this at the time. So that explains how it was possible that all those people were so eager to go to Auschwitz in their “ignorance” – at least that is what we will no doubt be told.<sup>201</sup>

The part of the Auschwitz legend touching on the Theresienstadt Jews is obvious nonsense even without contrary evidence, however. It is not believable that the Germans would quarter for six months at Birkenau each of three distinct

---

<sup>197</sup> US-WRB (1944), pt. 1, 19-21, 37-38; Reitlinger, 182-183; Blumental, 105.

<sup>198</sup> IMT, vol. 6, 218.

<sup>199</sup> Reitlinger, 183.

<sup>200</sup> *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 7, 109, 110n, 113.

<sup>201</sup> Reitlinger, 181-182; Boehm, 292-293.

groups of people of a category for which there exists an extermination program at Birkenau. The dual role of Zyklon in this story merely effects passage from the nonsensical to the incomparably ludicrous.

If we examine another extant source of what is said to be statistical data concerning transports to Auschwitz, we meet the same situation. The data offered in the Netherlands Red Cross reports is more reliable than that offered in the WRB report, although it is rather limited. Nevertheless, as shown in Appendix C, the data shows that virtually all of the male Jews who were deported from the Netherlands to Auschwitz in July and August of 1942 entered Birkenau and were given registration numbers. It is also known that these Dutch Jews wrote letters to acquaintances in the Netherlands in which they described the work at Auschwitz as “hard” but “tolerable,” the food “adequate,” the sleeping accommodations “good,” the hygienic conditions “satisfactory” and the general treatment “correct” (this was reported by the Jewish Council in Amsterdam which claimed, however, that it knew of only 52 such letters). To Reitlinger, these things are “mysteries” for, he says, “at certain periods, entire transports were admitted.”<sup>202</sup>

The term “spot decisions” has not been used subsequent to the Höss affidavit, so far as we know. The common term is “selections.” The story is that “selections” were made on incoming transports on a basis of suitability for work. This, of course, must be essentially true; given the extent and variety of the industrial operations at Auschwitz, selections were required not only on a work *vs.* no work basis but also on, *e.g.*, a light work *vs.* heavy work basis. Other factors which must have figured in this connection were whether a given transport was composed of prisoners, volunteer laborers, Jews being resettled (such as the Theresienstadt Jews) or other. The transports were no doubt also screened for certain key professionals, such as medical personnel, engineers, skilled craftsmen, etc. The extermination legend merely claims that one category sought in these elaborate sortings and selections was all non-employable Jews, destined for extermination. This claim has already been seriously undermined by the evidence.<sup>203</sup>

## A Hospital for the People Being Exterminated?

Selections on incoming transports are not the only mode of gas chamber selections which have been claimed. A Dutch Jew, Dr. Elie A. Cohen, was arrested in

<sup>202</sup> Reitlinger, 118-121. Reitlinger remarks on the “mystery” presented by the data in the Netherlands Red Cross reports, which is presented and discussed here in Appendix C. The letters from Auschwitz are considered by de Jong.

<sup>203</sup> The *Kalendarium*, published in 1964 in German, says that of 1500 people in a transport that arrived at Auschwitz on April 16, 1944, from the camp in Drancy, France, a certain number of the men were registered as inmates and the others gassed. Many years ago Robert Faurisson pointed out that, according to the deportation lists, “the others” included Simone Veil, who, as Faurisson wrote, was the first President of the European Parliament. Later I noticed that the English translation of the *Kalendarium*, published in 1990 (D. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945*), engages in a little bit of revisionism on this, and now says some of the women were registered. A document from the International Tracing Service, Arolsen, Germany, is cited.

1943 for attempting to leave the Netherlands without authority. In September 1943, he and his family were shipped to Auschwitz, and he was separated from his family, which he never saw again. He later wrote a book, *Human Behavior in the Concentration Camp*, based on his experiences as a member of the hospital staff at Auschwitz I. Because Cohen's contact with the people who were being exterminated was of a doctor-patient nature, it was necessary to produce an extraordinarily descriptive term for his book, and "objective" was as good a choice as any.

Cohen interprets certain selections in the hospital as selections for the gas chamber:<sup>204</sup>

*"After the 'HKB (camp hospital) administrative room' had given warning that the camp physician was about to make a selection, the whole block became a hive of activity, for everything had to be spic-and-span [...] while everybody stood at attention, he made his entry with his retinue: SDG (medical service orderly), Blockälteste and block clerk. The sick Jews were already lined up – as a matter of course, naked. Simultaneously with the presentation of the card with the personal notes concerning each prisoner, to the camp physician, the block physician, in whose ear the diagnosis was being whispered by the room physician, introduced the patient in question to him [...] in 90 per cent of the cases the card was handed to the SDG, which meant death by gassing for the patient, unless the political department gave orders to the contrary, which frequently occurred in the case of 'Schutzhäftlinge' (people charged with ordinary crime).*

*Not only emaciated prisoners, but also some who looked well fed were sometimes consigned to the gas chamber; and occasionally even members of the HKB staff, who were officially exempt, had to suffer a similar fate. Therefore, especially when one considered the 'medical style' of the camp physician, it was generally supposed that it was not only people incapable of work who were scheduled for killing, but that the decisive factor must be that a certain number of persons had to be gassed.*

*Officially no one knew what the final object actually was, not even the staff of the administrative room, for after the names of the gassed the initials S.B., short for 'Sonderbehandlung' (special treatment) were placed."*

Cohen does not report having seen any gas chambers; the only evidence which he draws on to support a "gassing" interpretation of such scenes (such interpretation certainly not being evident from the raw facts) consists in the post-war claim of extermination at Auschwitz and also in that there were rumors inside the camp of extermination somewhere at Auschwitz. The existence of such rumors is practically certain because a delegate of the International Red Cross reported their existence among British POWs at Auschwitz III in September 1944.<sup>205</sup> However, nothing much can be inferred from the existence of rumors, as rumor spreading is an elementary aspect of psychological warfare, and we have seen that the OSS and, of course, the Communists engaged in rumor spreading and "black propa-

<sup>204</sup> Cohen, 38-39.

<sup>205</sup> Red Cross (1947), 91-92.

ganda.” In fact, knowledgeable officials of the U.S. government have admitted the “information” spreading. At the Farben trial, prosecuting attorney Minskoff asked defense witness Münch the following question about gassings at Birkenau:<sup>206</sup>

*“Now, Mr. Witness, isn’t it a fact that, during the time you were at Auschwitz, Allied planes dropped leaflets over Kattowitz and Auschwitz informing the population what was going on in Birkenau?”*

Münch did not know that. Minskoff was knowledgeable in this area because he had been a foreign operations oriented lawyer in the Treasury Department during the war and was presumably well informed on WRB matters; the WRB had collaborated with the Office of War Information on various leaflet operations. The head of the prosecution staff at the Farben trial was DuBois, who had been general counsel of the WRB, who wrote that in his “office in 1944, [he] knew [...] what was going on at Auschwitz,” and who chose in his book to reproduce with general approval the part of the testimony containing the Minskoff question.<sup>207</sup> This is good evidence for an American leaflet operation over Auschwitz, although the method seems somewhat crude. My guess is that, if the leaflets were indeed dropped, they were dropped at night and in moderate quantities.

Actually, a leaflet operation was not necessary to get rumors going in the camps, for the highly organized Communists were very active in this area. Their superior organization, which involved systematic illegal listening to radios, had made the other inmates essentially fully dependent on them for “news.”<sup>208</sup> Let us remember that it was a small world, even in 1939-1945, and that, on account of the general ease with which information flowed into and out of the camp (a fact noted on page 121), the Allied stories about the camps would have ultimately and necessarily penetrated into those camps by various routes.

The Red Cross delegate mentioned above had attempted to visit the Auschwitz camps but apparently got no further than the administrative area of Auschwitz I and the quarters of the British POWs. The latter were the only persons the existing conventions entitled him to visit; with regard to other matters the German officers there were “amiable and reticent.” The delegate reported without comment that the British POWs had not been able to obtain confirmation of the rumors by consulting camp inmates. It is claimed that, despite these rumors, the British POWs who were interrogated by the Russians after the capture of the camp “knew nothing at all” of the “crimes.”<sup>209</sup>

Subsequent events have, of course, changed the rumors into “knowledge” in many cases. Incoming Jews certainly had no suspicions of gassings.<sup>210</sup>

With the “selections” we are offered another fact for dual interpretation. There is no doubt that the extensive industrial and other activities required “selections” of people for various conventional purposes. We are then asked to add an “extermination” purpose to these activities.

<sup>206</sup> NMT. vol. 8, 320.

<sup>207</sup> DuBois, 53, 173, 231; US-WRB (1945), 48-55.

<sup>208</sup> Lerner, 152-153.

<sup>209</sup> Friedman, 13-14.

<sup>210</sup> Cohen, 119.

Before leaving Cohen, we should note that there were sick emaciated Jews, as well as others, in the Auschwitz I hospital. He further informs us:<sup>211</sup>

“[...] *The HKB was housed in five good stone-built blocks. There was one block for surgery, one for infectious diseases, one for internal diseases, one for ‘Schonung’ (less serious cases) and Block 28 (X-ray, specialists’ rooms, medical experiments, admissions). The sick lay in three bunks, one above another, on straw mattresses, and were dressed in a shirt (with, later, a pair of drawers added), under two cotton blankets and a sheet. Every week the patients were bathed, and every two weeks they were given ‘clean’ underwear and a ‘clean’ sheet; there were few fleas and no lice. Each berth was seldom occupied by more than two persons. But [...] even patients in a state of high fever had to leave their beds to go to the toilet or to wash in the cold lavatory in the mornings. Because of ‘organizations’ from the SS, there were always medicines, though not in sufficient quantities, including even sulfa drugs; these had been brought in by large transports of Jews from every European country.*”

He adds that hospital conditions were much worse in other camps (about which he has only read).

The Auschwitz I hospital was obviously no luxury establishment but nevertheless it showed a serious concern, on the part of the Germans, for the recovery of inmates, including Jews, who had fallen ill. This observation also opposes the claim that those not fit for work were killed. Cohen reports certain selections of an incompletely known character, in connection with unknown destinations. It may be that those considered of no further use as labor were sent to Birkenau; this would be very reasonable because it has been shown that the unemployables from the Monowitz hospital were sent to Birkenau.

## “Special Treatment”

The term “special treatment,” *Sonderbehandlung*, is supposed to have been one of the code words for gassing. When it is said that N Jews in a transport to Auschwitz were gassed, and that this is according to some German record or document, it is the case that the word “*Sonderbehandlung*” is being interpreted as meaning gassing. The documents in question are two in number, and are printed (not reproduced from originals) in a 1946 publication of the Polish government. Both documents are said to be signed by an SS Lieutenant Schwarz. They state that from several Jewish transports from Breslau and Berlin to Auschwitz in March 1943, a certain fraction of Jews were selected for labor, and that the remainder were *sonderbehandelt*. As far as I know, these documents are not Nuremberg documents; the originals, if they exist (which I am not denying), are in Polish archives.<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> Cohen, 60.

<sup>212</sup> Friedman, 14-15; Reitlinger, 172; Hilberg, 587; Blumental, 109-110. One of the documents are

On account of this relatively well publicized interpretation of the term *Sonderbehandlung*, Cohen thinks that he has read “SB” in the notes made in the Auschwitz I hospital, but it is likely that he misread “NB,” *nach Birkenau* (to Birkenau).

There exists a document, apparently genuine, from the Gestapo District Headquarters Düsseldorf, which specifies the manner in which executions of certain offending foreign workers were to be carried out, and which uses the term “*Sonderbehandlung*” as meaning execution. There is also a document, put into evidence at Eichmann’s trial, which referred to the execution of three Jews as *Sonderbehandlung*.<sup>213</sup>

Thus, it seems correct that, in certain contexts, the term meant execution, but it is at least equally certain that its meaning was no more univocal in the SS than the meaning of “special treatment” is in English-speaking countries. There is completely satisfactory evidence of this. At the IMT trial prosecutor Amen led Kaltenbrunner, under cross examination, into conceding that the term might have meant execution as ordered by Himmler. Then, in an attempt to implicate Kaltenbrunner personally in *Sonderbehandlung*, Amen triumphantly produced a document which presents Kaltenbrunner as ordering *Sonderbehandlung* for certain people. Amen wanted Kaltenbrunner to comment on the document without reading it, and there was an angry exchange in this connection, but Kaltenbrunner was finally allowed to read the document, and he then quickly pointed out that the *Sonderbehandlung* referred to in the document was for people at “Winzerstube” and at “Walzertraum,” that these two establishments were fashionable hotels which quartered interned notables, and that *Sonderbehandlung* in their cases meant such things as permission to correspond freely and to receive parcels, a bottle of champagne per day, etc.<sup>214</sup>

Poliakov reproduces some document which show that *Sonderbehandlung* had yet another meaning within the SS. The documents deal with procedures to be followed in the event of the pregnancies caused by illegal sexual intercourse involving Polish civilian workers and war prisoners. A racial examination was held to decide between abortion and “germanization” of the baby (adoption by a German family). The term *Sonderbehandlung* was a reference either to the germanization or to the abortion. In addition, at Eichmann’s trial, some documents were put into evidence which dealt with the treatment of 91 children from Lidice, Bohemia-Moravia. These children had been orphaned by the reprisals which had been carried out at Lidice after Heydrich’s assassination. A certain number were picked out for germanization and the remainder were sent to the Displaced Persons Center in Lodz (Litzmannstadt), operated by the RuSHA. The commander of the Center, Krumei, regarded the children as a special case within the Center, to be given *Sonderbehandlung* while at the Center. The term or its equivalent (*eine gesonderte Behandlung*) was also used in the Foreign Office in connection with special categories of prisoners of war, such as priests.<sup>215</sup>

---

reproduced in Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 198.

<sup>213</sup> NO-4634 in NMT, vol. 4, 1166; Eichmann, session 79, W1-Y1.

<sup>214</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 336-339.

<sup>215</sup> Poliakov & Wulf (1956), 299-302; Eichmann, session 79, Y1-Bb1; session 101, Hhl-Mml; ses-

It is only to a person not accustomed to the German language that the term *Sonderbehandlung* sounds like it stands for some very special concept. For a German, however, the term is as diverse in possible application as “special treatment” is in English.

Himmler commented somewhat unclearly on *Sonderbehandlung* when he examined the “Korherr report,” documents NO-5193 through 5198. Korherr was the chief SS statistician and thus, in late 1942 and early 1943, he prepared a report for Himmler on the situation regarding European Jews. In March 1943 he reported that a total of 1,873,594 Jews of various nationalities had been subjected to a program of “evacuation,” with a parenthetical note “including Theresienstadt and including *Sonderbehandlung*.” The report also gave numbers of Jews in ghettos in Theresienstadt, Lodz and the General Government, the number in concentration camps, and the number in German cities on account of a special status conferred for economic reasons. It was also remarked that, from 1933 to December 31, 1942, 27,347 Jews had died in German concentration camps.

After Himmler examined the report, he informed Korherr through Brandt that the term *Sonderbehandlung* should not be used in the report and that transport to the East should be specified. Nevertheless, the document, as it has come to us, uses the term in the way indicated. The document gives no hint how the term should be interpreted but, because it occurs in such a way that it is linked with Theresienstadt, it is obviously fair to interpret it in a favorable sense, as a reference to some sort of favored treatment.

In a document said to be initialed by Himmler, he wrote shortly that he regarded the “report as general purpose material for later times, and especially for camouflage purposes.” What was to be camouflaged is not indicated in the document but, at his trial, Eichmann testified that after the Stalingrad disaster (January 1943) the German government quickened the pace of the deportations “for camouflage reasons,” *i.e.*, to reassure the German people that everything was OK out there. Himmler specified that the Korherr report was not to be made public “at the moment,” but the camouflage remark could still be interpreted in the sense in which Eichmann suggested (Eichmann’s statement was not in connection with the Korherr report.)<sup>216</sup>

Other documents are 003-L, a letter by SS General Katzmann, speaking of 434,329 resettled (*ausgesiedelt*) Jews of southern Poland as having been *sonderbehandelt*, and NO-246, a letter from Artur Greiser to Himmler dated May 1, 1942, asking permission to give *Sonderbehandlung*, specified as getting them “locked up” (*abgeschlossen*), to about 100,000 Jews in the Warthegau (part of annexed Poland). Greiser was sentenced to death by a Polish court on July 20, 1946, despite the intervention of the Pope on his behalf. There is also a letter by Lohse, which is discussed on page 243.<sup>217</sup>

Summarizing the situation with respect to documents which speak of *Sonder-*

---

sion 107, U1-V1; session 109, F1-H1, N1, O1; NG-5077.

<sup>216</sup> Most of the Korherr report is reproduced in Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 240-248. Eichmann, session 77, Y1, Z1.

<sup>217</sup> Reitlinger, 557. Documents reproduced in Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 197-199.

*behandlung*, we may say that, while one can certainly raise questions regarding the authenticity of the relevant documents, it is nevertheless the case that even if all of the relevant documents are assumed authentic, they do not require an “extermination” interpretation of those that apply to Auschwitz. That the term *Sonderbehandlung* had more than one meaning within one agency of the German government is not very peculiar. For example, I understand that, within the Central Intelligence Agency, “termination” can mean execution or assassination in certain contexts. However, the term obviously could also be applied to the dismissal of a typist for absenteeism.

The point in paragraph 7 of the Höss affidavit about endeavoring “to fool the victims into thinking that they were to go through a delousing process” is, of course, a logical one because anybody on entering a German camp went through a delousing process such as Höss described in the affidavit and in his testimony – disrobe, shave, shower.<sup>218</sup> Again we are offered a fact for dual interpretation.

## The Crematories

The last subject in paragraph 7 is the cremations; it is a big one. According to Höss and all other accounts of exterminations, Birkenau cremations took place in trenches or pits prior to the availability of the modern crematory facilities there.<sup>219</sup> It is claimed that the new crematories were intended for extermination of Jews, but we have suggested a more routine purpose in the preceding chapter (pp. 79, 120). Let us review their history.

The construction was well into the preliminary stages of planning and ordering early in 1942 and this fact, in itself, makes it difficult, to say the least, to believe that they were related to any extermination program orders by Himmler in the summer of 1942. The construction plans for four structures containing crematory furnaces are dated January 28, 1942.<sup>220</sup> On February 27, 1942, the head of the construction department of the WVHA, SS Colonel (later Lieutenant General) Dr. Ing. Hans Kammler, an engineer who also supervised the design of the German V-rocket bases and the underground aircraft factories, visited Auschwitz and held a conference at which it was decided to install five, rather than two (as previously planned), crematory furnaces, each having three muffles or doors.<sup>221</sup> This matter, therefore, was not left to the ingenuity of Höss. In the extermination legend, however, Höss definitely gets credit for the Zyklon. The fifteen muffles to be installed in each of the structures or buildings were ordered from Topf and Sons, Erfurt, on August 3, 1942.<sup>222</sup> The ovens were of the standard type which Topf (still in business in Wiesbaden in 1962) sold. Fig. 26 is said to be a photograph of one of the

<sup>218</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 400-401.

<sup>219</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 420; Central Commission, 87-88.

<sup>220</sup> Central Commission, 83-84; Rassinier (1962), 85-86. Rassinier does not cite a source, so he presumably got it from Central Commission.

<sup>221</sup> Reitlinger, 157-158; Hilberg, 565; NO-4472.

<sup>222</sup> Central Commission, 83; Rassinier (1962), 86; NO-4461.



crematories at Auschwitz. Each muffle was designed to take one body at a time, as are all standard cremation muffles; there is no evidence for the installation of any non-standard muffles, such as any designed to take more than one body at a time. Topf had also supplied ovens to camps for which exterminations are not claimed, such as Buchenwald.<sup>223</sup>

The plans for the four buildings containing the crematories, numbered II, III, IV and V (Crematory I seems to have been the ultimately dormant crematory at Auschwitz I which contained four muffles<sup>224</sup>), show that a large hall or room existed in each. For II and III, these were below ground level and were designated *Leichenkeller* (mortuary cellar – literally corpse cellar – a German word for mortuary is *Leichenhalle*); their dimensions were height 2.4 meters and area 210 square meters and height 2.3 meters and area 400 square meters, respectively. The halls in the building containing Crematories IV and V were at ground level and were designated *Badeanstalten* (bath establishments); they were each of height 2.3 meters and area 580 square meters. According to the information generated at the “Auschwitz trial” of 1963-1965, these four buildings were located as shown in Fig. 29.

The Auschwitz construction department, in erecting the crematories, was assisted not only by Topf but also by the SS company DAW (*Deutsche Ausrüstungswerke*, German Equipment Factory), which helped with miscellaneous constructions. The first ovens installed were in Crematory II and numbered, as we have noted, fifteen muffles in five three-muffle units. The construction took considerable time, although it was carried out with deliberate haste as shown by the documents. The NMT volumes offer us the following English translation of document NO-4473; if the reader thinks he sees something in the document that is hostile to my thesis he should withhold judgment:<sup>225</sup>

“January 29, 1943

*To the Chief Amtsgruppe C, SS Brigadeführer and Brigadier General of the Waffen SS.,*

*Dr. Ing. Kammler*

*Subject: Crematory II, condition of the building.*

*The Crematory II has been completed – save for some minor constructional work – by the use of all the forces available, in spite of unspeakable difficulties, the severe cold, and in 24-hour shifts. The fires were started in the ovens in the presence of Senior Engineer Prüfer, representative of the contractors of the firm of Topf and Söhne, Erfurt, and they are working most satisfactorily. The planks from the concrete ceiling of the cellar used as a mortuary [Leichenkeller] could not yet be removed on account of the frost. This is, however,*

<sup>223</sup> Reitlinger, 159; NO-4353, NO-4400 & NO-4401 in NMT, vol. 5, 353-356; NO-4445; NO-4448. Photograph also in Schoenberner and in Nyiszli.

<sup>224</sup> Friedman, 54; editor’s note: crematory I later received a third double-muffle oven, resulting in 6 muffles altogether. See Carlo Mattogno, “The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau,” in G. Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, pp. 373-412.

<sup>225</sup> NMT, vol. 5, 619-620.

not very important, as the gas chamber can be used for that purpose.

*The firm of Topf and Söhne was not able to start deliveries of the installation in time for aeration and ventilation as had been requested by the Central Building Management because of restrictions in the use of railroad cars. As soon as the installation for aeration and ventilation arrive, the installing will start so that the complete installation may be expected to be ready for use February 20, 1943.*

*We enclose a report [not attached to document] of the testing engineer of the firm of Topf and Söhne, Erfurt.*

*The Chief of the Central Construction Management,  
Waffen SS and Police Auschwitz,  
SS Hauptsturmführer*

*Distribution: 1 – SS Ustuf. Janisch u. Kirschneck; 1 – Filing office (file crematory); Certified true copy: [Signature illegible] SS Ustuf. (F)”*

I interpret this as meaning that, although all work for Crematory II was not completed, the ovens could be used in January 1943 for cremations, despite the impossibility of using the *Leichenkeller*.

On February 12, 1943, Topf wrote to Auschwitz acknowledging receipt of an order for five three-muffle units for Crematory III, the construction to be completed April 10. I have not seen any documentation indicating installation of any ovens in Crematories IV and V, unless a letter of August 21, 1942, from an SS 2nd Lieutenant at Auschwitz, mentioning a Topf proposal to install two three-muffle units near each of the “baths for special purpose,” should be interpreted as such.<sup>226</sup> There was, however, carpentry work done on Crematories IV and V.<sup>227</sup>

This brings us to the problem of the number of muffles at Birkenau; it is a problem because it is said that the Germans demolished the crematory buildings before abandoning Auschwitz.<sup>228</sup> Obviously, we must assume that there were at least thirty available, fifteen in both Crematory II and Crematory III, sometime in 1943. Evidence for ovens installed in IV and V consists mainly in the appearance of a labor *Kommando* assigned to these crematories in what is said to be the Birkenau employment roster for May 11, 1944 (the same document the Theresienstadt Jews appear in), plus some witness testimony. The Russians and Poles claimed that each of these crematories had two four-muffle ovens, and that the other two had fifteen muffles each: 46 muffles. The WRB report had specified 36 in both II and III and 18 in IV and V: 108 muffles.<sup>229</sup>

Reitlinger claims 60 muffles by assuming that each crematory had fifteen. His only authority for this is the writings attributed to one Miklos Nyiszli, which we should not accept on anything, least of all a number. The Nyiszli account purports to be a record of personal experiences of a Hungarian Jewish doctor deported to Auschwitz in May 1944. It appeared in French in 1951 in the March-April issues of *Les Temps Modernes*, with a preface by translator T. Kremer. Rassinier has re-

<sup>226</sup> 008-USSR.

<sup>227</sup> NO-4466 in NMT, vol. 5, 624; editor’s note: see C. Mattogno, *op. cit.* (note 224), for an update.

<sup>228</sup> Friedman, 20, 74, 78; Hilberg, 632.

<sup>229</sup> 008-USSR; Central Commission, 88; US-WRB (1944), pt. 1, 14-16; Fyfe, 158; Blumental, 100.

ported on his strenuous subsequent efforts to contact Nyiszli and determine whether or not he actually existed; the only person who seemed unquestionably to exist was translator Kremer.<sup>230</sup> An English translation of Richard Seaver, foreword by Bruno Bettelheim, was published in New York in 1960 under the title *Auschwitz*. Nyiszli was obviously dead by then because it is specified that the copyright is held by “N. Margareta Nyiszli.” As is the usual practice with deceased authors who held doctor’s degrees, the title page of a doctoral thesis, by “Nicolaus Nyiszli,” Breslau 1930, is reproduced in the 1960 NY edition. The book was republished in French and German editions in 1961.

According to Rassinier, it is difficult enough to reconcile the numbers in the various editions, but it is not even possible to get internal consistency in one edition. In the 1960 edition we read (page 55) that the 60 muffles could reduce “several thousand” corpses per day. Further on (page 87) we are told that “when the two (burning pits) were operating simultaneously, their output varied from five to six thousand dead a day, slightly better than the crematoriums,” but then later on (page 92) we learn that Crematoriums II and III could alone dispose of at least 10,500 per day. This is total confusion.

The writings attributed to Nyiszli also commit what I consider the basic witness-disqualifying act; they claim gratuitous regular beatings of initially healthy prisoners by the SS (e.g. pp. 25, 27, 44, 57); it is known that this was not the case. Aside from possible humanitarian objections to such beatings, the prisoners were a source of income to the SS. Many were the complaints, on the part of the SS, against various forms of alleged Farben mistreatment. On the other hand, for security reasons, the SS discouraged fraternization between guards and prisoners. The SS guard was ordered to maintain “distance” (*Abstand*) from the prisoners, not even talking to them unless absolutely necessary. This regulation was of course difficult to enforce and the regular and very frequent infringements of it produced memoranda from Pohl to the camp commanders ordering appropriate and systematic instruction of the guards.<sup>231</sup>

Despite a certain amount of SS guard brutality as reported by authors of other books, Cohen does not report such experiences at Auschwitz and remarks that the “reception ceremony” for his transport “passed without violence.” However, he mentions a specially constructed wooden table used for beating prisoners on the buttocks. This was a formerly regulated mode of punishment of prisoners who committed various offenses in the camps; “intensified” beating was defined as whacking on the *naked* buttocks.<sup>232</sup>

When an Auschwitz witness starts claiming regular gratuitous beating, he may be telling the truth on some matters, but one must reject his general credibility.

On the basis of the available evidence, the best assumption is that there were 30 muffles available at Birkenau in the spring of 1943, and 46 a year later. Before leaving the subject of the number of muffles, we should remark that there are certain ambiguities in the documents relating to the crematoriums. The most obvious is

---

<sup>230</sup> Rassinier (1962), 245-249.

<sup>231</sup> DuBois, 221. NO-1245.

<sup>232</sup> Cohen, 81, 125. See also Fyfe, 159, and Appendix D here.

due to the fact that the WRB report does not seem to be the only source that mistakenly numbers the Birkenau crematories I-IV rather than II-V; the Germans sometimes did this themselves, or so it would appear from, *e.g.*, NO-4466.<sup>233</sup>

The limit on the rate at which people could have been exterminated in a program of the type alleged is not determined by the rate at which people could have been gassed and the gas chambers ventilated, but by the rate at which the bodies could have been cremated. In estimating the capacity of the crematories, it is possible for arithmetic to produce some impressive figures. At that time an hour was a very optimistic time to allow for the reduction of one body, and the body's being wasted would not have made much difference.<sup>234</sup> If we allow for one hour of cleaning and miscellaneous operations per day, one muffle could reduce perhaps 23 bodies per day, so 30 muffles could reduce 690 and 46 could reduce 1058 per day. This could accommodate exterminations at the respectable rate of about 240,000 to 360,000 per year, but of course one must bear in mind that, because the exterminations are supposed to have been halted in the autumn of 1944, Auschwitz could not have had 46 muffles for more than about one year of exterminations.

However, the logic leading to such figures as the preceding is rubbish; things do not work that way. People, especially concentration camp inmates, who manned the crematories, do not work with such efficiency, such equipment cannot be used in such a continuous manner, and equipment needs do not occur with such mathematical regularity in any case. If we allow operations to relax toward something more realistic, taking into account downtime for regular and irregular maintenance and allowing for usual engineering margins of excess capacity we have figures that are generally in line with anticipated epidemic conditions. It is also possible that, as the WRB report asserts, there was a backlog of buried bodies to dispose of.

It is obvious that, given a policy of cremating dead inmates, a vast operation such as Auschwitz would naturally provide relatively elaborate cremation facilities for the purpose. Thus, we again have a fact for dual interpretation if we are to believe the extermination legend; to the commonplace interpretation of these ovens, unquestionably valid, it is proposed that we also accept as valid a second interpretation of exterminations. Below we will examine specific evidence that the number of muffles was completely compatible with the rate of "normal" deaths.

That is not the last fact for dual interpretation that we are offered in connection with the cremations. Höss tells us that "all of the people living in the surrounding communities knew that exterminations were going on" on account of the "foul and nauseating stench from the continuous burning of bodies." If I were to select just two points in the extermination tale to hold up as near proof that the whole thing is a hoax, it would be this point and also the alleged role of Zyklon.

The hydrogenation and other chemical industry that existed at Auschwitz was notorious for creating stenches. Visit the northern part of the New Jersey Turnpike by the Standard Oil (now Exxon) refineries, or any other refineries, to see (or

<sup>233</sup> NMT, vol. 5, 624-625. See also Blumental, 100.

<sup>234</sup> Polson, 138, 143-145.

smell) this.<sup>235</sup> The only significant difference Auschwitz presented, in terms of a stench, is that the coal the Germans started from is by any relevant measure a “dirtier” source than crude oil. If we are told that 30 to 46 bodies being reduced in modern crematories could even compete with, much less overwhelm, this stench of industrial origin then we know that what is involved here is not a fact for dual interpretation but an obvious lie. Actually, on account of the furor of phony objections raised by various fanatics in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, cremation had been developed so that it was a rather “clean” process.<sup>236</sup> Höss cannot be believed.

The analysis has revealed a previously unsuspected but nearly inevitable attribute of the great hoax: the excess fact. Following the principle that his story should involve mostly or almost entirely valid fact, the author of the hoax easily slips into the error of including *as much fact as possible* and commits the major blunder we have just seen; the story would obviously have been much better off without *that* “fact.” Of course, it is only on account of the passage of time that it has become a major blunder. At the time it was completely effective on account of an hysterical emotional atmosphere that it is impossible to recapture. DuBois wrote in 1952:<sup>237</sup>

*“On the stand Schneider had said that he never heard of any exterminations, although he recalled going along the main road one day, past a ‘dormant crematorium.’ At that time this ‘dormant’ crematorium was burning corpses at the rate of a thousand a day. The flames shot fifteen meters into the air; the stink pervaded the countryside to the north for forty miles until it joined the stink of the Warsaw crematorium; the fumes would pucker the nose of anyone within half a mile, and Schneider – a scientist with a specially acute sense of smell – had passed within a hundred yards of the place.”*

It does not seem possible that, toward the end of a book, which gives (outside of technical literature) the best available description of the chemical industry at Auschwitz, DuBois could write thus, but there it is. It is not explicable in terms of normal errors of judgment; it is explicable only in terms of hysteria.

It would seem that somebody at the trial would have challenged Höss on this point. There was a challenge, but it was weak and ambiguous. The following exchange occurred near the end of Höss’ testimony (Kaufman was counsel for Kaltenbrunner):<sup>238</sup>

*“THE PRESIDENT: The last sentence of Paragraph 7 is with reference to the foul and nauseating stench. What is your question about that?”*

*DR. KAUFMAN: Whether the population could gather from these things that an extermination of Jews was taking place.*

*THE PRESIDENT: That really is too obvious a question, isn’t it? They could not possibly know who it was being exterminated.*

---

<sup>235</sup> Editor’s note: equipped with modern ecological technology, today’s refineries do no longer produce such an intensive smell.

<sup>236</sup> Polson, 138-139.

<sup>237</sup> DuBois, 340-341.

<sup>238</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 421.

*DR. KAUFMAN: That is enough for me. I have no further questions."*

It is possible that there was a language difficulty at the time of this exchange, and that a misunderstanding existed, and that Kaufman really meant "persons" rather than "Jews" in his question. In any case this episode suggests the utterly irrational atmosphere that must have pervaded the IMT trial; Höss was not caught in a clumsy and transparent lie. It is not possible for us to grasp the spirit of these proceedings except to classify them as a form of hysteria. Speer was there, and he could have seen through this lie easily. Was he effectively asleep, resigned to the futility of opposition? Was he or his lawyer merely being careful to avoid becoming entangled in the extermination question? Only he can tell us; we do not know. All that is certain is that the spirit of the trial was such that even a simple truth such as the true source of the stench, exposing with great deftness that the witness was lying and suggesting the nature of the factual basis for the charges, could not emerge.

The stench was the basis for quite a bit of witness testimony to knowledge of exterminations,<sup>239</sup> and its use at one particular point of the Farben trial, to be discussed on page 226, was not only rather amusing but also revealing and illustrative of an important point to bear in mind when reading the records of these trials. This is discussed later.

In his booklet, Christophersen considered the problem of the factual basis, if any, for references to a pervasive stench at Auschwitz. The only thing he could recall was a blacksmith establishment at Auschwitz I; when horses were being shod, the burning hoofs created a stench, which could be perceived in the immediate neighborhood. Christophersen recognized that this could not account for a stench of the extent claimed in connection with the exterminations.

I communicated with Christophersen on this point, inquiring into the possibility that Christophersen might have forgotten the stench of industrial origin, in searching his memory for some stench that might have approximated the stench of burning flesh. Christophersen recalled no stench of industrial origin. I also communicated with Stäglich, who distinctly recalled only clean and fresh air near Auschwitz.

The recollections of Christophersen and Stäglich are, however, consistent with the theory that the stench of the hoax is none other than the stench associated with the Farben plant. With reference to Fig. 5, the map of the Auschwitz area, Christophersen was quartered at Raisko during his year at Auschwitz and had occasional business at Auschwitz I and Birkenau. Stäglich was quartered in the town of Osiek, which is about 6 miles due south of the town of Oświęcim, and mentions that he visited the "*KZ-Lager Auschwitz*" (presumably meaning Auschwitz I) "three or four times." We do not know exactly where the Farben plants were, but we know that the camp called "Monowitz" was either within or immediately next to the town of Monowitz, and that the camp had been placed there so that it would be close to the Farben plants. In consideration of the locations of the rail lines, rivers and roads in the area, it is probable that the Farben plants were either

---

<sup>239</sup> DuBois, 218, 230, 232.

immediately to the east or to the west of the town Monowitz. If the former, they were four or five miles from Auschwitz I and, thus, people at that camp, at Birkenau, and *a fortiori* at Raisko and Osiek would never have smelled the chemical industry (which was very modest in size compared to a typical American cracking plant). If the Farben plants were immediately to the west of the town, it is possible that people at Auschwitz I might have gotten a whiff now and then when peculiar wind conditions prevailed, but that could not qualify as a *pervasive* stench. Thus, close consideration of the point shows that Christophersen and Stäglich should not have experienced the stench of industrial origin to any extent that they would recall thirty years later. Moreover, the trial at which the pervasive stench was a pervasive feature of witness testimony was the Farben trial, at which most of the Auschwitz related defense witnesses and almost all of the prosecution witnesses were people who either lived near or worked at the Farben plant. Thus, they did indeed experience a stench and testified correctly in this respect, adding only an erroneous interpretation of the stench.

## Back to the ‘Gas Chambers’

The final subject in paragraph 7 is the gas chambers that, except for Höss’ early sealed up huts, are supposed to have been integrated into the crematory buildings. Reitlinger and Hilberg take different approaches to making this claim. Reitlinger interprets NO-4473, whose translation is presented above as it appears in the NMT volume, as evidence for a gas chamber in Crematory II. This is a result of mistranslation.

The crematories at Auschwitz are frequently referred to as “gas ovens” but this is hardly informative since, with the exception of electric crematories which enjoyed a brief existence during the Thirties, all modern crematories consist of “gas ovens,” a fuel-air mixture, which may be considered a “gas,” is introduced into the oven to start, control and finish the burning. The fuel used may be “gas,” town gas or some sort of liquefied gas is popular. Such a crematory is termed “gas-fired” on account of the use of gas as a fuel. Other types are “oil-fired” and “coke- (or coal-)fired,” but all are “gas ovens” because in all three cases it is a fuel-air mixture which is injected under pressure into the oven.<sup>240</sup>

The customary German word for the concept in question here is *Gaskammer*, but the word in NO-4473 which was translated “gas chamber” is *Vergasungskeller*, which Reitlinger also mistranslates as “gassing cellar.”<sup>241</sup> Now the word *Vergasung* has two meanings. The primary meaning (and the only one in a technical context) is gasification, carburetion or vaporization, *i.e.*, turning something into a gas, not applying a gas to something. A *Vergaser* is a carburetor and, while *Vergasung* always means gasification in a technical context, it usually means, specifically, carburetion in such a context.

---

<sup>240</sup> Polson, 137-146.

<sup>241</sup> Reitlinger, 158-159.

There is also a secondary meaning of *Vergasung*, established by military usage in World War I: attacking an enemy with gas. Why the word *Vergasung* was used in this sense is not clear; it may be because the gases used in that war were really dusts and were generated by exploding some chemical into the atmosphere: *Vergasung*.

The translation “gassing cellar” is thus not absolutely incorrect; it is just over-hasty and presumptuous. A “gas oven” requires some sort of gasification or carburization. In the case of the gas-fired ovens of Utting and Rogers in 1932:<sup>242</sup>

*“Burners set in the crown and sole of the furnace are fed by a mixture of air and gas under pressure; the mixture is regulated by fans, housed in a separate building. Separate control of both air and gas provides better regulation of the furnace temperature.”*

That building is just a big carburetor. Oil-fired crematories are so similar in design that most gas-fired ovens can be easily adapted for use with oil.

The ovens at Birkenau seem to have been coke or coal-fired,<sup>243</sup> and with this type there is an extra stage of fuel processing due to the initially solid state of the fuel. The two most common methods of producing fuel gases from coal or coke are, first, by passing air through a bed of burning coke to produce “coke oven gas” and second, by passing steam through the coke to produce “water gas.”<sup>244</sup> The first coke crematories employed what amounted to coke oven gas.<sup>245</sup> Processes for generating such gases are termed *Vergasung* in German, as well as processes of mixing them with air. The coal-fired crematory ovens that W. H. Lawrence saw at the Lublin camp after its capture by the Russians employed equipment, including fans, very similar to that described in the above quotation. Lawrence, incidentally, termed a “gas chamber” what was obviously a steam bath.<sup>246</sup>

In any case, it is obvious that the crematories at Auschwitz required equipment for doing *Vergasung* in order to inject a fuel-air mixture into the ovens and that the translation of NO-4473 should be revised, possibly to “gas generation cellar.” I have confirmed this interpretation of the *Vergasungskeller* with the technically competent sources in Germany. The reasons for installing such equipment in special separate rooms or even buildings are most probably the considerable noise that must be made by the fans and, in coal-fired ovens, the heat of the burning coal.

The primary meaning of the word *Vergasung* is of necessity applicable to document NO-4473. It is written in a technical context; it is a letter from the chief of the Auschwitz construction management to the head of the SS engineering group. It makes reference to a process, *Vergasung*, which is standard with all crematories, and the wording of the letter is such that it is implied that it would normally be peculiar to find bodies in the *Vergasungskeller*, because bodies are normally stored in what is correctly translated as the “cellar used as a mortuary.”

<sup>242</sup> Polson, 142.

<sup>243</sup> 008-USSR; Central Commission, 89.

<sup>244</sup> Johnson & Auth, 259-261.

<sup>245</sup> Polson, 141.

<sup>246</sup> *New York Times* (Aug. 30, 1944), 1.



Document NO-4473 tends, in fact, like so many prosecution documents, to rejection of the prosecution's claims when it is properly understood. We see that in Crematory II there were at least two cellars, a *Leichenkeller* and a *Vergasungskeller*, and that neither was a "gas chamber."

Now NO-4473 is included in the NMT volumes in a *selection* of prosecution evidence from Case 4 (trial of concentration camp administration). One must assume that the prosecution has selected well. Yet this is as close as it has gotten to offering the documentary evidence that "gas chambers" existed in the crematory buildings at Birkenau. The three "gas tight *Türme*" (towers) ordered from DAW in NO-4465<sup>247</sup> are obviously irrelevant.

Hilberg takes a different and even less sound approach. He inexplicably passes over NO-4473 without dealing with the problem it raises; he even quotes from the document without quoting the phrase containing the word "*Vergasungskeller*." He simply declares that the *Leichenkeller* in Crematories II and III and the *Badeanstalten* in Crematories IV and V were, in reality, gas chambers. Absolutely no evidence is offered for this; the documents cited by Hilberg at this point do not speak of gas chambers.<sup>248</sup> The only "evidence" for interpreting the *Leichenkeller* and *Badeanstalten* in this manner is in the affidavits and testimony (June 27 and 28, 1947) in Case 4 of witness (not a defendant) Wolfgang Grosch, an engineer and Waffen-SS major, who "baptized" these as "gas chambers," the existence of Zyklon at Auschwitz being obvious justification for such baptisms.<sup>249</sup> However, Grosch was a very unsteady witness since in affidavits of February 20 and March 5, 1947, he claimed knowledge of the existence of gas chambers, and then on June 26, 1947, the day before he was to testify, he retracted all these statements during interrogation and denied any knowledge of gas chambers.<sup>250</sup> None of Grosch's testimony is reproduced in the NMT volumes, and Hilberg does not cite his testimony or affidavits.

There is no reason to accept, and every reason to reject, the claims regarding the *Leichenkeller* and *Badeanstalten*. As for the *Badeanstalten*, we have observed that a shower for incoming inmates was standard procedure at all German camps, so there must have been showers at Birkenau. Now, according to Fig. 29, the "baths" or *Badeanstalten* associated with Crematories IV and V are near "filtration plants" and also near "Canada," where the clothes of incoming inmates was stored.<sup>251</sup> The "steam bath" was no doubt for disinfesting clothes, either prior to storage or after being temporarily taken away from inmates.<sup>252</sup> If it was a sauna for incoming inmates, the inmates would need a cold shower afterwards in any case. The people remove their clothing near "Canada" and then shower. What

---

<sup>247</sup> NMT, vol. 5, 622-623.

<sup>248</sup> Hilberg, 566.

<sup>249</sup> Grosch's testimony is supposed to be in the Case 4 transcript, 3565-3592, but these pages were missing in the transcript copy I consulted. Presumably he testified in agreement with his affidavit NO-2154.

<sup>250</sup> NO-2154 quoted in Rassiner (1962), 84ff, and also in Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 136. Grosch's precourt wavering is reported in the Ortmann memorandum attached to NO-4406.

<sup>251</sup> Central Commission, 41, 43; Naumann, 194, 254; German edition of Naumann, 540.

<sup>252</sup> IMT, vol. 6, 211.

could be simpler?

No reasonable considerations can make these gas chambers materialize. The claim that the shower baths, which are said to have been housed in the same buildings as some of the crematory ovens, were really gas chambers is just as unfounded as was the identical claim concerning the Dachau shower bath, which existed in the crematory building at that camp.

There is, incidentally, a small amount of doubt whether the shower baths were, indeed, in the same buildings as Crematories IV and V, because the camp plan given in the WRB report has the baths in a separate building. However, the point is of no importance.

This completes the analysis of the points raised in paragraph 7 of the Höss affidavit.

## Why in English?

### Final paragraph

This is a minor point. It seems strange that the Höss affidavit is in English. We are not aware of any evidence that Höss knew the English language but, in common with many Germans, he might have known something about it.

However, a prudent German, signing a document of this importance “voluntarily and without compulsion,” would not be satisfied with an ordinary foreign language ability; he would either have considered himself expert at English or he would have insisted upon a German translation to sign (a request that would necessarily have been honored). Höss was evidently not in a spirit to insist on anything.

There is no doubt that Höss hoped to buy his life by cooperating with the IMT prosecution, and it is most probable that a specific offer was made in this connection. However, Höss’ reward for his services was to be packed off to Poland about a month after his IMT testimony. In Poland he dutifully wrote out an “autobiography” for his captors, wherein he explained that he was just following orders in the exterminations. His reward on this occasion was final; he was “tried” and killed in April 1947. The “autobiography” was published in Polish translation in 1951 and in German and English in 1959.

## The Role of Birkenau

Birkenau, of course, performed the normal functions of a German concentration camp; it quartered inmates for the principal or ultimate aim of exploiting their labor. Thus, when we refer to the “role” of Birkenau, we are referring to a theory that Birkenau was the site of certain very special functions that bear particularly strongly on the matters we have been considering.

The theory, which I consider beyond dispute, is simply that Birkenau was designated to accommodate all persons who were in the non-worker category but were, for whatever reason, the responsibility of the Auschwitz SS administration. Thus, Birkenau was designated to receive the permanently or semi-permanently ill, the dying, the dead, the underage, the overage, those temporarily unassigned to employment, and those for whom Auschwitz served as a transit camp. These categories could have been received either from other camps (including the many small camps in the Kattowitz region) or from incoming transports. This theory is based on the following considerations.

First, as has been noted, Birkenau was clearly the “principal” camp in terms of inmate accommodating functions. Auschwitz I was the “main” camp in an administrative sense, but it was a converted and expanded military barracks, while Birkenau had been designed from the beginning as a much larger camp intended for the specific needs of the SS operations in the area.

Second, it has been noted that people discharged from the Monowitz hospital as unfit for work were sent to Birkenau.

Third, family camps existed at Birkenau (the “gypsy” and “Theresienstadt” camps in Fig. 29). It has been seen that these people had been designated as being “in readiness for transport” during their stays of pre-specified limited duration, so that the obvious interpretation of these family camps is that they were transit camps, comparable to those that existed at Belsen and Westerbork. The destination of transport has been suggested and will be discussed further in Chapter 7.

Fourth, it was only at Birkenau that unusually extensive facilities for disposal of the dead via cremation were constructed.

Fifth, it was quite normal for a very high proportion of Birkenau inmates to be unemployed. In the two years summer 1942 to summer 1944, as Reitlinger remarks, “only a fraction of the starved and ailing Birkenau population had been employed at all.” On April 5, 1944, 15,000 of the 36,000 Birkenau inmates were considered “unable to work,” while only about 3,000 of the 31,000 other prisoners of the Auschwitz area were considered in this category. A month later, two-thirds of the 18,000 inmates of the Birkenau male camp were classed as “immobile,” “unemployable,” and “unassigned” and were quartered in sick and quarantine blocks.<sup>253</sup>

This makes it impossible, of course, to accept the assumption, so often expressed, that to be sick and unemployable and to be sent to Birkenau meant execution. This has been expressed in particular in connection with sick people being sent from Monowitz to Birkenau, the assumption being reinforced by the fact that such inmates’ clothing came back to Monowitz. The return of the clothing, of course, was due to their being transferred from the Farben to the SS budget.<sup>254</sup>

Sixth and last, there was an unusually high death rate at Birkenau, although there are some difficulties in estimating the numbers except at particular times. The first major relevant event is the typhus epidemic of the summer of 1942, which resulted in the closing of the Buna factory for two months starting around

<sup>253</sup> Reitlinger, 125; NO-021 in NMT, vol. 5, 385. See also Fyfe, 729, or Appendix D herein.

<sup>254</sup> DuBois, 192, 220.

August 1. The major evidence of this is the WRB report,<sup>255</sup> but there is confirming evidence. First, there certainly were typhus epidemics at Auschwitz.<sup>256</sup> Second, the data presented by the Dutch Red Cross (Appendix C) shows that the average death rate at the Birkenau men's camp from July 16 to August 19, 1942, was about 186 per day, with the rates toward the end of the period noticeably higher than those toward the beginning. Third, there exists in Amsterdam a single volume of the Birkenau death book (also discussed in the Netherlands Red Cross Report). This volume contains death certificates for the five days September 28 to October 2, 1942. The number of deaths is 1,500, and the causes of death that are given are those typical of typhus epidemic conditions, although Reitlinger seems to consider such recorded causes as "weakness of the heart muscles" and others as "invented [...] fanciful diagnoses of internee doctors, who were trying to save their patients from the 'transport list' or the phenol syringe."<sup>257</sup> In fact, such causes of death are typical with typhus; under the "Typhus Fever" listing in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (eleventh edition) we read:

*"Typhus fever may, however, prove fatal during any stage of its progress and in the early convalescence, either from sudden failure of the heart's action – a condition which is especially apt to arise – from the supervention of some nervous symptoms, such as meningitis or of deepening coma, or from some other complication, such as bronchitis. Further, a fatal result sometimes takes place before the crisis from sheer exhaustion, particularly in the case of those whose physical or nervous energies have been lowered by hard work, inadequate nourishment and sleep, or intemperance."*

On account of the policy of sending sick people to Birkenau it appears that the victims of the typhus epidemic got recorded as Birkenau deaths, regardless of where they had been working. The WRB report claims that there were fifteen to twenty thousand deaths at Auschwitz during the two or three months of the epidemic.<sup>258</sup> Despite the unreliability of the source the claim seems consistent, at least in order of magnitude, with such other information as we have concerning this period at Auschwitz (although there is probably at least some exaggeration). It is also the case, as we shall see below, that the summer of 1942 was by far the worst at Auschwitz.

Incidentally, the "phenol syringe" which Reitlinger mentions comes up in so many places in the literature that it appears to have been real; mortally ill concentration camp inmates were sometimes killed by phenol injections into the heart.<sup>259</sup>

The fact of a very high death rate at Auschwitz during the summer of 1942 is, of course, at best only indirectly material to an "extermination" problem because these were recorded deaths from normal reasons, not exterminations carried out in attempted secrecy. They also have nothing to do with Jews as such, although

<sup>255</sup> US-WRB (1944), pt. 1, 30, 32; Reitlinger, 122.

<sup>256</sup> DuBois, 209.

<sup>257</sup> Reitlinger, 122-123. The death book is at the *Rijksinstituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie*, and is discussed by the Netherlands Red Cross, vol. 1, 8-12.

<sup>258</sup> US-WRB (1944), pt. 1, 32.

<sup>259</sup> E.g. Burney, 108-109.

some of the victims were Jews.

Reitlinger considers the high death rate at Auschwitz and offers an estimate of 160 to 179 deaths per day as a normal rate. However, the data he employs is essentially that which applies to the summer of 1942, which was a particularly catastrophic period. In the connection with these high death rates we should observe the fact that the extermination mythologists Reitlinger and Hilberg make much over such happenings at Auschwitz, although they recognize the distinction between high death rates and exterminations. It is therefore remarkable, indeed almost incredible, that they do not consider the possibility that the crematories existed on account of these high death rates. On the contrary, they both treat the crematories as having been provided primarily to serve in the extermination program.

In establishments that were supposed to be providing desperately needed labor these high death rates were naturally intolerable, so in late 1942 a special campaign got under way to reduce the concentration camp death rate and on December 28, 1942, Himmler ordered that the rate "be reduced at all costs."<sup>260</sup> On January 20, 1943, Glücks, in a circular letter to all concentration camp commanders, ordered that "every means must be used to lower the death rate." On March 15, 1943, Pohl wrote Himmler that:<sup>261</sup>

*"[...] the state of health [...] of the prisoners sent in by the administration of Justice is catastrophic. In all camps a loss of between at least 25-30 per cent is to be reckoned with [...] till now there were 10,191 prisoners [...] of which 7,587 were assigned to [...] Mauthausen-Gusen. From these the deaths totaled 3,853; 3,306 of them died in Mauthausen-Gusen. The reason [...] must presumably be that the many prisoners [...] who have been in prisons for years are suffering from physical debility owing to the transfer to a different milieu [...] a great number of tuberculosis patients were also delivered."*

On April 10, 1943, Pohl requested Himmler's approval of the draft of a letter to the Reich Minister of Justice. The letter, approved and presumably sent, points out that of 12,658 prisoners transferred to concentration camps, 5,935 had died by April 1. Pohl complained in the letter that these:

*"[...] shockingly high mortality figures are due to the fact that the prisons transferring them have literally released inmates who were in the worst possible physical condition [and] that in spite of all medical efforts the [...] death of the prisoners cannot be retarded. [...] I do not wish to support a quarantine station in the concentration camps. [...]"*

What seems involved here is inter-departmental rivalry or, at least, conflict of interest. The prisons of Germany no doubt had their own economic-productive aspects and were not only reluctant to part with their more healthy prisoners but also eager to part with the more sickly ones.

We do not know whether or not Pohl managed to get more cooperation from the prison system. However, on September 30, 1943, he was able to report progress, due mainly to hygienic, nutritional, and procedural measures; he presented

<sup>260</sup> Reitlinger, 127; 2172-PS.

<sup>261</sup> NO-1523 and NO-1285 in NMT, vol. 5, 372-376.

**Table 6: Death cases in the concentration camps, July 1942 to June 1943**

MONTH	INMATES	DEATHS	PERCENT	MONTH	INMATES	DEATHS	PERCENT
July	98,000	8,329	8.50	Jan	123,000	9,839	8.00
Aug.	115,000	12,217	10.62	Feb.	143,000	11,650	8.14
Sept.	110,000	11,206	10.19	March	154,200	12,112	7.85
Oct.	85,800	8,856	10.32	April	171,000	8,358	4.71
Nov.	83,500	8,095	9.69	May	203,000	5,700	2.80
Dec.	88,000	8,800	10.00	June	199,500	5,650	2.83

the Reichsführer-SS the following two tables with a promise that, allowing for the onset of the cold weather, the results achieved would be of a permanent nature.<sup>262</sup>

Thus, after more than a half year of a campaign to reduce the death rate in the camps, Auschwitz still had about 80 per day on the average. Because, as had been seen, almost all the “unable to work” were at Birkenau, it is certain that almost all of these deaths occurred there.

Auschwitz also seems to have received some rather bad selections of inmates from other concentration camps.<sup>263</sup>

The Netherlands Red Cross report on Auschwitz (vol. 2) also offers some data on the death rates at Auschwitz for 1942-1943. For the period October 30, 1942, to February 25, 1943, the death rate is specified as about 360 per week on the average, and about 185 per week for the period February 26 to July 1, 1943. It is also said that a total of 124 of the Dutch Jews who entered Birkenau in July-August 1942 (mentioned above) died in the period October 30, 1942, to July 1, 1943. However, their figures for total deaths seem somewhat low and difficult to reconcile with the data presented above, so there may be some error or misunderstanding here.

It is perfectly obvious that these deaths, however deplorable and whatever the nature and location of the responsibility, had nothing to do with extermination or with Jews as such. From the point of view of the higher SS administration, they were “catastrophic” and efforts were made to bring them under control. It is not at all remarkable that with such death rates, cremation and mortuary facilities anticipating worst period death rates of even hundreds per day existed at Auschwitz.

The Auschwitz death rate improved but slightly during the course of the war. During 1944, when the inmate population of the camp had expanded to 100,000 or more (probably on account of territorial losses in the east which forced evacuations of labor camps), the death rate was 350 to 500 per week at Birkenau (which, as we have seen, accounted for almost the entire Auschwitz death rate).<sup>264</sup>

It is a tragic fact that, even in modern times, “camps” established during war-time have amounted to death traps for many sent to them. The basic causes for such conditions have been similar: people thrown together chaotically in hastily organized camps, with inadequate sanitary measures and an uncertain situation as regards food and other supplies. Thus, during the American Civil War, the POW

<sup>262</sup> 1469-PS in NMT, vol. 5, 379-382.

<sup>263</sup> NO-1935 in NMT, vol. 5, 366-367.

<sup>264</sup> Fyfe, 729, or Appendix D herein. Case 6 transcript, 14326.

**Table 7: Death cases in the concentration camps for the month of August 1943**

CONCENTRATION CAMP	INMATES	DEATHS	PERCENT		
			AUGUST	JULY	CHANGE
Dachau	17,300	40	0.23	0.32	-0.09
Sachsenhausen	26,500	194	0.73	0.78	-0.05
Buchenwald	17,600	118	0.67	1.22	-0.55
Mauthausen-Gusen	21,100	290	1.37	1.61	-0.24
Flossenbürg	4,800	155	3.23	3.27	-0.04
Neuengamme	9,800	150	1.53	2.14	-0.61
Auschwitz (men)	48,000	1,442	3.00	2.96	+0.04
Auschwitz (women)	26,000	938	3.61	5.15	-1.54
Gross-Rosen	5,000	76	1.52	2.69	-1.17
Natzweiler	2,200	41	1.87	1.63	+0.24
Bergen-Belsen	3,300	4	0.12	0.39	-0.27
Stutthof (men)	3,800	131	3.45	5.69	-2.24
Stutthof (women)	500	1	0.20	0.00	+0.20
Lublin (men)	11,500	882	7.67	4.62	+3.05
Lublin (women)	3,900	172	4.41	2.01	+2.40
Ravensbrück (men)	3,100	26	0.84	0.76	+0.08
Ravensbrück (women)	14,100	38	0.27	0.24	+0.03
Riga Herzogenbusch	3,000	1	0.03	0.33	-0.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>224,000</b>	<b>4,669</b>			
Overall average for August 1943:			<b>2.09</b>		
Overall average for July 1943:				<b>2.23</b>	
Decrease:					<b>-0.14</b>

camps in the North such as Rock Island and Camp Douglas experienced death rates of 2%-4% per month. These figures were even exceeded in camps in the south such as Florence, where diarrhea and scurvy caused 20 to 50 deaths per day, in a prisoner population of about 12,000. Conditions at Andersonville were even worse, and 13,000 of the 50,000 Union POWs who were interned there perished.<sup>265</sup>

During the 1899-1902 Boer War in South Africa, about 120,000 non-combatant white Boers and 75,000 black Africans were placed in British concentration camps. For about a year, the Boer mortality rate ranged from 120 to 340 deaths per thousand per year (1.1% to 3.4% per month) while the Boer infant mortality rate, due chiefly to epidemics of measles, was as high as 600 per thousand per year (7.35% per month). About 20,000 Boer women and children died in these camps.<sup>266</sup> During World War I, the Germans mixed Russian POWs with those of other nationalities, resulting in typhus epidemics in their POW camps; conditions were strikingly similar to those experienced in the World War II con-

<sup>265</sup> Hesseltine, 152, 156, 192, 203; *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 1, 960.

<sup>266</sup> Amery, vol. 5, 252, 253, 601; vol. 6, 24, 25.

centration camps.<sup>267</sup> We have seen that Russians were used as labor at the concentration camps, especially at Auschwitz, so they were no doubt one of the principal sources of typhus. Because they were not considered regular concentration camp inmates, it is not clear whether or not they were included in the camp death figures which were reviewed above. However, it is certain that they contributed to the overall death rates at the camps, and that their bodies were disposed of in the same crematories, but numbers are not available.

A ridiculous feature of all this, as it strikes the student of the subject, appears in NMT volume 5, which summarizes Case 4, “U.S. vs. Pohl.” In section B, “The Concentration Camp System,” we are presented with documents which show that the camps experienced remarkably high death rates. These have just been summarized above. Then in section E, “The Extermination Program,” we are presented with documents showing that the Germans were building crematories at these camps at the time of the high death rates. Apparently it is believed that nobody would actually read one of these volumes, or maybe the compilers of the volumes did not read them!

Taking into account the different death rates, we can see that the number of muffles at Auschwitz was completely comparable to those which existed at camps where there were no exterminations. In 1942, crematories were constructed at Dachau and at Sachsenhausen; each contained four muffles. At Dachau, a crematory consisting of two muffles had existed prior to 1942, and the older crematory continued to be used after 1942. It is most likely that the same situation with respect to an earlier crematory held at Sachsenhausen. At Buchenwald, the pre-war cremation facilities were those, which existed in the nearby towns of Weimar and Jena. After the war started, crematories were constructed at the camp, and by the end of 1941, Buchenwald had a two tripple-muffle oven crematory. It appears that the Weimar crematory continued to be used until the end of the war.<sup>268</sup> It is also possible that concentration camp crematories, whether at Auschwitz, Dachau, or elsewhere, were used to dispose of the bodies of people who had nothing to do with the camps (*e.g.* Russian POWs).

This, then, is our view of the “death camp” aspect of the Nazi concentration camps. It is a view which does not harmonize with those of Christophersen and of Stäglich, who saw no high death rates and are not convinced that there existed extensive cremation facilities at Auschwitz. Our view is based on the relevant prosecution documents and comparable material, and their views are based on their observations at Auschwitz in 1944. It may seem that their observations are more to be trusted than the documentary material, but I believe that a careful consideration of the matter resolves the point in favor of our theory, while not denying their observations.

It is true that there exists a possibility of forged documents; indeed, it is more than a possibility. We shall see that there was considerable forgery of documents at Nuremberg. However, it does not appear that the documents dealing with

<sup>267</sup> *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 12th ed., vol. 32 (third volume supplementing 11th ed.), 157.

<sup>268</sup> Komitee der Antifaschistischen, 86; M.J. Smith, 95; NO-3863 and NO-3860 in NMT, vol. 5, 613-616; Internationales Buchenwald-Komitee, 206-207 and Fig. 55; Musiol, Figs. 88-91.



deaths in the camps and with the constructions of crematories were forged, for the simple reason that there is absolutely nothing about extermination in them, as the reader can verify by consulting the “selections” of documents in NMT volume 5. They speak of a very high death rate, at certain times, in penal institutions (concentration camps), which a relatively small country, fighting against overwhelming odds for its existence, was attempting to exploit for labor. That high death rates might have been one consequence is perfectly plausible.

While the documents we have reviewed say nothing of extermination, they are nevertheless somewhat unsatisfactory in the sense that one does not get a full picture from them in regard to the causes of the death rates and the specific victims involved. The unhealthy prisoners contributed by the Ministry of Justice do not explain everything. The picture must be guessed and inferred, so here we will offer our impressions.

German concentration camps during the Thirties had only punitive and security functions, and no economic function. After the war with Russia got started, the camps underwent rapid expansion and also assumed their economic roles. Thus in 1942, there were three things happening in the camps:

(a) the rapid expansion was accompanied by the general chaos, unanticipated problems, and organizational difficulties which are common when large new enterprises are put into operation; this is particularly true of Auschwitz, which was a new camp in the process of rapidly expanding into the largest of all camps;

(b) the continued German victories and advances in Russia resulted in hordes of Russian POWs, some of whom were absorbed by the camps;

(c) unhealthy prisoners were contributed by the Ministry of Justice.

There were probably other problems, but these three factors seem to me sufficient to explain a high death rate in late 1942 – early 1943.

By late 1943 the death rate, while still deplorably high, was relatively under control as compared to the previous year and remained under control until the collapse at the end of the war. The statement of the Birkenau camp commander (Appendix D) indicates that at Auschwitz, by 1944, the deaths occurred primarily among ordinary criminals who had been transferred out of prisons. I have seen no documents, comparable to those we have reviewed, which deal with high death rates for late 1943 or any later period.

Now we are in a position to consider the observations of Christophersen and of Stäglich, which included neither crematories nor a high death rate at Auschwitz. Very simple considerations support their observations. First, deaths are naturally not things that the Auschwitz camp administration would have advertised; both the deaths and the associated cremations would naturally have been concealed to the extent that such concealment was possible. Thus in mid-1943, Pohl complained to concentration camp commanders that, too commonly, crematory buildings were situated in excessively public locations where “all kinds of people” could “gaze” at them. In response to Pohl’s complaint, Höss had a belt of trees planted around Crematories II and III. Moreover, it was the policy to carry

corpses to the crematory only in the evening.<sup>269</sup> That Christophersen and Stäglich, who had only slight contacts with Birkenau, were unaware of the existence of a high death rate or of large crematories, is perfectly understandable.

The role that Birkenau plays in the hoax is very simple. Like any large industrial operation, Auschwitz was organized in a systematic manner thought to be of the greatest efficiency. The unemployed were quartered at Birkenau. Thus, the transit camps, to be discussed again in Chapter 7, were at Birkenau. This explains the existence of the gypsy and Jewish camps there. Also, the sick and the very sick and the dying and, perhaps, the dead were sent to Birkenau, and such concentration of the ill naturally meant that Birkenau was a “death camp,” complete with mortuary and cremation facilities, if one chooses to describe things thus. Indeed, of the order of one-half of all of the deaths in the entire German concentration camp system for 1942-1944 occurred at Birkenau. While the whole thing looks quite foolish when examined closely, as we have done in these chapters, the propaganda inventors obviously made a very rational choice in deciding to claim Birkenau as an extermination camp. The death rate in the concentration camp system was very high; it was near its highest at Auschwitz, which was the largest German concentration camp, and the Auschwitz deaths were concentrated at Birkenau.

## Summary for Auschwitz

In the introduction to this chapter it was promised that the Auschwitz extermination legend would be shown to possess the basic trademark of the great hoax: the need for a dual interpretation of facts. This is true in every significant respect conceivable:

1. Zyklon was employed for disinfestation and also allegedly for exterminations.
2. The “selections” were necessary by the nature of the operations at Auschwitz and also allegedly for exterminations.
3. It would not have been inaccurate (although perhaps somewhat misleading) to call Birkenau a “death camp,” especially at certain times (and especially when the Baruch Committee was in existence and immediately thereafter); it was also allegedly an “extermination camp.”
4. Disrobing – showering procedures were followed for delousing and also allegedly for exterminations.
5. Conventional crematories existed for accommodating both the death camp role and alleged extermination camp role of Birkenau.
6. Some *Leichenkeller* were mortuaries while it is alleged that others were, in reality, “gas chambers.” The two types of *Leichenkeller* were in proximate locations at Birkenau.
7. Some *Badeanstalten* were bath establishments while it is alleged that others

<sup>269</sup> Documents NO-1242 and NO-4463, cited by Hilberg, 566; Fyfe, 731 or Appendix D herein.

were, in reality, “gas chambers.” The two types of *Badeanstalten* were in proximate locations at Birkenau.

8. The stench that the people of the area experienced was due not only to the hydrogenation and other chemical processes at Auschwitz but also allegedly to the cremations.

Actually in view of the points made in the analysis, it is only charity to say that there are proposed dual interpretation of fact in connection with these eight points. The proposed interpretations of extermination are obvious lies and the last, concerning the stench, is the “excess fact”; the authors of the hoax should never have used the fact of the stench in their story.

The facts in contradiction to the claims, the inconsistencies and the implausibilities have been reviewed. Himmler gives his orders directly to Höss, but leaves the means to the ingenuity of Höss. The interview emphatically took place in the summer of 1941; on the other hand it must have taken place in the summer of 1942, so Höss started improvising half a year after the plans for the four crematories which were used in the exterminations were formulated. The crematories were not left to the ingenuity of Höss. Or something. Jewish families with children reside for months at Birkenau, their quarters having been previously disinfested with the same chemical product they are supposed to have been killed with on entering, but they will be killed with it later. Or something.

The analysis of Auschwitz is not complete. Although it may seem that the promised “crushing blow” has been delivered, the material of this chapter was not what was being referred to when that expression was used in the introduction to the chapter. Our analysis has, thus far, focused on happenings at Auschwitz and has not considered the fate of any specific nationality group of Jews at Auschwitz. For the sake of thoroughness this must be done, and we can think of no better case for emphasis than that which the bearers of the legend have selected themselves: the Hungarian Jews, whose fate or whatever it should be called will be examined in the next chapter, with special regard for the Auschwitz claims.

# Chapter 5: The Hungarian Jews

## The International Red Cross

Because the Germans and their allies allowed the Red Cross, both the International Committee (ICRC) and the various national societies, a not negligible liberty to operate in Axis-controlled Europe, it developed that the ICRC was able to report a great deal concerning the European Jews. The reports of such a neutrally-situated organization are naturally of great importance in connection with our problem.

We say “neutrally situated” rather than “neutral” because there is no such thing as strict political neutrality; every organization is subject to political pressures. It is a question of degree.

Two ICRC publications are of major interest to us. The first is *Documents sur l'activité du CICR en faveur des civils détenus dans les camps de concentration en Allemagne (1939-1945)*, Geneva, 1947. This is a collection of document reprints, the documents being correspondence between the ICRC and various governments and Red Cross societies, and also reports of ICRC delegates to the ICRC itself. Commentary sufficient only to interpret the documents is provided by the Red Cross. The publication is invaluable and had been cited several times in this book. Another 1947 publication was *Inter Arma Caritas*, but this was primarily a public relations effort.

The second important publication is the three volume *Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross on its Activities During the Second World War*, Geneva, 1948. This has the form of a historical report; quotations from documents appear only occasionally. Below is reproduced in full an excerpt from volume 1, namely pages 641-657. I believe that some political pressures are evident in the excerpt of the *Report*, but it will not be necessary for the reader to share my notions regarding the specific manifestations of these pressures in the excerpt in order to accept the major conclusion that I draw from the excerpt. However, some obvious urgent questions will arise during the first reading, and all that can be said here is that two points should be kept in mind.

First, this *Report* was published in 1948, at a time when the authors could not have failed, especially in view of the politically sensitive nature of the subject matter, to be thoroughly familiar with the Allied claims, exhaustively aired at the war crimes trials and in the press, regarding the fate of the European Jews. We expect no careless remarks here. Second, we are not consulting the ICRC as a general sort of authority. That is to say, we are interested only in the reports that fall within the ICRC area of competence. It had delegations in various European

countries that were heavily involved in Jewish affairs, and what we want to know is what, insofar as the ICRC was able to observe, happened to these Jews. Our emphasis, in fact, is on the Jews of Slovakia (Eastern Czechoslovakia), Croatia (Northern Yugoslavia) and Hungary. In a way our interest is even more narrow; we are interested in Hungary, but the other two lands are contiguous, and to the extent that the Germans controlled things, there was no reason for major differences in Jewish policy.

From a numerical point of view, it might seem that Poland should be selected as the key country in the problem. However, the fact remains that Hungary is the key because the creators of the legend chose to emphasize Hungary and not Poland in offering evidence for their claims. They offer no evidence for exterminations of Polish Jews, apart from witness testimony and the general extermination camp claims, which the analysis has already demolished. By a happy circumstance, it is possible to consult the reports of the ICRC to learn what happened in Hungary, but this is not the case with Poland. The reason for this is that the Germans did not permit the ICRC to involve itself in Jewish affairs in countries in which they considered themselves sovereign. However, the allies of Germany that were considered independent states admitted the ICRC into Jewish affairs. Thus develops the central importance of Hungary in the examination of the legend.

There are other respects in which the *Report* excerpt is of the greatest importance in our study, but this point is more effectively made in Chapters 6 and 7 (pp. 242, 258, 265).

The *Report* excerpt is reproduced in full here because it is written in such a way that it is difficult to cite on specific points without risking the possibility of being accused of distorting meaning. This will be more clear after the reading:

**“VI. Special Categories of Civilians**

**(A). JEWS**

*Under National Socialism the Jews had become in truth outcasts, condemned by rigid racial legislation to suffer tyranny, persecution and systematic extermination. No kind of protection shielded them; being neither PW nor civilian internees, they formed a separate category, without the benefit of any Convention. The supervision which the ICRC was empowered to exercise in favour of prisoners and internees did not apply to them. In most cases, they were, in fact, nationals of the State which held them in its power and which, secure in its supreme authority, allowed no intervention in their behalf. These unfortunate citizens shared the same fate as political deportees, were deprived of civil rights, were given less favoured treatment than enemy nationals, who at least had the benefit of a statute. They were penned into concentration camps and ghettos, recruited for forced labour, subjected to grave brutalities and sent to death camps, without anyone being allowed to intervene in those matters which Germany and her allies considered to be exclusively within the bounds of their home policy.*

*It should be recalled, however, that in Italy the measures taken against the Jews were incomparably less harsh, and that in the countries under the direct influence of Germany, their situation was usually less tragic than in Germany*

itself.

*The Committee could not dissociate themselves from these victims, on whose behalf it received the most insistent appeals, but for whom the means of action seemed especially limited, since in the absence of any basis in law, its activities depended to a very great extent upon the good will of the belligerent States.*

*The Committee had in fact, through the intermediary of the German Red Cross, asked for information concerning civilian deportees 'without distinction of race or religion,' which was plainly refused in the following terms: 'The responsible authorities decline to give any information concerning non-Aryan deportees.' Thus, enquiries as a matter of principle concerning the Jews led to no result, and continual protests would have been resented by the authorities concerned and might have been detrimental both to the Jews themselves and to the whole field of the Committee's activities. In consequence, the Committee, while avoiding useless protest, did its utmost to help the Jews by practical means, and its delegates abroad were instructed on these lines. This policy was proved by the results obtained.*

*Germany. – Even when the German Wehrmacht was winning, the Committee's activities in behalf of the Jews met with almost insupportable difficulties. Towards the end of 1943, however, the German authorities allowed the Committee to send relief parcels to detainees in concentration camps, many of them Jews, whose names and addresses might be known to it. The Committee was able to collect a few dozen names, and by these slender means the system of individual and then collective relief for political detainees was started, an account of which is given elsewhere in this Report. Each receipt returned bore several names, and these were added to the list of addresses: thus the receipts often gave the first news of missing persons. By the end of the war, the Committee's card index for political detainees (Jewish and non-Jewish) contained over 105,000 names.*

*During the last year of the War, the Committee's delegates were able to visit the camp of Theresienstadt (Terezin), which was exclusively used for Jews, and was governed by special conditions. From information gathered by the Committee, this camp had been started as an experiment by certain leaders of the Reich, who were apparently less hostile to the Jews than those responsible for the racial policy of the German government. These men wished to give to Jews the means of setting up a communal life in a town under their own administration and possessing almost complete autonomy. On several occasions, the Committee's delegates were granted authority to visit Theresienstadt, but owing to difficulties raised by the local authorities, the first visit only took place in June 1944. The Jewish elder in charge informed the delegate, in the presence of a representative of the German authorities, that thirty-five thousand Jews resided in the town and that living conditions were bearable. In view of the doubt expressed by the heads of various Jewish organizations as to the accuracy of this statement, the Committee requested the German government to allow its delegates to make a second visit. After laborious negotia-*

tions, much delayed on the German side, two delegates were able to visit the camp on April 6, 1945. They confirmed the favourable impression gained on the first visit, but ascertained that the camp strength now amounted only to 20,000 internees, including 1,100 Hungarians, 11,050 Slovaks, 800 Dutch, 290 Danes, 8000 Germans, 8000 Czechs and 760 stateless persons. They were therefore anxious to know if Theresienstadt was being used as a transit camp and asked when the last departures for the East had taken place. The head of the Security Police of the Protectorate stated that the last transfers to Auschwitz had occurred six months previously, and had comprised 10,000 Jews, to be employed on camp administration and enlargement. This high official assured the delegates that no Jews would be deported from Theresienstadt in future.

Whereas other camps exclusively reserved for Jews were not open to inspections for humanitarian purposes until the end, the Committee's activities were at least effective in several concentration camps containing a minority proportion of Jews. During the final months, the Committee, in urgent circumstances, took on a task of the greatest importance by visiting and giving aid to these internees, providing food, preventing last-minute evacuations as well as summary executions, and even taking charge during the critical hours, sometimes days, which passed between the retreat of the German forces and the arrival of the Allies from the West or the East.

A more detailed account of these various activities is given in the chapters on Political Detainees in this volume and in Vol. III, as well as in special publication entitled Documents sur l'activité du CICR en faveur des civils détenus dans les camps de concentration en Allemagne, 1939-1945.

Less is known of the part played by the Committee in countries whose governments were subject, in varying degrees, to German influence and where special laws concerning Jews had been enacted, similar to those under German legislation.

Through its delegates, particularly in Budapest, Bucharest, Bratislava, Zagreb and Belgrade, the Committee was able to make the best possible use of its moral authority and the well disposed attitude shown to it by a few non-German authorities, who had more or less freedom of action, but who were not so relentlessly bent on carrying out a racial policy as the German government. In its capacity as a neutral intermediary, the Committee was in a position to transfer and distribute in the form of relief supplies over twenty million Swiss francs collected by Jewish welfare organizations throughout the world, in particular by the American Joint Distribution Committee of New York. Without the help of the ICRC, this concerted effort made by a whole community would have doubtless been vain, as no Jewish organization was allowed to act in countries under German control. A detailed account of this important relief scheme will be found in Vol. III.

The efforts of the Committee were not limited to the activities described above; as time went on, it eventually became in truth a 'Protecting Power' for the Jews, by interceding with governments in their behalf and in some cases

*exercising a genuine right of protection, by obtaining the benefit of extraterritoriality for hospitals, dispensaries and relief organizations, and even by acting as arbitrators in the settlement of disputes. This was its task, especially in Rumania and Hungary, for over a year during the last phase of the war in 1944 and 1945. In countries where the efforts of the Committee were less considerable, they were none the less of great benefit to the Jews. These may be described in a brief summary before reverting to the Committee's activities in Hungary and Rumania.*

*France. – In November 1940, the Committee obtained permission from the authorities for one of its members to visit camps in the South, where a certain number of Jews were amongst the civilian internees. The camp at Gurs, in particular, contained six thousand Jews from the Bavarian Palatinate. The visit gave a clear idea of the situation inside the camp and the urgent necessity for relief; appropriate steps were taken in the internees' behalf.*

*The Jews from Poland who, whilst in France, had obtained entrance-permits to the United States were held to be American citizens by the German occupying authorities, who further agreed to recognize the validity of about three thousand passports issued to Jews by the consulates of South American countries. The persons concerned were lodged in camps reserved for Americans at Vittel. In 1942, when Germany and the States in South America began negotiations for the exchange of internees, it was found that the majority of the internees at Vittel held accommodation passports and consequently were in danger of being deported. The ICRC interceded in their behalf through the Berlin Delegation and succeeded in arranging for them to remain at Vittel, only a few being deported.*

*Greece. – Immediately after the German occupation, the Committee was called upon to deal with the case of 55,000 Jews in Salonica, who were the victims of racial legislation. In July 1942, all men between eighteen and forty-five were registered, and the majority were enrolled in labour detachments. The delegation furnished them with medical and toilet supplies. In May 1943, these workers were sent to Germany, and the delegation in that country insisted on the right to give them food-parcels. This course led to difficulties with the German authorities, who in their resentment demanded that one of the delegates should be replaced.*

*Slovakia. – Many thousands of Jews had been forced to leave the country and enlist in what was called 'labour service,' but which in fact seems to have led the greater number to the extermination camps. At the same time, a large proportion of the Jewish minority had permission to stay in the country, and at certain periods Slovakia was even looked upon as a comparative haven of refuge for Jews, especially for those coming from Poland. Those who remained in Slovakia seemed to have been in comparative safety until the end of August 1944, when a rising against the German forces took place. While it is true that the law of May 15, 1942, had brought about the internment of several thousand Jews, these people were held in camps where the conditions of food and lodging were tolerable, and where internees were allowed to do paid work on*



terms almost equal to those of the free labour market. In 1944, the Jewish community had managed to secure an almost complete suspension of forced immigration towards the territories under German control.

At the time of the rising, the interned Jews escaped from the camps; some returned home, and others took to the hills. The measures of repression which followed fell on the Jewish population as a whole. The German military authorities summoned the Slovak government to make wholesale arrests for the purpose of deporting the Jews to Germany. The order dated November 16, 1944, laid down that all Jews should be mustered in the camp of Sereď, and to that end, that Jews living in the capital should previously be assembled, on November 20, in the Town Hall of Bratislava. On the same day, the delegate went to the Town hall and noted that only about fifty Jews had obeyed the summons. The rest had gone into hiding, as the Slovak authorities had foreseen, either by fleeing to the country or concealing themselves in the town in the so-called 'bunkers.' In his concern over this situation, the President of the ICRC wrote to the Head of the Slovak government asking him to put an end to the deportations. Monsignor Tiso received this letter on January 2, 1945, and answered at length on January 10. He recalled the fact that up to that time the Jews had been spared, adding however that in view of the rising, his government had been forced to yield to the pressure which had been brought to bear upon them. He concluded by saying: 'To sum up, it remains wholly true that in the solution of the Jewish question, we have endeavoured to remain faithful to humane principles to the full extent of our powers.' Official aid to the fugitives in the 'bunkers' was out of the question; the delegation in Bratislava, however, with the help of the Slovak Red Cross and, in the provinces with that of the Catholic Church, succeeded in providing them with funds, which were handed to their spokesmen, and which allowed them to support life during the last months of the war.

The Committee's representative was unable to secure permission to visit the camp of Sereď. He was, however, allowed to enter the camp of Marienka, where Jews of alien nationality were interned.

Croatia. – From May 1943 to the end of 1945, the delegation gave aid to the Jewish community of Zagreb, to whom on behalf of the Joint Committee of New York, it paid out an average amount of 20,000 Swiss francs monthly. It also made available to it considerable quantities of food supplies, clothing and medical stores.

In October 1944, the German authorities, on the pattern of measures taken in the neighbouring countries, imprisoned the Jews of Zagreb, and seized their food stores. The delegation at once made representations to the Croat government, and secured the return of these stores.

Hungary. – As in Slovakia, the Jews were relatively spared, in so far as the local government retained a certain freedom of action. But when German pressure was reasserted, from March 1944 onwards, the position of the Jews became critical. The replacement in October 1944, of Horthy's government by one in bondage to Germany, provoked a violent crisis; executions, robberies,

deportations, forced labour, imprisonments – such was the lot of the Jewish population, which suffered cruelly and lost many killed, especially in the provinces. It was at this point that the Committee, to alleviate these sufferings, took action with vigour and authority. At the same time the aid prompted by the King of Sweden, was given with considerable courage and success by the Swedish Legation in Budapest, helped by some members of the Swedish Red Cross.

Until March 1944, Jews who had the privilege of visas for Palestine were free to leave Hungary. On March 18, 1944, Hitler summoned the Regent, Admiral Horthy, to his headquarters. He expressed his indignation that ‘in Hungary very nearly a million Jews were able to live in freedom and without restrictions.’ Even before the Regent had returned to Budapest, German troops had begun the occupation of Hungary in order to prevent her from abandoning her alliance with Germany. This occupation forced upon the Head of the Hungarian State a new government that was far more dependent on German authority than the one preceding it. Emigration of the Jews was straightway suspended, and the persecutions began.

This was a matter of the gravest concern to the ICRC. The President appealed to the Regent, Admiral Horthy: ‘The matters brought to our knowledge seem to us,’ he wrote on July 5, 1944, ‘so utterly contrary to the chivalrous traditions of the great Hungarian people that it is difficult for us to credit even a tithe of the information we are receiving. In the name of the ICRC, I venture to beg Your Highness to give instructions enabling us to reply to these rumours and accusations.’ The Regent replied, on August 12: ‘It is unfortunately not within my power to prevent inhuman acts which no one condemns more severely than my people, whose thoughts and feelings are chivalrous. I have instructed the Hungarian government to take up the settlement of the Jewish question in Budapest. It is to be hoped that this statement will not give rise to serious complications.’

In the spirit of this reply, the Hungarian authorities allowed the delegate in Budapest to affix shields on the camps and internment buildings for the Jews, conferring on them the protection of the Red Cross. If the use of these shields (hardly compatible, moreover, with the precise terms of the Geneva Convention) was no more extensive, this was due to the fact that the Jewish Senate of Budapest was of the opinion that the measure would doubtless lose its effectiveness if generally applied.

The Hungarian government, furthermore, showed themselves willing to favour a resumption of Jewish emigration. The Committee got in touch with the British and United States governments as a matter of extreme urgency and, during August, obtained a joint statement from these two governments declaring their desire to give support by every means to the emigration of Jews from Hungary.

To this end, the Committee was requested to transmit the following message to Budapest from the United States government: ‘The United States government has been advised by the ICRC of the Hungarian government’s will-

*ingness to permit certain categories of refugees to emigrate from Hungary. [...] The Government of the United States, taking into account the humanitarian considerations involved as regards the Jews in Hungary, now specifically repeats its assurance that arrangements will be made by it for the care of all Jews who in the present circumstances are allowed to leave Hungary and who reach the territory of the United Nations or neutral countries, and that it will find for such people temporary havens of refuge where they may live in safety. The governments of neutral countries have been advised of these assurances and have been requested to permit the entry into the territory of Jews from Hungary who may reach their frontiers.'*

*On October 8, the Hungarian authorities, in conformity with the undertaking given to the Committee, announced the final suspension of deportations and made known that the Kistarcea Camp for Jewish intellectuals, doctors and engineers, had been broken up and the internees released.*

*The hope raised by this statement was short-lived. A few days later the full tide of the great tribulations of the Hungarian Jews was to set in. In view of the setbacks of the German Army, Admiral Horthy had decided to sever his country's connection with Germany. On October 15, he asked the Allied Powers for an armistice for Hungary. This proclamation had an immense effect amongst the Jews, who were ardent in their demonstrations against the occupying Power. Although the German Army was in retreat both in Eastern and Western Europe, it had still a firm foothold in Hungary. The Regent failed in his plan and was arrested. Hungarian supporters of the Germans seized power and set about a repression, increasing in severity as the fighting zone came nearer, placing Budapest in a state of siege. It is alleged that shots were fired from Jewish houses on the German troops; however that may be, repression was centered on the Jews. It was immediately decided to remove them from Budapest and to confiscate their property. Sixty thousand Jews fit for work were to be sent to Germany, on foot, in parties of one thousand, by way of Vienna. Moreover, among the able-bodied, men between sixteen and sixty, and women between fourteen and forty were commandeered for forced labour in building fortifications in Hungary. The rest of the Jewish population, including the disabled and sick, was confined in four or five ghettos near Budapest. The only Jews to escape evacuation were those in possession of passports with visas for Palestine, Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal or Spain.*

*These measures were accompanied, at the outset, by brutalities and thefts against which the delegate immediately protested. The Ministry of the Interior, giving heed to this action, issued a decree forbidding pillage as from October 20. Meanwhile, the delegation was giving refuge to the members of the Jewish Senate of Budapest. Since their position was apparently threatened, the delegate renewed his appeals to the German authorities, as to the Hungarian government and on October 29, the wireless announced that the ICRC buildings were granted extraterritoriality, similar to that of the Legations.*

*His position thus strengthened, the delegate devoted himself with all the more assurance to the relief work he had courageously undertaken in behalf of*

the Jews. 'It is hard,' he wrote, 'to imagine the difficulty I had in holding out against a gang in whose hands the power lay, and at a time when disorder, murder and aggression were the order of the day, to compel it still to show some restraint and to observe the respect due to the Red Cross emblem [...]'

The fate of children whose parents had been deported to the labour camps was especially tragic. The delegate succeeded, with the help of the 'Jo Pasztor' organization, in setting up some twenty homes in which these children, accompanied in some cases by their mothers, could be accommodated. The hospital staff consisted of trained nurses and of Jews, whose employment in these homes ensured them a certificate of protection similar to those which the delegate issued to his fellow workers.

The Committee's representatives also opened soup-kitchens, each able to provide about a hundred hot meals a day. Reception and accommodation centres were set up, as well as hospitals with children's and maternity wards, and a first aid station open to the public 'without distinction of race or creed.' Furthermore, the delegate issued thirty thousand letters of protection, which although without any legal basis, were respected by the authorities and exempted their holders from compulsory labour.

In November, one hundred thousand Jews poured into Budapest from the provinces. The government decided to shut them up in a ghetto, and with them the Jews who had remained in Budapest, in particular the children sheltered in the Red Cross homes. 'I considered that my main task,' wrote the delegate, 'lay in ensuring that this ghetto life was at least as bearable as possible. I had incredible difficulty in obtaining from the Hungarian Nazis, in the course of daily bargaining, conditions and concession which would ensure to some degree the means to exist for those in the ghetto. Continual interviews took place with the Jewish Senate on the one hand, and with the town administration on the other, to ensure at least minimum food supplies for the ghetto at a time when all traffic had stopped, owing to the constant bombing, and provisioning was becoming more and more difficult.' The delegate secured that the Jews' rations should be fixed at 920 calories, i.e. two thirds of the minimum Hungarian prison fare. Later on it was possible to make a slight increase of this figure, thanks to the issue of relief supplies.

In spite of the delegate's efforts, the children transferred to the ghetto had been put sixty in a room in premises which it had been impossible either to clean or to disinfect. Pleading the danger of epidemics, he succeeded in getting the children inspected by a committee who had authority to make some decision on their situation. This health inspection allowed 500 of the 800 children examined to be sent back to the homes from which they had been removed, and for 300 to be placed in hospitals. The other children did not leave the ghetto, but were taken care of there by relatives or friends. Furthermore, the Delegation sent into the ghetto, with permission of the government, five persons instructed to furnish regular and detailed reports on each child's need of food and clothing. Finally, on the initiative of the delegate, one thousand orphans selected 'without distinction of race or religion' were assembled in

*the Abbey of Panonalma, a Benedictine monastery placed at the delegate's disposal by the Bishop of Gyor. This refuge, under the protection of the Red Cross, was respected by the German and Hungarian troops in retreat, and also by the Soviet Army.*

*The devotion and generosity of the Bishop of Gyor were a fruitful help to the delegate in the relief work he had undertaken. His task was to improve the food and shelter of the convoys of Jews who were being deported to labour camps in Germany and compelled to do stages of twenty-five to thirty kilometres a day on foot. The Bishop organized a relief centre en route, which he financed and which was administered by representatives of the Committee. It gave shelter from bad weather, for a few hours at least, to thousands of Jews during their terrible exodus. The 'transport groups' of the delegation issued food to them on the road, paid the peasants to carry the weakest, fifteen to twenty at a time, in their carts, gave medical attention to the sick and dispensed medical supplies.*

*On November 12, a new threat hung over the hospitals protected by the Red Cross emblem, which the police had searched with an order to turn out the Jews. The delegate, on the strength of the authority he had been granted, protested to the government. As a result, the police authorities were instructed not to proceed with the evictions from the hospitals.*

*It must be apparent what difficulties and dangers were encountered at every turn by the Committee's representatives in a town subject to the most violent bombardments. They were supported in their courageous work by the untiring devotion to duty of the members of the Jewish Senate, and by the equally generous activity of the representatives of the two main protecting Powers, Switzerland and Sweden.*

*As soon as Budapest was liberated, the delegate and the local Jewish organizations established, with the funds of the New York Joint Committee stocks of foodstuffs and of the most necessary medical supplies. The Russian military authorities had ordered all foreigners to leave Budapest. When our delegate had to go, a Hungarian minister paid him the tribute of stating that he had, in a time of historic crisis, succeeded in making the capital a 'protectorate of Geneva.'*

*Rumania. – The delegate's part was a very important one, owing to the opportunities there were in that country for the purchase of foodstuffs. Financial aid and relief in kind could be sent from Bucharest to Poland and neighbouring countries. The Committee came to an agreement concerning relief in Rumania itself with the National Red Cross there, to whom our delegate handed funds for the purchase of goods. It should be emphasized that wealthy Rumanian Jews contributed in large measure towards assisting their co-religionists in need. From 1943, the Committee's work in Rumania was made easier by the fact that the delegate had been able to inspire the Rumanian government with trust.*

*During the period in September 1940, when the 'Iron Guard,' supported by the Gestapo and the German SS, had seized power, the Jews had been sub-*

jected to persecution and deportation to death camps. Later, under the dictatorship of Marshall Antonescu, they met with less severity. Special understanding was shown by the Vice-president of the Council, Mr. Mihai Antonescu, who was entrusted with the settlement of the Jewish question. 'The Rumanian government,' he wrote to the delegate in Bucharest, 'repudiates any material solution contrary to civilized custom and in defiance of the Christian spirit which dominate the conscience of the Rumanian people.'

In December 1943 Mr. Mihai Antonescu had an interview with this delegate which led to making their activities of the Committee in behalf of Jews far easier. This talk bore mainly on the case of Jews deported beyond the Dniester to the Ukraine, who were native of Bessarabia and the Bukovina. These provinces had been returned to Rumania after the first World War, and came again under Soviet power by the terms of the Soviet-German treaty at the beginning of the Second War. After the reshuffle in 1941, Rumania, who had become Germany's ally against the USSR, reoccupied these two provinces. The Jews, whom the Rumanians considered guilty of having welcomed too easily a return to Russian allegiance, were then deported. The Rumanian government's plan, drawn up in agreement with Germany, seems to have been to settle these Jews on lands in the region of the Sea of Azov. This could not be carried out, however, unless the USSR were defeated. In the light of the Russian victories, the Rumanian government decided, towards the close of 1943, to repatriate the survivors of this deplorable migration, the numbers of which had fallen from 200,000 to 78,000. Mr. Mihai Antonescu welcomed the opportunity of the approaches made by the delegate in Bucharest, to entrust him with a mission of enquiry into the means of carrying out this repatriation, and authorized him to tour Transnistria to distribute clothing and relief to these unfortunate people. Furthermore, the delegate succeeded in getting an assurance that the Czernowitz Jews, the only ones still compelled to wear the yellow star, should be exempted, as this badge exposed them to the brutality of German troops passing through. Finally, it was agreed that Red Cross purchases might be freely made at the official rates.

When the delegate saw the Vice-president of the Council again on his return, he drew his attention specially to the plight of the children who had lost their parents and were left abandoned in Transnistria. Mr. Mihai Antonescu promised to allow 150 children to leave each week for Palestine or elsewhere, if the Committee could arrange their journey. Three months later, the Rumanian government offered two recently-built first-class steamers, the Transilvania and the Bessarabia, then held in Turkish waters, and suggested the Committee should buy them, reserving to Rumania the option of repurchase, for use as transports for emigrants under the Swiss flag. Switzerland, as the protecting Power for British interests, could in fact be considered as the protecting Power for Jews bound for Palestine, since these Jews were to become on arrival assimilated to British nationals.

Up to that time, the remedy of emigration had been no more than a meagre palliative for the sufferings of the Jews. Bulgaria had shut her frontiers to

emigrants traveling on a collective passport, and only Jews under eighteen years of age or over forty-five had been able to reach Turkey, under individual permits. Transport by sea from Rumanian ports would have afforded the best means of emigration. But besides the difficulties met with by the Jews in leaving, account had to be taken of the political problem raised for the British authorities by an influx of Jews, considered as intruders by the majority of the local population of a territory under British mandate. The first vessel, the *Struma*, which left Constanza for Palestine independently of any action by the Committee, at the beginning of 1942, had been detained at Istanbul owing to engine trouble, and was subsequently obliged to sail again for Rumania, as it was impossible to obtain the necessary permits to continue on its route. It was wrecked, and 750 emigrants were drowned. This pioneer expedition, ending so disastrously, was a lesson in the need of prudence.

The Committee was asked to grant the protection of the Red Cross emblem to emigrant transports and would have consented to this, on the basis of a very liberal interpretation of the provisions of the Tenth Hague Convention of 1907, which govern the use of hospital ships, whilst reckoning too that cargo-boats sailing under their control and carrying relief supplies for PW or civilian internees were covered by the Red Cross emblem. However, it would have wished to do this in agreement with all the Powers concerned. Therefore, the Committee made its consent conditional on the following terms. The transport organizations should charter neutral vessels which would be accompanied by the Committee's representative, and would be used exclusively for the transport of emigrants. The ships were not to sail before obtaining safe-conducts from all the belligerents concerned, as well as their agreement as to the route to be followed.

These conditions were unfortunately never obtained. The *Bellacita*, however, was authorized by Rumania to carry out a daily service for the transport of Jewish children from Constanza or Mangalia to Istanbul, and sailed under the protection of the Rumanian Red Cross, the Committee having notified all belligerents of these voyages.

The delegate in Bucharest was faced with a very grave decision when the question arose of embarking Jews for Palestine on two Bulgarian vessels, the *Milka* and the *Maritza*, both chartered by Zionist organizations. There was reason to fear the same fate for them as for those who sailed in the *Struma*. Moreover, the heads of Jewish organizations did not agree as to the names for the list of emigrants, and the Rumanian authorities applied to the Committee to arbitrate. The delegate confined himself to a check of the emigration permits and thus aided their departure. They arrived safely in Istanbul a few days later. In August 1944, the Committee finally agreed that vessels carrying emigrants might display the Red Cross emblem, even in the absence of certain of the conditions which had been laid down.

On August 23, the King of Rumania took advantage of the retreat of the German troops to put an end to the dictatorship of Marshal Antonescu, and to enter into armistice negotiations with the Allies. The racial laws were there-

upon abolished in Rumania.

*The Committee continued their relief work on behalf of Jews, however, until the close of hostilities.*

*In its report of December 1944, the delegation in Bucharest stated that, thanks to consignments from the Joint Committee of New York and to collections made on the spot, it had been able to come to the help of 183,000 Rumanian Jews, comprising: 17,000 deportees repatriated from Transnistria; 30,000 men liberated from forced labour with their families (90,000 persons); 20,000 evacuees from small towns and villages; 10,000 evacuees from the war zone; 20,000 homeless persons, as a result of bombardments; 20,000 workmen and officials dismissed from their employment; and 6,000 Hungarians who had succeeded in escaping deportation and were found in Northern Transylvania.*

*Tribute was paid to this humanitarian work by the President of the American Union of Rumanian Jews. He wrote, in March 1945, to the Committee's delegate in Washington as follows:*

*'The work of the International Red Cross in helping the Jewish population in Rumania, and the Jews transported to Transnistria has been appreciated at its true worth not only by Dr. Safran, the Chief Rabbi in Rumania and the Jewish Community of Rumania, but also by the many thousands of members of our Union whose own relatives benefitted by that help. The International Red Cross Committee had rendered truly invaluable service to our people in Rumania.'*

*Mr. Joseph C. Hyman, Vice-President of the American Joint Distribution Committee of New York, had already made public the debt of gratitude due to the International Red Cross. In an article published in the journal 'News' on February 16, 1945, under the title 'The Joint Distribution Committee Lauds International Red Cross Co-operation,' he is quoted as follows: 'Thousands of Jews in newly liberated lands and in German concentration camps owe their lives to the sanctuary and the help given them by the International Red Cross. In those parts of the world where J.D.C. , major American agency for the rescue and relief of distressed Jews overseas, cannot itself work directly, we know we can count on the International Red Cross [...] to act for us in bringing aid to suffering Jewry.'*

Volume 3 of the *Report*, particularly pages 73-84, 335-340, 479-481, 505-529, contains additional material that can be cited as needed.

Recall that our objective here is to form a reasonably accurate picture of what happened to the Jews of Slovakia, Croatia, and Hungary. However there are some matters raised in the excerpt which deserve at least a few remarks.

There are enough references to "extermination" here to lead the casual reader to the impression that the Red Cross accepted the extermination claims. On reflection, however, such an inference is seen as being not so clearly necessary and, even if made, not very relevant. We are told that "the Jews had become [...] condemned by rigid racial legislation to [...] systematic extermination" but there was, as is well known, no such legislation if by "extermination" is meant mass murder.



Also “they were [...] sent to death camps,” which was true of those who had been conscripted for labor and sent to the concentration camps during the camps’ two worst periods (1942 and 1945). It “seems” that “many thousands” of Slovakian Jews went “to the extermination camps.” It is anybody’s guess what is meant by the “death camps” to which some Romanian Jews were sent in 1940; whatever is meant, it was not a German measure.

In Volume 3 we read (page 479) that “when military operations spread to Hungarian soil (in early October 1944), the ICRC delegate in Budapest made the uttermost exertions to prevent the extermination of the Hungarian Jews.” Further on (pages 513-514) we read that during the war, “threatened with extermination, the Jews were, in the last resort, generally deported in the most inhuman manner, shut up in concentration camps, subjected to forced labor or put to death.” The Germans “aimed more or less openly at their extermination.”

We can see two possible reasons for the presence of such (ambiguous and/or very general) remarks. The first is that they are there because the authors of the *Report*, or most of them, on the basis of news reports, the war crimes trials, the fact of deportations, the fact of Nazi hostility toward the Jews, and the fact that the Germans wanted the Jews out of Europe, believed the wartime and post-war extermination claims (they obviously did not see any Jews being exterminated). The second possible reason is that the remarks are there for political-public relations reasons. For example, although the Germans and Hungarians had allowed the ICRC to operate in Hungary and the Russians had expelled it, the *Report* nevertheless finds it expedient to say that Budapest was “liberated” by the Russian capture.

The critical reader will obviously wish that the first explanation for the appearance of these remarks be accepted, at least for purposes of discussion. We should have no objections to this; it makes little difference in the analysis because all we want to know from the *Report* is what happened to the Jews of Slovakia, Croatia, and Hungary. The presence of the remarks about “extermination,” put into the *Report* at a time when the detailed extermination charges had received the widest publicity, is actually helpful to our case because, whatever the explanation for the remarks, the possibility of extermination of most or many of the Jews of Slovakia, Croatia, and Hungary most definitely is part of the proper subject matter of the *Report*. An absence of claims bearing on extermination should not, thus, be interpreted as meaning that the possibility of extermination is not part of the matters being treated, but that the ICRC did not observe occurrences consistent with the extermination claims.

With these considerations in mind, what does the *Report* say happened to the Jews of Slovakia, Croatia, and Hungary? The extent of German influence had differed prior to 1944, and some number of Slovakian Jews had been deported to the East, but the *Report* makes no speculations of extermination here and obviously accepts that they had merely been deported. By 1944, German influence in the three countries was about uniform, and nothing very consequential happened until the autumn of 1944 when the Germans interned, or attempted to intern, many of the Jews for very valid security reasons and also deported a number of Hungarian

Jews to Germany for labor.

On the subject of the Hungarian Jews, a certain amount was going on between March and October 1944, but whatever it was, the events which began in October 1944 after the arrest of Horthy were the most severe. The excerpt is most emphatic on this point in two places and, moreover, to place the critical date in the autumn of 1944 is fully consistent with the identical claim for the contiguous countries of Slovakia and Croatia.

It was after October 15 that “the full tide of the great tribulations of the Hungarian Jews was to set in” on account of the “German pressure (which) was reasserted, from March 1944 onwards,” which in October 1944 “provoked a violent crisis; executions, robberies, deportations, forced labor, imprisonments.” The Jews “suffered cruelly and lost many killed, especially in the provinces.”

To repeat, there was a certain amount going on prior to October 1944, including deportations, but the *Report* asserts unambiguously that the events beginning October 1944 were the major ones for the Hungarian Jews. The “executions” and “robberies” probably refer to private actions of Hungarians taken, perhaps, with the implicit encouragement or at least unconcern of the new puppet government. The *Report* is fully precise about the “deportations” and “forced labor” measures that were instituted in October 1944. Jews were put to work on fortifications in Hungary and the Germans decided to send 60,000 to Germany for labor (the number actually deported in this action was between 35,000 and 45,000). There being no rail transport available, the Jews had to walk, at least as far as Vienna, but the Red Cross organized aid along the route.<sup>270</sup>

It is not possible that the ICRC delegation in Hungary could have been unaware of anti-Jewish measures occurring significantly earlier in 1944, which even equaled in severity, much less dwarfed, the events beginning in October 1944. After all, the Jewish Senate of Budapest was being quartered in the Red Cross legation, and was doubtless fully informed on Hungarian Jewish matters. In addition, the later extermination claims would have “reminded” the delegate of far more drastic events earlier in the year, if they had actually occurred, as we shall see shortly.

Before passing on to consider the specific claims of extermination of Hungarian Jews, we should touch briefly on a few points made in the excerpt in connection with Theresienstadt.

We have had occasion in previous chapters to remark on Theresienstadt in Bohemia-Moravia (western Czechoslovakia) and our remarks are consistent with those of the excerpt. What is arresting in the Red Cross account is the report that “this camp had been started as an experiment by certain leaders of the Reich, who were apparently less hostile to the Jews than those responsible for the racial policy of the German government. These men wished to give to Jews the means of setting up a communal life in a town under their own administration and possessing almost complete autonomy.”

Jewish policy was administered by Eichmann’s office in the RSHA of the SS,

---

<sup>270</sup> Red Cross (1948), vol. 3, 523.

and it was Karl Adolf Eichmann, “specialist for all Jewish questions,” who had accompanied the head of the Security Police of Bohemia-Moravia, Colonel Erwin Weinmann, in showing the Red Cross delegation around Theresienstadt during the April 6, 1945, visit. During a gathering in the evening, Eichmann had explained to the delegates “that Theresienstadt was a creation of Reichsführer-SS Himmler” and had explained the philosophy involved, accurately passed on to us in the *Report* excerpt. Eichmann added that he, “personally, did not entirely approve of these methods but, as a good soldier, he naturally blindly obeyed the orders of the Reichsführer.”<sup>271</sup>

It is quite clear, therefore, that Theresienstadt was an operation of the SS, who were the “certain leaders of the Reich” involved here. In addition, it is known that it was RSHA chief Heydrich who made the Theresienstadt decision shortly after he had acquired his secondary role of Deputy Protector of Bohemia-Moravia in September 1941.<sup>272</sup>

What the Red Cross saw at Theresienstadt was part of regular SS policy. It is of some interest that the *Report* tells us, without comment, that the delegate had asked about “departures for the East” and that the ICRC makes no speculations regarding any sinister interpretations to be placed on the “transfers to Auschwitz,” despite the notorious and universally known charges in this connection.

In critical evaluation of the Red Cross *Report*, one must obviously be wary in two senses. First, one should reserve some judgments in relation to a *self-serving* aspect of the *Report*. The typical respects in which a charitable organization’s publications might be self-serving are in exaggerating the efficacy of measures taken and, in cases where it is evident that no efficacious measures have been taken, in hastily blaming the lack of efficacy on the tight fists of potential contributors (and often there are very solid grounds for such claims). Thus, we should not be crushed if it were found that the Hungarian Jewish children or the Jews who walked to Vienna, both of whom were aided by the Red Cross, actually suffered a little bit more than might seem suggested by the *Report* (I am not, of course, making any claim that such was the case).

A second reservation concerns inevitable political bias as a result of external political pressures; the “liberation” of Budapest by the Russians shows this at work in the *Report*. The situation of 1948 clearly implied that when political bias appeared in the *Report* it be anti-German bias. We observe that this exists in the *Report*, but fortunately, this bias is effectively non-existent, if one reads the *Report* with well defined questions in mind, such questions bearing only on matters within the actual sphere of competence of the ICRC and its delegates.

Nevertheless, it should again be stressed that my argument in no way depends upon interpreting the *Report* as meaning other than what it says, or as not really meaning what it says, at those points selected by me. I offer no parallel of the extermination claims, which insist that phrases such as *Leichenkeller*, *Badeanstalt*, special treatment and “readiness for transport” be attributed meanings consistent with wartime propaganda claims. There is no quarrel with the person who insists

<sup>271</sup> Reitlinger, 512-513; Red Cross (1947), 99-100.

<sup>272</sup> Reitlinger, 176-177; Shirer (1960), 991.

on interpreting the *Report* as declaring in a very general way that the Germans were attempting to exterminate the Jews, because all we want to know is what the ICRC delegates were able to witness in their positions in Slovakia, Croatia, and Hungary.

## 1944 Propaganda

We have seen roughly what happened in Hungary, and now the extermination claims should be examined. We first review the relevant propaganda during 1944 and then the charges made after the war, constituting the legend of the extermination of the Hungarian Jews. There are both significant differences and significant similarities between the 1944 propaganda and the later claims. Our survey of the former again employs the *New York Times* as source.

In 1944, atrocity and extermination propaganda of a general sort continued:

12 Feb. 1944, p. 6: *"A young Polish Jew who escaped from a mass execution in Poland [...] repeated a story [...] that at Belzec] Jews were forced naked onto a metal platform operated as a hydraulic elevator which lowered them into a huge vat filled with water. [...] They were electrocuted by current through the water."*

This claim had also been made in London in November 1942,<sup>273</sup> and we encountered it on page 102 in the *New York Times* story of December 20, 1942. The emphasis in the propaganda during the spring and summer of 1944 was, however, on the Hungarian Jews. Immediately after the German occupation:

21 Mar. 1944, p. 4: *"The fate of 800,000 Jews in Hungary was one immediate concern of Jewish circles in Stockholm."*

Roosevelt involved himself directly with a speech prepared for him by the War Refugee Board.<sup>274</sup>

25 Mar. 1944, p. 4: *"In the meantime in most of Europe and in parts of Asia the systematic torture and murder of civilians – men, women and children – by the Nazis and Japanese continue unabated. In areas subjugated by the aggressors innocent Poles, Czechs, Norwegians, Dutch, Danes, French, Greeks, Russians, Chinese, Filipinos – and many others – are being starved or frozen to death or murdered in cold blood in a campaign of savagery.*

*The slaughters of Warsaw, Lidice, Kharkov and Nanking – the brutal torture and murder by the Japanese, not only of civilians but of our own gallant American soldiers and fliers – these are startling examples of what goes on day by day, year in and year out, wherever the Nazis and the Japs are in military control – free to follow their barbaric purpose.*

*In one of the blackest crimes of all history – begun by the Nazis in the day of peace and multiplied by them a hundred times in time of war – the wholesale systematic murder of the Jews of Europe goes on unabated every hour. As*

---

<sup>273</sup> Reitlinger, 148.

<sup>274</sup> US-WRB (1945), 49.

*a result of the events of the last few days hundreds of thousands of Jews, who, while living under persecution, have at least found a haven from death in Hungary and the Balkans, are now threatened with annihilation as Hitler's forces descend more heavily upon these lands. That these innocent people, who have already survived a decade of Hitler's fury, should perish on the very eve of triumph over the barbarism which their persecution symbolized, would be a major tragedy.*

*[...] All who knowingly take part in the deportation of Jews to their death in Poland or Norwegians and French to their death in Germany are equally guilty with the executioner. All who share the guilt shall share the punishment.*

*[...] In the meantime, and until the victory that is now assured is won, the United States will persevere in its efforts to rescue the victims of brutality of the Nazis and the Japs. In so far as the necessity of military operations permit this government will use all means at its command to aid the escape of all intended victims of the Nazi and Jap executioner – regardless of race or religion or color. We call upon the free peoples of Europe and Asia temporarily to open their frontiers to all victims of oppression. We shall find havens of refuge for them, and we shall find the means for their maintenance and support until the tyrant is driven from their homelands and they may return.*

*In the name of justice and humanity let all freedom loving people rally to this righteous undertaking.”*

April 1, 1944, p. 5: “*HUNGARY ANNOUNCES ANTI-JEWISH DECREES*  
*[...] based on the Nazi Nuremberg laws [...]*”  
whose nature was further specified as:

April 16, 1944, p. 17: “*[...] the registration and closing of all Jewish properties. [...]*”

April 28, 1944, p. 5: “[...] recent reports from Hungary said 300,000 Jews had been moved from the eastern and northeastern parts of the country to so-called collection camps.”

May 10, 1944, p. 5: “*by Joseph M. Levy*  
*[...] it is a fact that Hungary [...] is now preparing for the annihilation of Hungarian Jews by the most fiendish methods. [...] Sztojay's [...] government [...] is about to start the extermination of about 1,000,000 human beings. [...] The government in Budapest had decreed the creation in different parts of Hungary of 'special baths' for Jews. These baths are in reality huge gas chambers arranged for mass murder, like those inaugurated in Poland in 1941.*”

May 18, 1944, p. 5: “*by Joseph M. Levy*  
*80,000 Jews of the Carpathian provinces [...] have been sent to murder camps in Poland.*”

June 9, 1944, p. 5: “*300,000 Hungarian Jews have been interned in camps and ghettos [within Hungary...]*”

June 18, 1944, p. 24: “[...] recent statements made by the Hungarian Premier, Doeme Sztojaj, that Jews were being exterminated to provide ‘room for American Hungarians to return to their native country after the war.’”

June 20, 1944, p. 5: “Czechoslovak Jews interned in [...] Terezin [...] were dragged to gas chambers in the notorious German concentration camps at Birkenau and Oswiecim. Confirmation of the execution there of uncounted thousands was brought to London recently by a young Pole who had been imprisoned in both camps.”

June 25, 1944, p. 5: “[A Polish underground] message said that new mass murders were taking place at the Oswiecim concentration camp. They were carried out by gas in the following order: Jews, war prisoners, whatever their nationality, and invalids. A hundred thousand Jews have already been sent to Oswiecim for execution. [...]”

June 27, 1944, p. 6: “Hull [called] upon Hungary to halt her mistreatment of Jews [and warned that] those German officers and men [...] who have [...] taken [...] part in the [...] atrocities, massacres and executions will be punished.”

July 2, 1944, p. 12: “Hungarian sources in Turkey reported that the 350,000 Jews [...] were being rounded up for deportation to death camps in Poland. By June 17, 400,000 had been sent to Poland; the remaining 350,000 are expected to be put to death by July 24.”

On July 3 (page 3) the “report” that eventually became the WRB report appeared as a report of two relief committees in Switzerland, specifying that since April 400,000 Hungarian Jews had been sent to Auschwitz-Birkenau. The crematories are reported to contain 50 furnaces each taking 8-10 corpses at a time. On July 6 (page 6), the story was repeated, Eden endorsed the charges, and the World Jewish

“Congress was notified more than two weeks ago that 100,000 Jews recently deported from Hungary to Poland had been gassed in the notorious German death camp at Oswiecim. Between May 15 and 27 sixty two railroad cars laden with Jewish children [...] and six cars laden with Jewish adults passed daily through the Plaszow station near Cracow. Mass deportations have also begun from Theresienstadt, Czechoslovakia, where the Jews have heretofore been unmolested.”

July 13, 1944, p. 3: “2,500 Jewish men, women and children [...] will arrive in the Auschwitz and Birkenau camps by this week-end, probably with previous knowledge of their fate.”

On July 15, (page 3) Hull again condemned the alleged killing of Hungarian Jews, and then from the “Polish underground”:

August 4, 1944, p. 5: “courier [...] declared that Hungarian Jews were still being sent to Oswiecim, twelve trainloads every twenty-four hours. In their haste [...] the Germans [...] were killing small children with bludgeons.

*Many bodies were being burned in open fires, he said, because the crematories were over-taxed."*

On August 11 (page 4) is reported a letter by Horthy to the King of Sweden declaring that deportations of Jews had been stopped and that they were being allowed to leave Hungary.

There are too many contradictions in the propaganda for it to equal later charges. However, the charges resemble the propaganda somewhat. The present story is that between the middle of May and sometime in early July 1944, approximately 400,000 Hungarian Jews, from districts outside of the capital of Budapest, were deported by rail by the Germans and that almost all of these were killed at Birkenau, the killings having been the primary purpose of the deportations. This operation essentially cleaned out the Hungarian Jews, except for Budapest, where the Jews were left essentially intact. Even Birkenau was not designed for such large numbers of killings, so many bodies were disposed of in burning pits, and many were shot rather than gassed.<sup>275</sup>

It is obvious that no such thing could have happened, and received world-wide publicity during the war and at the later trials, without the ICRC delegation in Budapest learning of it. After all, we are speaking here of the near entirety of non-Budapest Jews, and such massive and monstrous events could not have been flipantly forgotten by the person contributing the "Hungary" section of the excerpt we have examined. The excerpt says emphatically that the major negative events effecting the Hungarian Jews occurred starting on October 1944 after Horthy's arrest. Moreover, the *Report* contains the general remarks about "extermination" which we have noted, so any extermination of Hungarian Jews would, if it were a reality, definitely be mentioned in the *Report*. There is clearly no truth to the claim of exterminations of Hungarian Jews.

At this point it is appropriate to provide some remarks on Hungarian Jewish population in early 1944. The Nazis used a figure of about 700 or 750 thousand.<sup>276</sup> Ruppin's 1940 book reports that the Hungarian Jewish population rose from 440 to 480 thousand in the autumn of 1938, due to the annexation of parts of Slovakia. In the spring of 1939, the Carpatho-Ukraine was annexed so that, in June 1939, there were about 590,000 Jews in Hungary. It is known that a good number of non-Hungarian Jews, mainly Polish, took refuge in Hungary after 1939, so Ruppin's pre-war figure of 590,000 could easily have swelled to the 700,000 or 750,000 figure that the Nazis used. Ruppin's figure for Budapest's Jewish population is 200,000 in 1930. This figure would not have been supplemented by the annexations, but it would have been supplemented to some degree during the Thirties by German and Austrian Jews and to a greater degree by Polish and other Jews after 1939. It seems reasonable to assume that there were about 300,000 Jews in Budapest in the spring of 1944. Thus, we seem to have a fairly good idea of Hungarian and Budapest Jewish population in 1944. Clearly the re-

<sup>275</sup> Reitlinger, 447-487, 540-542; Hilberg, 509-554, 599-600. Reitlinger figures some of the Hungarian Jews among the Romanians.

<sup>276</sup> NG-2586-G in NMT, vol. 13, 212; NO-5194, part of the Korherr report, which is reproduced in Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 240-248; NG-5620, cited by Hilberg, 513.

removal of 400,000 or more non-Budapest Jews in the spring of 1944 would have entailed the removal of essentially all non-Budapest Jews. Not only could this not have failed to be noticed by the Red Cross delegation, it is also difficult to see where the “one hundred thousand Jews” who “poured into Budapest from the provinces” in November could have come from.<sup>277</sup>

There are other arguments against the extermination claims. First, it will be seen that the charges specify that special arrangements were made at a conference in Vienna in early May to provide four trains per day to effect these deportations, and that the trains were in fact provided on schedule. That is, in the crucial few weeks before and after D-Day (June 6), at a time of desperate rail shortages, with both fronts threatening to collapse, the Germans provided an amount of extra rail transportation that would strain the resources of any rail system under the best of circumstances. That is just not believable. It is worth remembering that the rail journey from Budapest to Auschwitz is much more formidable than the map might suggest, on account of the mountains in eastern Czechoslovakia.

## Where are the pictures?

A second additional argument against the charges relate to the question, often asked, why did not the Allies attempt to bomb the gas chambers that, by the time of the alleged killings of Hungarian Jews, the whole world “knew” about? The question can be considerably broadened.

On June 8, 1944, the U.S. Fifteenth Air Force, based in southern Italy, was ordered to emphasize oil targets in its bombings, and was given a list of specific oil targets in eastern and southeastern Europe. The principal target and the one that received the major share of attention was the Ploesti area in Romania. However, Auschwitz, which was also one of the targets on the list, was first bombed on August 20 and was subsequently bombed in September and December.<sup>278</sup>

Now in the Allied bombing operations in World War II it was customary to make extensive use of photographic intelligence. One objective was the assessment of damage done by attacks and another was the planning of attacks: determining whether or not the target was worth attacking and also determining the extent and nature of the defenses in the area of the target.<sup>279</sup> It is a certainty that intelligence had photographed Auschwitz and the surrounding area, rather thoroughly, soon after the June 8 order. In this case the Americans should have been able to provide actual photographs of all these Hungarian Jews being moved into Auschwitz and shot and burned out in the open. They should not even have been obliged to take any special measures to produce for us, either at the time of the alleged killings or at the later trials, photographic evidence for their claims. Of course, to have been fully convincing, the former time should have been chosen,

---

<sup>277</sup> Ruppin, 30-31, 68.

<sup>278</sup> Craven, 280-302, 641f; Carter (see Index under “Auschwitz”).

<sup>279</sup> C. B. Smith, 167.



because the Russians controlled Auschwitz after January 1945.

The photograph of Fig. 7 is claimed to have been taken at Auschwitz in August 1944, but it has already been discussed in proper context. In any case, the number of bodies evident in the photograph roughly corresponds to the rate of ordinary deaths at Auschwitz, especially for 1942.

Despite all the attention the Hungarian Jews and Auschwitz were receiving at the time and despite the Roosevelt promise publicized on March 25, the Americans did not lift a finger either to interfere with the alleged deportations – by bombing the specific rail lines involved – or with the alleged killings – by bombing the “gas chambers.” They not only failed to take the opportunity to provide us with photographic evidence for their claims, they also do not seem to have the evidence despite having taken the photographs.

All of these considerations, the Red Cross *Report*, the wild impracticality of exterminating Hungarian Jews in the spring and summer of 1944, and the non-existence of any relevant consequences of the Allied control of the air, compel the conclusion that nothing resembling or approximating extermination actually happened to the Hungarian Jews.

## Air Raids on Auschwitz: Rudolf Vrba Overreaches Himself

We will shortly review the evidence for the extermination claim, but first we should provide an aside relative to the problem of the date of the first air raid at Auschwitz. We remarked on page 126 that Rudolf Vrba’s claim that there was an air raid at Auschwitz on April 9, 1944, undermines his credibility. We have indicated above that Auschwitz was first bombed in August. This view is based mainly on the *Combat Chronology*, edited by Carter and Mueller, that the U.S. Air Force published in 1973, and on the standard and semi-official work by Craven *et al.*, *The Army Air Forces in World War II*. The latter also treats the activities of the RAF Bomber Command, especially in connection with the oil campaign. The corresponding four volume British work by Webster and Frankland, *The Strategic Air Offensive Against Germany 1939-1945*, bases its account of the oil campaign on that of Craven *et al.*

An attack in early April seems completely out of the question. Auschwitz was of strategic importance only as an oil target. Craven *et al.* provide an excellent summary of the air force oil campaign. There had been a spectacular raid at Ploesti in 1943, but there was no sustained oil campaign until the spring of 1944, on account of disagreements among Allied leaders regarding target priorities. By May 1944, only 1.1% of Allied bombs had fallen on oil targets. On March 17, 1944, the Fifteenth Air Force was advised to undertake attacks against Ploesti at the first opportunity, but “surreptitiously under the general directive which called for bombing transportation targets supporting German forces that faced the Russians.” The first such attack came on April 5, and there were also attacks on April

15 and 24, in all three cases directed mainly against the rail centers near Ploesti, with a hope that there would be “incidental” damage to oil refineries. Oil-related bombings by England-based aircraft did not commence until April 19, but these were also carried out under cover of an objective other than oil. The Fifteenth Air Force carried out several more raids against Ploesti before the June 8 order, after which the oil campaign got under way officially and extensively.<sup>280</sup>

This being the situation, and in consideration of the confirmation provided by the *Combat Chronology*, it is impossible to believe that Auschwitz was bombed in April, when it was difficult to justify, within the allied command, raids even against choice targets such as Ploesti. That a relatively minor oil target such as Auschwitz, much smaller than the not distant synthetic oil plants at Blechhammer, was bombed in April, is most unlikely. Even Blechhammer is not mentioned as a target until long after April.

Only the U.S. and British air forces are relevant to the problem of possible air raids at Auschwitz in the period April to September 1944. The Russians did not engage in industrial-strategic bombing operations of this nature.

Our conclusions, drawn from the official U.S. Air Force war histories, are confirmed by the recollections of two Germans who were at Auschwitz in 1944. Thies Christophersen, author of the booklet *Die Auschwitz Lüge* (mentioned on p. 27), wrote that the first air raid was “in the autumn of 1944.” Christophersen seems to be completely unaware that there is any significance in the question of the date of the first aid raid at Auschwitz.

In Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich’s statement, published in German journal *Nation Europa* (also mentioned here on page 27), he did not make any remarks in connection with air raids, but he did write that he was a member of an anti-aircraft unit that was stationed near Auschwitz for a very short time starting in mid-July 1944. In reply to a neutrally worded inquiry by this author, with no reference to the nature of the underlying issue involved, Stäglich replied that there were no air raids while he was there and that he believed there had been none earlier, because he had not been informed of any and had not seen any corresponding destruction.

The August date for the first air raid is confirmed by the Italian Jew Primo Levi, who wrote in his book *Se Questo è un Uomo* (early in the chapter entitled *I fatti dell'estate*) that the first raid was in August, when he had been there five months.

Our analysis of the problem of the first air raid at Auschwitz is also essentially confirmed by the extermination mythologists. Reitlinger does not explicitly take a position on the date of the first raid but remarks (page 383) on “the failure of the Allies to bomb the passes between Hungary and Auschwitz in May – July, 1944.” Hilberg (page 632) is well off the mark in placing the first raid on December 16, 1944, and this date is accepted by Levin (page 701). Friedman (page 78) is relatively on the mark in reporting a raid on September 13, 1944.

Because all evidence rejects a claim that there was an air raid at Auschwitz in April 1944, Vrba’s claim that there was such a raid while he was sitting there

---

<sup>280</sup> Craven, 172-179.

peeking out from the woodpile is an important factor in demolishing his credibility, in addition to the others mentioned in Chapter 3 (pp. 124-128). Moreover, it would be difficult for Vrba to claim a faulty memory comparable to Stäglich's, because the raid supposedly occurred at a uniquely crucial point in Vrba's life.

## Documentary Evidence?

Returning to the immediate subject, we now review the evidence which is offered for exterminations of Hungarian Jews. It is mainly documentary.

We will essentially disregard the IMT affidavit (2605-PS) of Kastner, given September 13, 1945. Kastner was a Hungarian Jew who was in contact with Eichmann and associates in Budapest in 1944. His affidavit declares that 475,000 Hungarian Jews had been deported by June 27, 1944. It also gives a general "history" of the entire extermination program, said to be based on things told Kastner by SS Colonel Kurt Becher and SS Captain Dieter Wisliceny. That he enjoyed the confidence of these men is entirely possible, however, because in 1954, as an influential member of Ben-Gurion's Mapai party in Israel, he was accused by another Hungarian Jew of having been a collaborator of Becher, one of Eichmann's superiors in the SS operations in Hungary. The resulting libel actions, with verdicts against Kastner, generated a major political crisis in Israel whose catastrophic consequences were averted by the assassination of Kastner in 1957.<sup>281</sup> Kastner was another victim of the hoax.

Wisliceny, Eichmann's subordinate in Hungary, also gave an affidavit on November 29, 1945, and supporting testimony at the IMT on January 3, 1945.<sup>282</sup> The affidavit is another English-language job with, *e.g.*, the obscure (for a German) expression "heads" for people in transports. In Wisliceny's story there were written orders, given in early 1942 by Himmler, to exterminate the Jews. The orders were addressed to, among others, the "Inspector of Concentration Camps" who, according to the later testimony of Höss, was not intended by Himmler to know anything about the program.

The major evidence is a collection of reputed German Foreign Office documents. In March 1944, one Dr. Veessenmayer of the Foreign Office was sent to Hungary as "plenipotentiary" to act for the German government, supplementing the activities of special Ambassador Ritter. Veessenmayer communicated a great deal with the Foreign Office in Berlin via telegram. A document, NG-2263, shown in Fig. 30, is typical of those which are said to be one of these telegrams, taken from Foreign Office files. As a telegram received at the Foreign Office, it naturally does not have Veessenmayer's signature. The endorsements consist in the Foreign Office stamps that have been used, and the handwritten notation on the left which says that the document is to be filed under "Hungary" (*Ungarn*) and is

<sup>281</sup> Reitlinger, 421-422; Hilberg, 528; Rassiner (1962), 229-230; Sachar, 463-464; John & Hadawi, vol. 2, 36n.

<sup>282</sup> IMT, vol. 4, 355-373; U.S. Chief of Counsel, vol. 8, 606-621.

initialed by von Thadden and dated: vTh 4/7. It reads:

*"I.) Transport of Jews out of Zone III concluded with 50,805 according to plan. Total number out of Zones I – III 340,162.*

*II.) Concentration in Zone IV and transport out of that Zone concluded with 41,499 according to plan. Total number 381,661. Continuation of operations had been separately reported with teletypes no. 279 of 27 June, no. 287 of 29 June and no. 289 of 30 June to Fuschl. Concentration in Zone V (hitherto uncovered region west of the Danube without Budapest) commenced 29 June. Simultaneously smaller actions in the suburbs of Budapest commenced as preparatory measures. A few small transports of political, intellectual and specially skilled Jews, and Jews with many children, are also under way."*

It is a collection of such documents that constitutes the evidence for the deportation of over 400,000 Hungarian Jews between May 15 and early July of 1944. In my determination, the relevant documents are summarized as below. The nature of the endorsements is indicated in each case. Naturally not all documents dealing with anti-Jewish measures, including deportations during the relevant time period, are involved; only those are listed, which might be claimed to compel an interpretation consistent with the extermination claims.

NG-2059: Mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veessenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 8, 1944. A certain number of Jews previously scheduled for deportation are to be put to work on military projects in Hungary instead. Application for the 100,000 employable Hungarian Jews requested by Organization Todt (the Speer ministry) must be made to Glücks of the WVHA, who is in charge of the deportation of Hungarian Jews. The endorsement is Thadden's initials.

NG-2060: In two parts. The second part is a mimeograph copy of a telegram from Veessenmayer to Ribbentrop via Ritter, dated April 21, 1944. It reports that 100,038 Hungarian Jews have been confined to camps as a result of the "Special Operations." The endorsements are a Top Secret stamp and Thadden's initials. The descriptive material accompanying the document (the "staff evidence analysis") indicates that Geiger's initials also appear, but this is not confirmed by examination of the rest of the material (in this case the English translation only).

NG-2061: Mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veessenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 20, 1944. It reports arrests of people involved with the anti-Nazi underground, and the interception of "intelligence material concerning the alleged conditions in the German concentration camps in the Government General. In particular the happenings in the Auschwitz camp are described in detail." The endorsements are a Foreign Office stamp and Thadden's initials, although the staff evidence analysis says it is initialed by Geiger.

NG-2190: The first part is a covering note for the second part. Signed by Thadden and Wissberg and initialed by Wagner, and stamped Top Secret. The second part is a report from Thadden to the Foreign Office on anti-Jewish measures in Hungary, dated May 26, 1944. It is reported that the Hungarian government has agreed to the deportation to the Eastern territories of all Hungarian Jews, with the exception of 80,000 to be retained for labor on military projects. The

number of Hungarian Jews is estimated at 900,000 to 1,000,000. Most of the Jews outside Budapest have been concentrated in ghettos. As of May 24, 116,000 had been deported to the General Government in daily shipments of 14,000. The Jewish Council in Budapest (same as the Jewish Senate of the Red Cross *Report* excerpt) was reassured that these measures were directed only against unassimilated Jews, and that others were to be treated differently. However, the SS expects difficulties with future concentration and deportation measures anyway. Plans for future measures are outlined. Problems stemming from the differing German and Hungarian definitions of a Jew are discussed. It is estimated that about one third of the Hungarian Jews deported to Auschwitz are able to work, and that these are distributed immediately after arrival to Sauckel, Organization Todt, etc. Stamped Top Secret and signed by Thadden. The third part is a covering note for the fourth part, initialed by Wagner and Thadden, with handwritten references to Eichmann. The fourth part is a summary of Thadden's report, with no endorsement.

NG-2230: A copy of a two page letter, dated April 24, 1944, from Thadden to Eichmann relaying the contents of NG-2233 (next to be discussed). Both pages initialed by Thadden. Date stamp and handwritten notations on bottom of page one. Note: the second time I consulted document NG-2230, it was an entirely different document, so there may be some error here.

NG-2233: In two parts. First part is a copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to Ritter, dated April 23, 1944. It reports on the work of interning Jews from the Carpathians in ghettos. 150,000 Jews have already been rounded up. It is estimated that 300,000 Jews will have been affected when the action is completed. The internment of Jews in other areas is then to follow. From May 15 on, 3,000 Jews are to be shipped daily to Auschwitz, and in order not to hold up their transport, the transfer of the 50,000 Jews, demanded for work in the Reich by Veesenmayer, will temporarily be held up. For reasons of security, feeding, and footwear, it is not considered practicable to send them on foot. The endorsement is the stamp of the foreign Office (Classified Material). The second part of the document is a carbon copy of a letter from Thadden to Eichmann, dated April 24, repeating the substance of the telegram. Initialed by Thadden.

NG-2235: A carbon copy of a telegram from Wagner to Veesenmayer, dated May 21, 1944. It is reported that Thadden is to visit Budapest shortly to discuss the disposal of the property of German and Hungarian Jews, within the framework of the general European solution of the Jewish question. Initialed by Wagner. There also appear to be initials "VM" on the document, but it does not appear that this is supposed to be Veesenmayer's initials.

NG-2236: A typed memo from Wagner to Steengracht, dated July 6, 1944. Wagner states that it is the Reich policy to prevent Jewish emigration. The War Refugee Board request, through Switzerland, that emigration of Hungarian Jews to Palestine be permitted, must be denied because that would alienate the Arabs. Anyway, the Swiss-American intervention will be too late by the end of the month, for the anti-Jewish action in Hungary will be completed by that time. Stamped Secret and signed by Wagner. Initialed by Thadden and, possibly, by Hencke.

NG-2237: A mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 10, reporting that the measures for the concentration of Jews located north of Budapest had started, and that deportation of the Jews would start June 11. The endorsement is a Foreign Office stamp and Thadden's initials.

NG-2238: Typewritten memo by Wagner proposing that negotiations with the Swiss and Swedes on emigration of Hungarian Jews be treated in a dilatory manner until the question of the treatment of the Jews remaining in Hungary had definitely been solved. Dated September 16, 1944. Signed by Wagner, initialed by Thadden and illegible others.

NG-2262: A mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to Ritter, Dated May 4, reporting that evacuation of 310,000 Jews of the Carpathian and Transylvanian regions into Germany ("*nach Deutschland*") is scheduled to begin in the middle of May. Four daily transports, each holding 3,000, are contemplated. The necessary rail arrangements will be made at a conference in Vienna on May 4. Foreign Office stamp and Thadden's initials.

NG-2263: A mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 30, reporting that 381,661 Hungarian Jews had been deported as of June 30. Round-ups had started west of the Danube, not including Budapest, and also in the suburbs of Budapest. Foreign Office stamp and Thadden's initials.

NG-2424: In two parts. The first part is a typed letter from Foreign Office press chief Schmidt to Foreign Office Secretary of State Steengracht, dated May 27, suggesting a propaganda campaign ("the discovery of explosives in Jewish clubs and synagogues," etc.) to precede any actions against the Jews of Budapest. The endorsement is initialing by Wagner. The second part is a typed copy of a telegram from Thadden to Budapest, dated June 1, passing on the suggestion. Initialed by Wagner and Thadden.

NG-2980: In three parts. The first part is a typed copy of a telegram from Wagner to Budapest, dated May 21, announcing a forthcoming visit to Budapest by Thadden, for negotiations on the Jewish problem. Stamped and initialed by Wagner. The second part is an unsigned carbon copy of a letter from Thadden to Wagner, constituting a covering letter for Thadden's report on his activities in Budapest. Stamped Top Secret. The third part is the typed five page report, dated May 25. It is reported that special referent for Jewish questions at the German Embassy in Budapest von Adamovic, "has no idea of the actual intentions (or) of the practical application of the measure against the Jews." He also reports a visit to Eichmann's office, where he learned that 116,000 Jews had been deported to the Reich and that the deportation of another 200,000 was imminent. Concentration of about 250,000 Jews of the provinces north and northwest of Budapest will begin June 7. More plans are given. It is estimated that only about 80,000 Jews able to work will remain in Hungary. The entire operation is to be concluded by the end of July. The report is five pages long and the only endorsement is a top secret stamp on the first page.

NG-5510:1 A typed copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Of-

office, dated May 8, stating that Count Bethlen and Dr. Schilling do not approve of the Jewish action, and that Veesebmayer will therefore request their dismissal. "Count Bethlen declared that he did not want to become a mass murderer and would rather resign." The endorsements consist of a top secret stamp and a handwritten notation to file under "Hungary."

NG-5532: A typed copy of a telegram from Veesebmayer to Foreign Minister Ribbentrop, dated July 9, reporting Hungarian Minister of the Interior Jaross' intention to concentrate the Budapest Jews outside of Budapest and then "release them gradually in batches of 30 – 40,000 Jews for transport to the Reich." No endorsement.

NG-5533: A typed copy of a telegram from Veesebmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 14, asserting that numerous Hungarian Jews had been slipping into Slovakia "since we pounced upon them" after March 19. Stamped with "Hungary" and "State Secretary" handwritten on the bottom.

NG-5565: An original typed copy of a telegram from Thadden to the German Embassy in Pressburg, dated May 2, announcing that a conference will be held May 4-5 in Vienna for the purpose of organizing rail transport for "a large number of Hungarian Jews for work in the Eastern Territories." Stamped secret and initialed by Thadden.

NG-5567: A mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veesebmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 17, giving the total number of Hungarian Jews deported to the Reich as 326,009. Stamped and initialed by Thadden (the staff evidence analysis states that the document is initialed by Wagner and Reichel, but this is not confirmed by the documents I examined).

NG-5568: A mimeographed copy of a telegram from Veesebmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 8. "In execution of Jewish measures in Hungary basic principle to be observed is secrecy regarding dates of deportation and of zones which will be cleansed one after the other in order to avoid disquieting of Jewish elements and attempts to emigrate. This applies especially to the city district of Budapest which is to be the last zone and where difficulties in this respect are to be expected." Stamped and blue pencil noted by Thadden.

NG-5569: In several parts. The first and major part is a mimeograph of a telegram from Ludin in Pressburg (Slovakia) to the Foreign Office, dated June 14. It is reported that guards had entered the trains deporting Jews from Hungary across Slovakia and had robbed the Jews of money and jewelry and had shot some. They had then used the proceeds to get drunk at a nearby restaurant. Stamped. Next four parts are notes discussing the incident. Various stamps; initials of Wagner, Thadden, and Mirbach.

NG-5570: Mimeographed copies of five telegrams. The first is dated October 14, and reports the plans to deport about 50,000 Jews by foot from Hungary for labor in the Reich. It is added, confidentially, that "Eichmann plans [...] to request 50,000 additional Jews in order to reach the ultimate goal of cleaning of Hungarian space [...]" Stamped and handwritten notes. Next four parts discuss operations with Budapest Jews and also with the Jews being deported for labor. Stamps and initialings by Wagner and Thadden.

NG-5571: Typewritten telegrams exchanged by Veesenmayer and Altenburg of the Foreign Office, dated June 25 and 28. In view of the “liquidation of the Jewish problem” in Hungary, the Hungarian government should reimburse the Reich with the corresponding amounts of food-stuffs. Stamped.

NG-5573: Typed report by Wagner to Ribbentrop, dated October 27. Of the 900,000 Jews who had been in Hungary, 437,402 had been sent for “labor to the East.” A discussion of Hungarian Jews being allowed to emigrate follows. Stamped and initialed by Mirbach.

NG-5576: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 30. Horthy objected to measures against the Budapest Jews but agreed to postponed measures. Thus, “assembling in last provincial Zone V [so far not covered space west of Danube, with exclusion of Budapest] has started. Simultaneously assembling will be carried out within jurisdiction of first constabulary commando in remoter suburbs of Budapest in order to facilitate drive in capital.” Stamped.

NG-5594: Anonymous telegram from Budapest to the Foreign Office, dated April 18. The “Hungarian population urgently desires a swift, radical solution to the Jewish problem, since fear of Jewish revenge is greater than the fear of Russian brutality.” Handwritten notations to file.

NG-5595: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the foreign Office, dated April 28. “Special operations” in Hungary had resulted in the arrest of 194,000 Jews. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5596: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated April 28. 194,000 Jews arrested by the special operations, and Hungarian plans to distribute the Budapest Jews throughout the city on account of the Allied bombing raids. Stamped.

NG-5597: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated April 30. 194,000 Jews arrested by the special operations, and discussion of Jews trying to be conscripted for labor in Hungary in order to avoid concentration camps. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5599: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 5. 196,700 Jews arrested by the special operations. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5600: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 6. Jews are being rounded up, and the Jews think that they are “only going to the special camps temporarily.” Stamped.

NG-5602: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 24. 110,556 Hungarian Jews have been deported. Stamped, handwritten notations, and illegible initials.

NG-5603: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 19. 51,000 Hungarian Jews deported. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5604: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 20. 62,644 Hungarian Jews deported. Stamped and handwritten notations.



NG-5605: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 20. Same report as NG-2061. Handwritten notations.

NG-5607: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 16. The deportation of the 300,000 Jews concentrated in the Carpathian area and in Transylvania had begun on May 14, with four special trains with 3,000 Jews in each leaving daily. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5608: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office dated May 25. 138,870 Hungarian Jews had been deported to the Reich. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5613: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated July 20. The Hungarian Nazis got the Franciscans to schedule a Thanksgiving mass to celebrate the deportation of the Jews, but the bishop objected and certain compromises had to be made. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5615: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated July 11. 437,402 Hungarian Jews had been deported. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5616: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated July 8. 422,911 Hungarian Jews had been deported to the Reich. Stamped.

NG-5617: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 17. 340,142 Hungarian Jews had been deported to the Reich. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5618: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 17. 326,000 Hungarian Jews had been deported to the Reich. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5619: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 13. 289,357 Jews had been deported from the Carpathian and Transylvanian regions. Future plans for deportation are outlined. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5620: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 8. Document, except for staff evidence analysis, was missing from the collection consulted, but it is apparently similar to those immediately preceding and immediately following.

NG-5621: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 2. 247,856 Hungarian Jews had been deported to the Reich. Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5622: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 1. 236,414 Hungarian Jews had been shipped to the Reich. Stamped.

NG-5623: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated June 1. 217,236 Hungarian Jews had been shipped to the Reich. Stamped and handwritten notations

NG-5624: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veesenmayer to the Foreign Office, dated May 31. 204,312 Hungarian Jews had been shipped to the Reich.

Stamped and handwritten notations.

NG-5637: Typed memo from Wagner to Steengracht, dated May 21, 1943. Wagner reports a visit from the Hungarian Ambassador. Difficulties relating to solution of the Jewish problem in Hungary were discussed. The deportations would have to be carried out in stages and, in order not to alarm those left behind, the ones deported should be allowed “a possibility to earn a living, at least for a short period.” Stamped and signed by Wagner.

NG-5684: Typewritten copy of a telegram from Veessenmayer to Ribbentrop, dated July 6. A six page report of a conference with Horthy, who mentioned that “he received a flood of telegrams every day from all quarters abroad and at home, for instance from the Vatican, from the King of Sweden, from Switzerland, from the Red Cross and other parties,” in regard to the Hungarian Jews. He advocated keeping Jewish physicians and also the Jewish labor companies who had been assigned to war related tasks. Veessenmayer told him that “the solution of the Jewish question [...] was carried out by Hungary [but] could never [have been] completed without [SS and SD] support.” Initialed by Steengracht.

A few words on the general conditions under which this documents analysis was carried out are in order before proceeding to interpret this evidence. Unless one goes to Washington to examine original documents, what one typically has made available when a specific document is examined may consist of as many as four parts. First, there may be a photostatic copy of the original document. This happens only in a minority of cases. The other three parts are almost always available. First, there is the mimeographed reproduction, in German, of the original document. Thus, instead of any handwritten material, there is typewritten material that is indicated as having been handwritten. Second, there is the English translation of this German language document. Third, there is the accompanying descriptive material, the “staff evidence analysis.” Among the four parts, quite a few minor contradictions were noted in the course of the study. In addition, a very few documents were missing from the collection examined.

It might be said, with good grounds, that certain of these documents should not be in the list, because they admit of many interpretations other than transport of the majority of Hungarian Jews to the Reich. NG-2424 is of this nature; we have seen that the proposed Budapest action finally took place in October. NG-5533 and NG-5684 admit of many interpretations; with respect to the latter, there is no doubt that some Hungarian Jews were deported to the Reich specifically for labor and the document may be interpreted in that respect.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that I must declare, at this point, that a quite considerable amount of forgery was involved in the production of these documents; they were written after the war. That the events the documents speak of, involving over 400,000 Hungarian Jews transported to the Reich (or Poland) in May – July of 1944, did not occur is a certainty, for reasons given. However there are grounds for a certain uneasiness here because forgery does not seem to have been practiced with respect to the parts of the Auschwitz extermination legend which have been examined up to this point. Forgery is a risky business. Thus, although forgery seems a certainty, we should wish for some independent evidence for a

charge of forgery.

Forgery is less risky if it does not involve the actual forgery of signatures; if the cooperation of the persons who signed or initialed the forged documents could have been obtained, then it might have seemed that the risk was removed or minimized. Thus, we should take a close look at the endorsers of these documents. If NG-5684 is excepted, we have endorsements consisting of initials and/or signatures (or alleged initials and signatures) by Geiger, Wissberg, Hencke, Reichel, Mirbach, Wagner and Thadden, with the great majority of the endorsements coming from the latter two. These seven people have one very interesting thing in common; none were defendants in Case 11 or, apparently, in any other trial. In the cases of the first five, this can be argued to have been reasonable, either on account of the low rank of the person or on account of his peripheral involvement with the alleged crimes. Thus, the first five people had only a minor involvement in Case 11; Mirbach appeared as a defense witness and Hencke was a defense affiant.<sup>283</sup>

With Wagner and Thadden, however, the immunity from prosecution is most mysterious, if one does not grasp that the apparently safe manufacture of the incriminating Hungary documents required, basically, only their cooperation. We should thus examine their roles in the Foreign Office and their experiences after the war.

Eberhard von Thadden was an official in "*Inland II*" in the Foreign Office. This group's responsibility was liaison with the SS, and thus, Thadden was the "Jewish expert" of the Foreign Office, so to speak. Communication with Eichmann relative to the carrying out of Jewish policies, whatever those policies were, was a quite normal part of his duties. NG-2233 and NG-2980 are quite accurate in at least that respect. Horst Wagner was a member of Foreign Minister Ribbentrop's personal staff and, as the head of *Inland II*, was Thadden's superior and, as the documents correctly suggest, he was equally involved in the Jewish policies of the German government. The Foreign Office had been accused by the various military tribunals of being implicated in the extermination of Jews, and at the IMT Ribbentrop had been found guilty in this respect. The main defendants in Case 11 were some officials of the Foreign Office, most of them ordinary diplomats, and implication in Jewish extermination was naturally one of the charges. Both *ex officio* and in consideration of the documents that have been reviewed, both Thadden and Wagner would have seemed, at the start of Case 11, to have been in serious trouble. Moreover, they could not have been considered too obscure in relation to Case 11, the Ministries or Wilhelmstrasse Case. For example, the *New York Times* story announcing the opening of Case 11 chose to mention eight prominent "defendants or witnesses," and Thadden was one of those in the list.<sup>284</sup>

It is thus inexplicable, on normal grounds, that they were not even defendants in the trial; they both appeared as prosecution witnesses.<sup>285</sup> Strange occurrences

---

<sup>283</sup> NMT, vol. 14, 1023, 1027.

<sup>284</sup> *New York Times* (Feb. 26, 1947), 4; Hilberg, 350f; NMT, vol. 14, 1057f; Steengracht 86.

<sup>285</sup> NMT, vol. 14, 1031.

continued for several years. With respect to Thadden, German tribunals attempted to correct the glaring omission by prosecuting him. After he was released from American detention in 1949, a German court in Nuremberg charged him in December 1950, but he went to Cologne in the British zone and extradition was denied. Then a Cologne court charged him in May 1952, but the trial never materialized. He signed a prosecution affidavit for Eichmann's trial in 1961. In early 1964, he was arrested again but released after he managed to produce \$500,000 bail, but then in November 1964 he was in an automobile accident and died of the injuries received.

Similarly, Horst Wagner was arrested by German authorities in 1949, but he managed to flee to Spain and then to Italy. Extradition proceedings commenced in 1953 but failed. In 1958, he returned to Germany to apply for a pension, was arrested, but soon released on \$20,000 bond, despite his previous flight to escape prosecution. His case seemed to disappear, but a trial was finally scheduled for May 20, 1968, ten years after his return to Germany. However there were several postponements for various stated reasons, and finally, in late 1972, his trial was postponed indefinitely. In late 1975, he was living in quiet retirement in a suburb of Düsseldorf.<sup>286</sup>

So much for the documentary evidence supporting the claims of extermination of Hungarian Jews. Wagner and Thadden had joined, as had Höss and others, the "new *Meistersinger von Nürnberg*," but they evidently did it in an intelligent manner, because they acquired effective immunity from prosecution. In this connection, a detailed study of the documents by some expert person would be, most probably, very worthwhile. One object of analysis should be the language used. For example, the expression "*nach Deutschland*" in NG-2262 sounds as peculiar to me as "to America" would sound in an official State Department document, but I am not the appropriate judge in this matter. In any case, Wagner and Thadden held some cards merely by virtue of knowledge of the existence of false documents, that others did not hold. For example, Höss was in a position of dependence only on the gratitude of the Allies.

I have not examined all of the documents in the NG series (there are more than 5,000), and therefore I cannot reject the possibility, or even probability, that a few more exist. It is also possible that one or two might turn up with scribbles, said to be initials, for which I have no immediate answer. However, the documents study has been relatively thorough in consideration of the purposes of our study. It goes far beyond the documents that happen to have been referenced by Hilberg and by Reitlinger, far enough to satisfy me three times over on the fundamental dependence of this evidence on the post-war cooperation of von Thadden and Wagner.

It is well worth noting that Wagner and Thadden were not the only Germans involved with the Hungarian Jews who were mysteriously excused from prosecution. SS General Otto Winkelmann, Higher SS and Police Leader for Hungary and in command of all SS operations in Hungary, was also a prosecution witness in

---

<sup>286</sup> Hilberg, 714, 715; Reitlinger, 443, 566, 567; Eichmann, session 85, A1, B1, O1-R1; London *Times* (Nov. 20, 1964), 16; *New York Times* (Nov. 20, 1964), 8. London *Daily Telegraph*, (Nov. 7, 1975), magazine section, 17.

Case 11. SS Colonel Kurt Becher, representative in Hungary of the SS *Führungshauptamt* (and thus of Himmler), served the prosecution at the IMT. In fact none of the principals unquestionably involved in whatever were the German measures relative to the Hungarian Jews stood trial at Nuremberg or (with the exception of Eichmann) anywhere else. Eichmann was missing at the time of the Nuremberg trials, and the others gave evidence for the prosecution of those whose involvement had been at most peripheral.

## The Producers

Nobody should be surprised to find the most sordid practices behind these trials. We have seen in Chapter 1 (pp. 40-43) that no ethical limitations were respected in the means sometimes employed to produce "evidence." We should, therefore, take a closer look at who was in charge in Case 11. Recall that there was no substantial "indictment" process involving a grand jury, and that, as one may confirm by reading DuBois' book, it was the prosecution in each case that decided who was to be put on trial and with what he was to be charged.

The Wilhelmstrasse Case was not really commensurate with the other cases tried before the NMT; all of the latter had had special purpose characters, as Table 4 shows (p. 35). The Ministries or Wilhelmstrasse Case, however, was somewhat like a "little IMT," that is, people from an assortment of German government ministries were put on trial and the trial had a correspondingly wide scope. Thus, it was split into an "economic ministries section" and a "political ministries section," each of which had different prosecution staffs.

The important section from our point of view and, indeed, the most politically important case to come before the NMT was the political ministries section of Case 11, whose chief prosecutor was Robert M. W. Kempner, who has quite a history. It is very useful to present a short summary here of the "high" points of his career.

Kempner, a Jew, was born in Germany in 1899, studied law, and joined the Prussian Ministry of Interior during the Twenties. In the years 1928-1933, he was a senior counsel for the Prussian State Police (under the Ministry of the Interior) and specialized in investigating the rising Nazi Party. He became an anti-Nazi crusader in his official capacity and energetically attempted, without success, to have the party outlawed.

When the Nazis took over the German government in 1933, he was dismissed from his government position, but although Jewish, he was able to continue his legal practice for a short while as a counselor in international law and Jewish migration problems and also, apparently, as legal counsel for the German taxi drivers' organization. Whether or not he spent any time in a camp or in some other form of detention is not clear. In any case, he moved to Italy in 1935 to take an administrative and teaching (political science) position at a small school in Florence. The Mussolini government closed the school in 1938, so the school and

Kempner moved to Nice, France. He did not remain with the school for very long, however, and emigrated to the United States in 1939. His mother already had a research job at the University of Pennsylvania, and this connection seems to have landed him his “research associate” position at that University.<sup>287</sup>

He immediately resumed his anti-Nazi crusading. He had somehow managed to smuggle out of Germany some of the Prussian police papers, to which he had contributed, and these became the basis of a book, which he published privately in 1943. The book, in stencil form, attempted to show, on the basis of Kempner’s past experiences in Germany, what should be done in Germany after the war in order to permanently suppress Nazism. It did not achieve wide circulation but, together with some other books and articles that he wrote, established him as a sort of expert on fighting Nazis. He had also smuggled out some phonograph recordings of Nazi meetings; these had been made by the Prussian police during the years of his service. He contributed them to the University of Pennsylvania. He also did a certain amount of anti-Nazi letter writing to the newspapers. As the war was drawing to a close, he wrote that the Nazi leaders should be tried in the U.S. before regular American courts. In the meantime, he had acquired U.S. citizenship.<sup>288</sup>

During the war he worked for both the U.S. Department of Justice and the OSS. In the latter agency, he was charged with drawing up lists of German anti-Nazis who could be trusted with posts in the coming occupation government of Germany. He was one of a large group of German Jews in the OSS (which included, e.g., Herbert Marcuse).

At the end of the war, Kempner switched to the War Department and accompanied the U.S. Army back into Germany “on the payroll of the Judge Advocate General.” Prior to the opening of the IMT trial, he served in the fairly significant role of prosecution liaison with defense counsel and later on was in charge of the division that prepared the U.S. trial briefs against individual defendants. During the trial, he was an apparently ordinary member of the prosecution staff and specialized in the prosecution of the Nazi Minister of the Interior Frick. He does not appear to have been particularly prominent, although immediately after the trial he contributed a magazine article to the *New York Times* on the great work the trial had done in educating the Germans. The killings of the German military and political leaders had not yet been carried out, so he simultaneously predicted, with great satisfaction, that the doomed Nazis would be buried in unmarked graves to “avoid fanatical pilgrimages by still ardent Nazis.” Actually, the ultimate procedure was even more hysterical, because the bodies of Göring *et al.* were photographed (in order to be gloated over shortly later in the press and in newsreels), disguised in U.S. Army uniforms, taken secretly to Dachau and cremated there, the ashes being sifted into a nearby stream.<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>287</sup> *New York Times* (Feb. 22, 1940), 22; (Aug. 26, 1940), 17; (Mar. 30, 1944), 6; (Nov. 14, 1945), 8; (Jan. 17, 1946), 14; Select Committee, 1534-1535; *Current Biography* (1943), 370; *Who’s Who in World Jewry* (1965), 498.

<sup>288</sup> Kempner, 1-12; *New York Times* (Sep. 28, 1941), sec. 2, 6; (Jan 20, 1945), 10.

<sup>289</sup> R. H. Smith, 217, 222; *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 5, 44; *New York Times* (Oct. 6, 1946), sec. 6, 8;

As he was taking over his responsibilities in Case 11 in 1947, Kempner was in the news in a related but nevertheless highly important connection from the point of view of our subject. In 1943 and 1944, there had been held, in the land of the "free press," some "sedition trials" of Americans whose views of the U.S. government's war policies were considered unwelcome. The U.S. prosecutor was O. John Rogge, an Ohioan who had, in his youth, been expected by family and friends to enter the ministry. He became a lawyer instead and is said to have turned in a brilliant performance at the Harvard Law School. Attorney General Biddle chose him to prosecute the "sedition" case, replacing William P. Maloney, whose methods had provoked protests from several influential members of Congress. The proceedings, involving 30 defendants, were completely contrary to U.S. constitutional principles and were fortuitously aborted when the trial judge passed away in November 1944, and a mistrial was declared. While the government was planning to resume the case, the Supreme Court had reversed another sedition conviction, and grave doubt arose within the Justice Department about the wisdom of continuing the spectacle. We hope the reader will abide this long digression on the "sedition" episode within the present digression on Kempner, for the point to be made is most important.<sup>290</sup>

Rogge lost interest in the sedition case as such, but he did not lose interest in the general subject of a "Fascist" internal menace in the U.S. In the spring of 1946, he went to Germany on an 11 week "information" gathering expedition and accumulated some alleged facts that he summarized in a report, which he submitted to the Justice Department later in the year. Because there was no immediate reaction from the Justice Department to the material he had submitted, it appears that he got impatient and could not restrain himself. He therefore resorted to going around giving speeches in which he divulged some of the "information" he had been able to gather by interrogating Germans. In a speech to B'nai B'rith in New York in October 1946, he reported in very general language that Fascists are still at large "in the world and in this country. [...] Now the Fascists can take a more subtle disguise; they can come forward and simply say 'I am anti-Communist'." A few days later he was much more specific whom he was talking about. John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine workers, and the late William R. Davis, an oil operator and promoter, had, he declared in a speech at Swarthmore College, conspired with Göring and Ribbentrop to defeat President Roosevelt in the elections of 1936, 1940 and 1944. According to the "evidence" that he had obtained in Germany, other prominent Americans who, in the view of the Nazis, "could be organized against United States participation in the war" included, he said, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, former Vice President John N. Garner, former President Herbert Hoover and Democratic big-wig James A. Farley. Rogge had also given some of his material to Drew Pearson, and it appeared in Pearson's column at about the same time. For such flagrant violation of the rules and standards of the Justice Department and of the legal profession and also, presumably, for stepping on some important political toes, Rogge was immediately dismissed from the Jus-

---

(Oct. 7, 1946), 2; (Mar. 18, 1947), 4; Select Committee, 1536, 1539.

<sup>290</sup> *Current Biography* (1948), 533-534; *New York Times* (Feb. 7, 1943), 34.

tice Department by Attorney General Clark. Rogge defended his actions, explaining that, after all, he had merely made “a study of international Fascism, for the people under investigation were part of an international movement to destroy democracy both here and abroad.” Again he was specific; two of the people posing the Fascist threat were Mr. Douglas MacCollum Stewart and Mr. George T. Eggleston, at the time a member of the staff of the *Reader's Digest*. Rogge said that in Germany he had obtained information about them from former German diplomats who had had official connections with the U.S. before Pearl Harbor. *Pravda* described Rogge's removal as a “scandal.”<sup>291</sup>

In the period before Pearl Harbor, Stewart and Eggleston had published the *Scribner's Commentator*, which was dedicated to keeping the U.S. out of World War II. During 1941, Stewart had received a large sum of money, \$38,000, and could not explain where it came from. He told the “sedition” grand juries of 1943-1944 that he had found this money in his home. Since such a story sounds ludicrous even to an impartial observer, Stewart was assailed by the prosecutor and judge for giving such testimony. His refusal to change it led to his being held in contempt of court, and he was sentenced to serve 90 days in jail (he was paroled after 75 days).

In the course of 1946, the Justice Department, including even Rogge, had become convinced that no “sedition” charge could succeed in court, so the case that had been opened in 1943 was finally closed. However, there was still the matter of Stewart's testimony, which seemed a good basis for a perjury charge. Thus, in March 1947, Stewart was put on trial for committing perjury in testifying before the wartime grand jury.

The prosecution claimed that Stewart had received \$15,000 of the \$38,000 from the German government and produced two witnesses to support its contention. Baron Herbert von Stempel, former First Secretary of the German Embassy in Washington, testified that he had given Stewart \$15,000 in the Hotel Pennsylvania in New York in the fall of 1941. The money had been obtained, he said, from Dr. Hans Thomsen, German Chargé d'Affaires. Thomsen then testified in support of von Stempel's story. The testimony of Stempel and Thomsen was, in fact, the direct consequence of Rogge's information gathering expedition in Germany in 1946.

Stewart's defense produced evidence that Stewart had received large sums of money from American sources in 1941. It claimed that some wealthy Americans wished to support the, by then, beleaguered cause of staying out of the war, but anonymously, so they slipped money to Stewart anonymously. Whether this claim was truthful or the truth was that Stewart had, indeed, lied before the wartime grand jury on account of feeling himself obliged not to divulge the identities of his American supporters, is scarcely relevant to our subject. More relevant was the defense cross examination of the prosecution's German witnesses, because the defense was able to discredit the prosecution case by showing that the testimony

---

<sup>291</sup> *Current Biography* (1948), 534; *New York Times* (Oct. 14, 1946), 44; *New York Times* (Oct. 23, 1946), 8; (Oct. 26, 1946), 1; (Oct. 27, 1946), 16; (Nov. 3, 1946), 13; *Newsweek* (Nov. 4, 1946), 26.



had been coerced. Baron von Stempel said that he had been arrested in Hamburg by two British agents who, when asked for their warrant, “smiled, drew their guns from their shoulder holsters, and said that was their warrant.” He then spent four weeks in an American interrogation center and then seven months in a detention camp, where he was again subject to continual questioning. During this period, his health was “never so bad.” He was questioned by Robert M. W. Kempner, but did not want to talk about this. Judge Laws was obliged to direct von Stempel to reply to defense attorney Magee’s questions about this feature of his experiences. He finally said that Kempner had told him that if he “concealed any embassy dealings” he would be court martialed and sentenced to death. He then told the whole story. Incessant, intensive questioning by interrogators made him feel as if he had been “hypnotized.” O. John Rogge became one of von Stempel’s interrogators in Germany. During Rogge’s interrogation, he said, his necktie and shoelaces were removed, he was kept in solitary confinement, was questioned all day without food, and was “at all times under duress.” He admitted that he had signed a statement, but said that this was on account of fear of further solitary confinement. He gave this testimony, so destructive to the prosecution’s case, despite the fact that the U.S. was paying him \$70 per week, plus hotel expenses, in connection with his appearance as a witness against Stewart. There was also the possibility of U.S. retaliation via some sort of “war crimes” charge. Thomsen was likewise cross-examined; he admitted that von Stempel had told him of the death threat and said that he had been “coached” by Rogge in recalling details. The jury found Stewart innocent during the course of a lunch break. Thus had Kempner appeared in the newspapers even before Case 11 had gotten underway.<sup>292</sup>

In examining the sedition affair, we have, therefore, encountered the Wilhelmstrasse Case, in the sense that Kempner enters the picture as interrogator and potential prosecutor of incarcerated former officials of the German Foreign office. The connection with Case 11 is even more substantial because Stewart’s attorney in the 1947 trial, Warren E. Magee, was shortly later to become co-counsel for Baron von Weizsäcker, the principal defendant in Case 11. We therefore have the unusual fact that the two sides involved in Case 11 had, almost simultaneously, clashed in a regular U.S. legal proceeding and that the testimony that had been the result of the interrogation of the captive Germans had been successfully challenged by the defense as coerced. This is an extraordinary and important confirmation of the kind of activity, indicated by the evidence we have already reviewed, which must have transpired behind the scenes at the NMT – carrot and stick tactics of various sorts, including even third degree methods in some cases (but not necessarily in all cases where the evidence could correctly be said to have been “coerced”). Magee’s successes along these lines did not, moreover, cease with the Stewart trial. In another extraordinary choice of a person to use as a prosecution witness rather than put on trail, Kempner had used Friedrich Gaus, who had a reputation as “Ribbentrop’s evil spirit,” as the chief prosecution witness against von Weizsäcker. Magee, evidently by virtue of being an American

<sup>292</sup> *New York Times* (Mar. 12, 1947), 6; (Mar. 13, 1947), 17; (Mar. 14, 1947), 12; (Mar. 15, 1947), 11; (Mar. 18, 1947), 4; (Mar. 19, 1947), 5; (Mar. 26, 1947), 4; *Chicago Tribune* (Mar. 19, 1947), 20.

having access to documents denied the German lawyers, was able to prove in court that Kempner had threatened to hand Gaus over to the Russians if Gaus did not cooperate with the prosecution, a frequent and effective threat that had certain variations. Häfliger, one of the defendants in Case 11, was a Swiss citizen, but according to his trial testimony, he was told by interrogator Sachs that if he stood on his Swiss nationality he would be turned over to the Russians, and Sachs urged him “to note that there were no diplomatic relations between Russia and Switzerland.” Much more to the point is the fact that von Thadden, under cross examination by defense attorney Dr. Schmidt-Leichner, admitted that Kempner, in connection with an execution that had supposedly been carried out by German authorities in France:

*“had made me understand that there were two possibilities for me, either to confess or to be transmitted to the French authorities, before a French tribunal, where the death penalty would be sure for me. A delay of twenty four hours was accorded me, during which I had to decide.”*

A Swiss journalist wrote at the time that Kempner and colleagues were attempting to misrepresent Nazism as a “concoction of the German upper classes” in order to destroy the pre-Nazi social structure of Germany.<sup>293</sup>

Rogge had a long and interesting career, but a thorough summary would carry us too far afield. In fairness to him, we should say that his behavior in connection with the “sedition” cases should not lead one to assume that he was insensitive in regard to civil liberties, because when the first postwar steps were being taken to set up an anti-Communist internal security program, Rogge started yelling about “witch hunts” and, in the following years, became Chairman of the New York State (Henry) Wallace for President Committee, a perfectly logical appointment, because Rogge embodied all that was unique in that movement’s approach to dealing with the Soviet Union. Characterized by the left wing *Nation* in 1950 as “the lone independent in various Communist-operated congresses, committees, and delegations,” he had traveled to Moscow in March to attend the “World Congress of Partisans for Peace.” He explained to the Soviets that the cold war was equally the fault of both sides, and stood up in a formal meeting in the Kremlin and quoted Thomas Jefferson, actions that were not appreciated by his Soviet hosts. The *Nation* commented further that<sup>294</sup>

*“It is easy to put down O. John Rogge as a quixotic busybody, a fuzzy-minded liberal so out of touch with reality that he believes the ills of the world to be merely the result of unfortunate misunderstanding. [...] He has shown why the Russian rulers regard with suspicion even their own followers who have had contact with the West.”*

---

<sup>293</sup> Utlely, 172, 177; Gaus (Case 11 transcript, 5123-6167) denied the coercion but, as Magee commented in court, “we have the questions and answers that the witness gave” in the relevant interrogation. The von Thadden and Häfliger declarations were made in the sessions of March 3 and May 11, 1948, respectively, and the corresponding parts of the trial transcript are quoted by Bardèche, 120ff, who gives other examples of coercion and intimidation of witnesses at Nuremberg.

<sup>294</sup> *New York Times* (Nov. 8, 1947), 10; (Apr. 4, 1948), 46; *Nation* (May 27, 1950), 528; (Dec. 2, 1950), 499.

Rogge also involved himself in the widely publicized “Trenton Six” murder case of 1948-1953 as a lawyer for the “Civil Rights Congress.” In December 1949, the judge barred him from the New Jersey trial for :

“[...] violating the lawyers’ canons of ethics by denouncing the conduct of the trial in public, by showing ‘studied discourtesy and contempt’ in the court and by ‘deliberately distorting the facts.’ [The judge also charged that] *the Civil Rights Congress [...] collected more money from the public than was needed for the trial.*”

Seven months later, a U.S. court held that Rogge’s barring from the trial was wrong but did not order his restoration.<sup>295</sup> This short discussion of Rogge suffices for our purposes.

To return to Kempner. When the Bonn government had been newly constituted in 1949, he warned of incipient Nazism there. Such a view did not prevent him from serving, two years later, as Israel’s representative to Bonn in negotiations relative to the restitution of Jews who had suffered injury at the hands of the Nazi government. However, the next month he was attacking the reprieves and reductions of sentences of “war criminals” that had been granted by the U.S.<sup>296</sup>

Kempner next appeared in connection with the 1952 House investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, a well known Russian atrocity whose handling by the IMT throws full light on the absurdity of that tribunal’s claim to respect.

On April 13, 1943, the Germans announced that, in the Katyn Forest near the city of Smolensk in Russia (mid-way between Minsk and Moscow), mass graves of Polish officers who had been captured by the Russians in 1939 had been uncovered. Four days later the minister of defense of the Polish government in exile (in London) announced that he was requesting the International Red Cross to make an inquiry. The Germans supported the proposed inquiry but the Russians opposed it, referring to the London Poles as “Hitler’s Polish collaborators,” and on April 26 broke diplomatic relations with that government over the matter.

On account of the Russian opposition, the Red Cross refused to get involved. However, the German government exhibited the Katyn mass graves to various parties of Poles, to a group of foreign newspaper correspondents, to a group of German journalists, to small parties of British and American POW’s, to a technical team of the Polish Red Cross and, most importantly, to an international commission of experts in forensic medicine (specialists in rendering medical opinions in legal proceedings). The commission concluded with a report which demonstrated the certainty that these Polish officers had been murdered by the Russians prior to the outbreak of war between Russia and Germany in June 1941.

When the graves had first been discovered, the German propaganda service, not knowing how many bodies were to be found there but knowing the approximate number of Polish officers who could have been involved as victims, used the figure of 10,000 and 12,000 as the number of bodies discovered, and these were the figures which were given the widest publicity during the war. Consequently, at the IMT, the indictment charged the Germans with murdering 11,000 Polish of-

<sup>295</sup> *New York Times* (Dec. 17, 1949), 1; (Jul 22, 1950), 32.

<sup>296</sup> *New York Times* (Sep. 30, 1949), 2; (Jan. 12, 1951), 7; (Feb. 2, 1951), 8.

ficers at Katyn, although it had been established, later in 1943, that there were only 4,253 bodies to be found. This fact was published by the German government, but naturally, because it contradicted their earlier claims, the Germans did not give the correct figure great publicity.

What happened at the IMT with respect to this charge illustrates the foolishness of that tribunal's claim to anything approximating legal jurisdiction. The testimony of members of the forensic commission was naturally of interest, so the Russians produced Professor Marko Markov, a citizen and resident of Bulgaria, who had been one of the signers of the commission report. Bulgaria being, by then, under Soviet control, Markov had changed his mind and testified in support of the Russian position, *i.e.*, that the Germans had intimidated him into approving the commission report.<sup>297</sup>

Göring's counsel, on the other hand, applied to have Professor F. Naville, the chairman of the commission, called to testify. On this point one can see the emptiness of the tribunal's effectiveness in getting at the truth, even if it had wished to. Naville was a Swiss citizen, resident in Geneva, and could not be forced to testify and, in fact, he declined to testify. The motivation is obvious. The counsel for Field Marshall Keitel also requested that Naville (who had also been an International Red Cross representative) answer some questions (relative to a different subject) to be put to him in writing, but it appears that this interrogation did not materialize. Thus, the IMT tribunal, by its very nature, was prejudiced against the appearance of the most reliable type of witness: the citizen of a country which had been neutral during the war and independent after the war (I am only saying that the IMT could not *compel* testimony from such people; we have seen that Burckhardt, the President of the Red Cross, voluntarily answered written questions put to him in Switzerland for Kaltenbrunner's defense). The defense ended up by calling three German soldiers to testify (three witnesses were allowed to each side on this matter).<sup>298</sup>

The tribunal's final disposition of the Katyn issue was a disgrace even independent of the true facts concerning the atrocity: it was quietly dropped and does not appear in the judgment. The Germans were not "found" either guilty or not guilty of this Russian atrocity. The IMT ducked the whole matter.

In 1952, the U.S. House of Representatives investigated the Katyn massacre and naturally made an inquiry into what had happened at the IMT in this respect. The Select Committee set up for this purpose accordingly held some hearings in Frankfurt, Germany, in April of that year. The Committee heard, among others, representatives of both the defense and prosecution legal staffs of the IMT. To speak for the German side, the Committee logically called Dr. Otto Stahmer, who had been counsel for the principal defendant Göring, who had also been the defendant who had pressed this particular matter at the IMT. To speak for the American prosecution, the Committee, surprisingly, chose Robert M. W. Kempner. Examination of the trial record reveals no reason why Kempner should have been selected for this role. That Kempner appears to have been living in Germany

---

<sup>297</sup> Belgion, 64-78.

<sup>298</sup> IMT, vol. 10, 648.

at this time and that the Committee naturally thought it convenient that he testify at the Frankfurt hearings, does not explain anything. During the course of all of its hearings, the only other member of the prosecution that the Committee heard was Justice Jackson, but his appearance in November in Washington was somewhat ceremonial and added nothing to the record.

According to the record of the public hearing held in Frankfurt, Kempner explained that the Katyn massacre was, according to the understandings among the prosecution staffs, “a clear-cut Russian affair and was handled right from the beginning by the Russians. [...] We had no right to interfere in any way.” Nevertheless, after the witnesses had been heard, the general view, according to Kempner, was that Göring had scored a victory on this point. Thus, the failure to mention Katyn in the judgment called into question the integrity of the Nuremberg trials, and a realization of this was implicit in the questions asked by the committee members. Kempner was asked about possible participation by the U.S. prosecution staff in the behind-the-scenes activity in regard to Katyn, and denied that such had taken place. In response to questioning, he also denied that there had been any “conspiracy or attempt to collude between anybody on the American side and anybody on the Russian side.”<sup>299</sup>

The *New York Times* reported that the tone of the Frankfurt hearing was such that “the principles governing the trial procedure in Nuremberg were being questioned. United States officials at the hearing privately expressed concern over the situation.”<sup>300</sup> The *Chicago Tribune* reported that, at a secret session the night before the public hearing in Frankfurt, Kempner had admitted that the U.S. prosecution staff at the IMT had possessed evidence showing that the Russians had committed the Katyn murders.

The Select Committee on the Katyn Forest massacre concluded that the U.S. government had suppressed the truth about Katyn both during and immediately after the war. In particular, a report by Lt. Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., one of the American POW’s who had witnessed the mass graves, “later disappeared from either Army or State Department files.” It was also found that the Federal Communications Commission had intimidated radio stations in order to suppress criticism of the Russians.<sup>301</sup>

In the years immediately following 1952, there was little for Kempner to do in relation to Nazis, but with the Eichmann affair he was back in action and served as a “consultant” to the Israeli government in assembling evidence for the trial. From that point on, he was very active. He contributed an article to the *Yad Vashem Studies* on methods of examining Nazis in trials, and he published a book in German, rehashing old propaganda myths. In 1971, he expressed approval of the conviction of Lt. Calley, and in December 1972, he endorsed the “evidence” that Ladislas Farago had gathered in connection with Farago’s Martin Bormann-is-in-Argentina fiasco of that month. Evidently yearning for the old days, Kempner declared that the “United States and its Allies should reopen the Bormann case

---

<sup>299</sup> Select Committee, 1536-1548.

<sup>300</sup> *New York Times* (Apr. 25, 1952), 5; *Chicago Tribune* (Apr. 24, 1952), pt. 4, 1.

<sup>301</sup> *New York Times* (Nov. 15, 1952), 2; (Dec. 23, 1952), 1.

within the framework of the International Military Tribunal.”<sup>302</sup> Bormann had been tried *in absentia* at the IMT and sentenced to death. He was never found, and it is now generally agreed that he died in Berlin.

In regard to Kempner, three principal conclusions may be drawn from this short summary of the man’s career (based entirely on material in the public record). First, he could accurately be characterized as a fanatical anti-Nazi, starting in the Twenties, when the Nazis were certainly no more criminal than several other groups on the violent and chaotic German political scene (the Communists and Social Democrats also had private armies). Anti-Nazism is obviously Kempner’s consuming vocation. Second, he was an extremely important figure in the trials that the U.S. held in Nuremberg. We have seen that he had critically important responsibilities in connection with the IMT and was also treated, later on, as a particular authority on what had gone on there. At the end of the IMT trial, the press described him as “Jackson’s expert on German matters” and “chief of investigation and research for [...] Jackson.”<sup>303</sup> At the NMT, he took over the prosecution of the most important case, the political section of the Wilhelmstrasse Case, and he may well have been the most important individual on the Nuremberg staff, although further research would be required to clarify the real power relationships that existed on the Nuremberg staff, if such clarification is possible. James M. McHaney headed the division that prepared Cases 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, and 12. Other significant persons at the NMT have been discussed by Taylor.<sup>304</sup> The *Encyclopedia Judaica* describes Kempner as “chief prosecutor” at the NMT trials.

The third conclusion that may be drawn is that there are excellent grounds, based on the public record, for believing that Kempner abused the power he had at the military tribunals and produced “evidence” by improper methods involving threats and various forms of coercion. The Stewart case makes this conclusion inescapable.

This is the man who held the power of life and death over Eberhard von Thadden and Horst Wagner.

Our digression on Kempner is concluded. We came to the point, in our analysis of Hungary, where irregularities in the production of evidence in Case 11 were clearly indicated. Thus, it was necessary to examine two subjects: who was in charge in Case 11 and what was the level of integrity maintained in the operations of the trials at Nuremberg. It was found that the truth in regard to the latter subject was established rather decisively in the course of examining the former; a study of Kempner’s career reveals all that one needs to know in order to evaluate the reliability of the evidence generated at the Nuremberg trials.

Clearly, any person who wished to maintain the authenticity of the Hungary-related documents that imply extermination must produce some tortured story whose structure we cannot begin to imagine.

Another person involved in the documents is Veesebmayer, who was a defendant in the Wilhelmstrasse Case and who was questioned in connection with some

<sup>302</sup> *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 10, 904; *New York Times* (Mar. 31, 1971), 1; (Dec. 5, 1972), 16.

<sup>303</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 6, 1946), sec. 6, 8; (Oct. 7, 1946), 2.

<sup>304</sup> Taylor (Aug. 15, 1949), 38+.

of these documents. The general position taken in his testimony was a reasonable one in view of his objective of gaining acquittal or a light sentence. He had to report everything that went on in Hungary, and thus, Jewish measures were in his reports. However, these measures did not have the importance in his mind at that time that they have in our minds at this time. He testified that he often got twenty assignments a day and in the course of a month would receive mutually contradictory assignments. His reports, he said, were naturally prepared by assistants, hastily scanned by him, and then signed. Shown documents, which have him reporting that two transports, each of 2,000 Jews fit for work, were sent to Auschwitz in April 1944, and asked if this were correct, he remarked that he had no specific memory but that it was "quite possible," but that he never knew what Auschwitz was. Shown NG-5567, which had him reporting that up to June 17, 326,009 Jews had been deported from Hungary, he also remarked "quite possible." In other words, he did not want to involve himself, in any way, in these matters by taking any strong position, either assenting or dissenting, with respect to the alleged facts. If he had said that he clearly recollected, in detail, mass deportations of Jews in the numbers alleged in the spring and summer of 1944, then such testimony would have implicated him in the alleged exterminations. On the other hand, if he had denied that such mass deportations had taken place, then he would, in effect, have been claiming close involvement in whatever had happened and he would have also, by such testimony, flung down a challenge to the prosecution and court which they couldn't possibly have ignored. Thus the logic of his testimony. He said that he was concerned with moving the Jews out of Budapest because of the danger of revolt as the Russians approached. Pressed on this matter, he explained that:

*"In practice the question was, will the front hold or won't it? If Budapest revolts, the whole front will be rolled up. [...] If I participated in such conversations, which I won't deny is possible, then I participated exclusively from a military point of view. What can I do to hold up the Eastern front as long as possible? Only from that point of view."*

Veesenmayer was sentenced to twenty years imprisonment, but he was out by early 1952.<sup>305</sup>

This seems to be as good a place as any to point out a fact that seems to be effectively forgotten by many writers on this subject. There was a war going on during World War II. The Germans were thinking about ways of winning it, not about exterminating Jews. The claim of NG-2233 that the extermination program had rail priority over military production is absolutely ridiculous.

## What Happened in Hungary?

On the subject of what actually happened in Hungary, note that the Red Cross *Report* says that the basic German policy in 1944 was to intern East European

<sup>305</sup> NMT, vol. 13, 487-508; Reitlinger, 566.

Jews, on account of their posing a security menace as the front came nearer. Now, the documents reporting concentration and deportation of large numbers of Hungarian Jews may be correct in regard to concentration alone; this was the policy in neighboring countries. However, it seems unlikely that anywhere near 400,000 were concentrated. That would have been quite a huge operation.

It appears possible to get a fairly accurate picture of what happened in Hungary by supplementing the story of the Red Cross with an examination of the documents, rejecting the documents which are obvious forgeries. We are fortunate in having the two-volume collection of reproductions of selected original documents, *The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry*, edited by Randolph L. Braham; these volumes offer the normally circumstanced reader a handy substitute for a regular documents collection. Examining the documents included and rejecting as forgeries those that pertain to alleged deportations of 400,000 Hungarian Jews, a believable story unfolds. On April 14, 1944, Hungary agrees to the deportation of 50,000 employable Jews to Germany for labor (page 134, NG-1815). On April 19, Veessenmayer requests freight cars, whose procurement is "encountering great difficulties," for the deportation of 10,000 employable Jews delivered by the Hungarians (page 138, NG-5546). Finally on April 27, Veessenmayer reports on the imminent shipment of 4,000 employable Jews to Auschwitz (page 361, NG-5535). Also on April 27, Ritter reports on delays in the deportation of the 50,000 on account of rail shortages (page 362, NG-2196). Later in the year, July 11, Veessenmayer reports on the difficulty of carrying out the Jewish policy in Hungary because of the more lenient policies practiced in Romania and Slovakia (page 194, NG-5586). On August 25, Veessenmayer reports Himmler's offer to stop deportations from Hungary (page 481, no document number), and on October 18, Veessenmayer reports on the new Jewish measures in Hungary (page 226, no document number). A believable story, and one consistent with the Red Cross *Report*. One may also remark that, on Hungary, the authors of the hoax have again attempted to supply a dual interpretation to a perfectly valid fact. There were, indeed, deportations of Hungarian Jews in the spring of 1944 to, among other places, Auschwitz. However, the deportations, which were for labor purposes only, were severely limited by the disintegrating European rail system and do not appear to have been carried out on the approximate schedule originally contemplated or aspired to.

A few words regarding the Joel Brand affair, the proposed swap of Hungarian Jews for trucks and other supplies, are in order.

The pre-war German policy, which was also maintained to some extent early in the war, was to encourage Jewish emigration by all means. However, after the war had developed into a great conflict, the policy changed, and emigration from countries in the German sphere was made very difficult for Jews. The principal reason for this was, of course, that such Jews were manpower that could and would be used against them. There were a variety of lesser reasons, one of the most important being that, in an attempt to drive a wedge between Britain and the Arabs, the Germans supported the Arab side on the question of Jewish immigration into Palestine. Thus, the standard German attitude in the latter half of the war



was that Jewish emigration could proceed in exchange for Germans held abroad, especially if the Jews were not to go to Palestine. We have seen that Belsen served as a transit camp for Jews who were to be exchanged. What was involved in the Brand Affair was the same sort of thinking on the German side, with a variation regarding the form of the *quid pro quo*. The Germans were willing to let the Jews emigrate in exchange for the trucks and other supplies. Thus, there is nothing implausible in the Brand affair, provided one understands that it was not the lives of the Hungarian Jews that were at stake in the matter.

Although the Brand deal was not consummated, there was a trickle of German and Hungarian authorized emigration of Jews from Hungary to, e.g., Sweden, Switzerland, and the U.S. A rather larger number slipped into Romania and Slovakia illegally in 1944 (reversing the earlier direction of movement, which had been into Hungary). The defense documents Steengracht 75, 76, 77, and 87 give a picture of the situation.

The survey of 1944 propaganda that was presented in this chapter shows that Auschwitz (referred to as Oświęcim) finally emerged in the propaganda as an extermination camp in the period immediately after D-Day, when nobody was paying any attention to such stories. Later in the summer of 1944, the emphasis switched to the camp at Lublin, which was captured by the Russians in late July. The expected propaganda nonsense was generated in respect to the cremation ovens (five in number) that were found there, the Zyklon, some bones (presumably human), etc. Lublin remained the propaganda's leading extermination camp well into the autumn of 1944.<sup>306</sup>

## Can Anybody Believe such a Story?

This concludes our analysis of the Auschwitz charges. It is impossible to believe them; the allegations are so breathtakingly absurd that they are even difficult to summarize. We are told that the Nazis were carrying out mass exterminations of Jews at the industrial center Auschwitz, employing the widely used insecticide Zyklon B for the killing. The 30 or 46 cremation muffles at Auschwitz, used for disposing of the bodies of the very large numbers of people who died ordinary deaths there, were also used for making the bodies of these exterminated Jews vanish without a trace. As an extermination center, Auschwitz was naturally the place that the Hungarian Jews were shipped to for execution. Shipments of Jews conscripted specifically for desperately needed labor in military production were delayed in order to transport the Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz for execution. The 46 cremation muffles, which existed at Auschwitz, turned out to be inadequate to dispose of people arriving at the rate of about 10,000 per day, so the bodies were burned out-of-doors in pits. This cleaning out of the Hungarian Jews escaped the

---

<sup>306</sup> Lublin (Majdanek) propaganda appeared in *Life* (Aug. 28, 1944), 34; (Sep. 18, 1944), 17; *Newsweek* (Sep. 11, 1944), 64; *Reader's Digest* (Nov. 1944), 32; *Time* (Aug. 21, 1944), 36; (Sep. 11, 1944), 36; *Saturday Review Lit.* (Sep. 16, 1944), 44.

notice of the International Red Cross delegation in Budapest, which was deeply involved in Jewish affairs. The evidence for all of this, presented to us by the U.S. government, consist of documents whose authenticity is proved by the endorsements of Jewish policy specialists Wagner and von Thadden, who are also incriminated by the documents. However, the U.S. government did not prosecute Wagner and von Thadden in the Wilhelmstrasse Case, where the indictments were in the hands of a lifelong Nazi-hater (Kempner) and where an American lawyer had exposed the evidence as coerced, just as he did in a regular U.S. legal proceeding in Washington where Kempner was involved.

The U.S. government also failed, despite all of its talk in 1944, to interfere in any way with, or even make photographs of, these alleged events at Auschwitz.

Can anybody believe such a story?



## Chapter 6: Et Cetera

The extermination claims have been so concentrated on Auschwitz that this book could justifiably end right here; because the central part of the extermination legend is false, there is no reason why the reader should believe any other part of it, even if the evidence might appear relatively decent at first glance. Hundreds of trained staff members were dispatched to Europe and employed there to gather the “evidence” for exterminations and related crimes, and we have seen what kind of story they have presented with respect to Auschwitz; a fabrication constructed of perjury, forgery, distortion of fact and misrepresentation of documents. There is no reason to expect a better case for the less publicized features of the extermination legend. Nevertheless, the remainder of the story should be examined, partly for the sake of completeness, partly because the examination can be accomplished rather quickly, and partly because there is a respect in which one feature of the legend may be partially true. It is also convenient to review here a few odd matters that might strike some readers as evidence in support of the extermination claims.

### More ‘Extermination’ Camps

The evidence for exterminations at Belzec, Chelmno, Lublin, Sobibor, and Treblinka is fairly close to zero. There is the Höss affidavit and testimony and the “Gerstein statement.” There is a draft of a letter by Dr. Wetzel, another Nazi who became immune from prosecution, speaking of there being “no objections to doing away with those Jews who are unable to work, by means of the Brack remedy” (NO-0365). The draft is typewritten and apparently initialed by Wetzel, who had been head of the Race-Political Office of the NSDAP, but was transferred in 1941 to Rosenberg’s Ministry for the East, where he served as the expert for Jewish affairs. There is no evidence that the letter, which is addressed to Hinrich Lohse, Reichskommissar for the Ostland (map, Fig. 3), was ever sent. A similar document, bearing a typewritten Wetzel signature, is NG-2325. Wetzel was not called as a witness at any of the Nuremberg trials, and was not threatened with prosecution until 1961, when he was arrested by German authorities in Hannover, but his case seems to have immediately disappeared from the public record, and nothing more was heard of him, except that he is said to have been finally charged in 1966; if such is the case it is odd that he is not listed in the 1965 East German *Brown Book*. However, no trial ever materialized.<sup>307</sup> We will have occasion to comment on Lohse below.

The Viktor Brack of Wetzel’s letter was an official of the Führer-Chancellery,

---

<sup>307</sup> Hilberg, 562; Reitlinger, 137, 567; Rassiner (1962), 80n.

involved in the Nazi euthanasia program. The present claim is that the gas chambers in Poland, exclusive of those allegedly used at Auschwitz, “evolved” from the euthanasia program which, it is claimed, employed gas chambers. Despite Brack’s testimony, it is difficult to believe that euthanasia was practiced in German hospitals by a method of gassing 20 or 30 persons at a time with carbon monoxide.<sup>308</sup> Auschwitz, of course, must be excluded from this “evolution” from the euthanasia program on account, among other reasons, of the Höss testimony. Reitlinger and Hilberg do not seem worried over the confusion thus created in the structure of the legend.

The euthanasia program came into existence via a Hitler decree of September 1, 1939, authorizing the mercy killing of mortally ill patients. Later the severely insane were included. The program encountered deep hostility in the German population, especially because rumors of unknown origin immediately started circulating; the rumors claimed, *inter alia*, mass gassings of the sick and elderly. On November 6, 1940, Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich wrote to the Ministry of Justice, setting forth the Catholic Church’s objections, and pointing out<sup>309</sup>

*“[...] that a great disturbance has arisen in our people today because the mass dying of mentally ill persons is discussed everywhere and unfortunately the most absurd rumors are emerging about the number of deaths, the manner of death, etc.”*

It did not take long for the euthanasia program to appear in propaganda, and in December 1941 the BBC broadcast an address by author Thomas Mann, in which Mann urged the German people to break with the Nazis. In listing the Nazi crimes, Mann said:<sup>310</sup>

*“In German hospitals the severely wounded, the old and feeble are killed with poison gas – in one single institution, two to three thousand, a German doctor said.”*

This seems to be the first appearance of gas chambers in the propaganda but, as far as we can see, this claim was not related to the extermination propaganda which started half a year later, and in the course of which no reference, apparently, was made to the euthanasia program. The relating of the euthanasia program to exterminations came much later.

At the IMT, the prosecution did not attempt to relate euthanasia to exterminations. It remained for a defense witness to do this. In the closing days of the IMT, Konrad Morgen appeared as a defense witness for the SS. We have seen that it was Morgen who had exposed the ring of murder and corruption centered around commandant Koch of Buchenwald. Morgen was thus considered a “god” SS man, in contrast to the bloodthirsty scoundrels who had been his colleagues and comrades (he continues to be considered a good guy, although not as good as Gerstein, who has by now achieved beatification in the “holocaust” litany). As a defense witness for the SS under seemingly hopeless circumstances, Morgen presented a story that had an inevitable logic to it and, indeed, the logic of Morgen’s

---

<sup>308</sup> NMT, vol. 1, 876.

<sup>309</sup> NO-824 (Hitler order), NO-846 (Faulhaber letter), NO-844 (report on rumors).

<sup>310</sup> *New York Times* (Dec. 7, 1941), 45.

testimony has an importance in our analysis which transcends the immediate point we are discussing.

Morgen testified that in the course of his investigations of the camps, carried out in pursuance of his duty as an SS official, he unexpectedly encountered extermination programs at Auschwitz and at Lublin, but that SS involvement was nonexistent or minimal. At Lublin the exterminations were being conducted by Wirth of the ordinary criminal police, with the assistance of Jewish labor detachments (who were promised part of the loot). Wirth supervised three additional extermination camps in Poland, according to Morgen. Although the criminal police, the Kripo, was administratively under the RSHA, Morgen was careful to point out that Kriminalkommissar Wirth was not a member of the SS. Morgen claimed that Wirth had been attached to the Führer Chancellery, had been involved in the euthanasia program (which is possibly true), and had later received orders from the Führer Chancellery to extend his exterminating activities to the Jews. Although the only real point of Morgen's testimony was the futile attempt to absolve the SS, the testimony is considered "evidence" by Reitlinger and by Hilberg, who avoid considering the fact that Morgen, in his attempt at excusing the SS, also testified that at Auschwitz the extermination camp was Monowitz, the one of the complex of camps that was administered by Farben. Morgen did not go so far as to claim that Farben had its own company extermination program, but he declared that the only SS involvement consisted of a few Baltic and Ukrainian recruits used as guards, and that the "entire technical arrangement was almost exclusively in the hands of the prisoners."<sup>311</sup>

Morgen's ploy obviously inspired the prosecution anew, because it had not occurred to relate exterminations to euthanasia. It was too late to develop the point at the IMT, so it was developed in Case 1 at the NMT (actually the euthanasia program is loosely linked with exterminations in the "Gerstein statement," reproduced here in Appendix A – the Gerstein statement was put into evidence at the IMT long before Morgen's testimony, but nobody paid any attention to its text). To us, this relating of exterminations to euthanasia is just another example of the "excess fact"; the inventors were so concerned with getting some real fact into their story that it did not occur to them that there are some real facts that a good hoax is better off without.

This seems to cover the evidence for gassings at the camps in Poland exclusive of Auschwitz.

We again remark that the logic of Morgen's testimony, as courtroom defense strategy, is of some importance to our study. His side obviously calculated that the court was immovable on the question of the existence of the exterminations, and thus, Morgen's testimony invited the court to embrace the theory that somebody other than the SS was guilty.

---

<sup>311</sup> IMT, vol. 20, 487-515.

## Logic of Defense Testimonies

Before passing to consideration of the activities of the *Einsatzgruppen* in Russia, it is convenient to review various statements made or allegedly made by various Nazis, mostly after the war, which explicitly or implicitly claim exterminations.

An important category consist of statements made by German witnesses and defendants at the war crimes trials. In evaluating such statements, one must bear in mind the simple fact that the powers which conducted these trials were committed, as an immovable political fact, to the legend of Jewish extermination, especially in regard to Auschwitz. Their leaders had made the relevant charges long before they possessed a scrap of what is today called "evidence." Thus, the courts were committed *a priori* to the extermination legend. A finding that exterminations had not occurred was simply not in the realm of political possibility at these trials, in any practical sense. This is an undeniable fact.

On the other hand, with only a tiny handful of exceptions, the courts were not *a priori* committed on questions of personal responsibility of individuals. With respect to individuals the courts were not as greatly constrained, politically speaking. In most cases judgments of absence of personal responsibility were well within the realm of political possibility (as distinct from probability). All defense cases were organized in relation to these undeniably valid observations, and even with those individuals whose cases were hopeless, the lawyers had no choice but to proceed on the assumption that a favorable verdict was within the realm of the possible. In considering the trials from this point of view, it is very helpful to consider them chronologically.

### Josef Kramer, 'Beast of Belsen'

The first relevant trial was not the IMT but the "Belsen trial," conducted by a British military court, of Germans who had been on the staff of the Belsen camp when it was captured. The commandant, SS Captain Josef Kramer (the "Beast of Belsen"), was naturally the principal defendant. The importance of the Belsen trial derives, however, from the fact that Kramer has previously been (during 1944) the Birkenau camp commander. Kramer's trial was conducted in the autumn of 1945 and was concluded in November, just as the IMT trial was beginning. Kramer was hanged in December 1945.

We are fortunate in having the lengthy first statement that Kramer made in reply to British interrogation. The importance of this statement lies in the fact that it was made before any general realization developed among Germans that the Allied courts were completely serious, and immovable, on the question of the reality of the exterminations (it might have been made within about a month after the capture of Belsen, but this is not certain). There is little courtroom logic playing a role in Kramer's first statement, and for this reason it is reproduced here in Ap-

pendix D. Kramer's story was completely in accord with what we have presented here, *i.e.*, there were crematories in all of the concentration camps, some had rather high death rates, especially Auschwitz, which required relatively extensive cremation facilities, because it was also a huge camp. His statement is quite frank regarding the more unhappy features of the camps, and is as accurate a description of the camps as we are likely to get. In regard to atrocities, he firmly asserted:

*"I have heard of the allegations of former prisoners in Auschwitz referring to a gas chamber there, the mass executions and whippings, the cruelty of the guards employed, and that all this took place either in my presence or with my knowledge. All I can say to all this is that it is untrue from beginning to end."*

Kramer later retreated from this firm stand and made a second statement, also reproduced in Appendix D, in which he testified to the existence of a gas chamber at Auschwitz, adding that he had no responsibility in this connection, and that the exterminations were under the direct control of the central camp administration at Auschwitz I. At his trial, Kramer offered two reasons for the discrepancy between his two statements:<sup>312</sup>

*"The first is that in the first statement I was told that the prisoners alleged that these gas chambers were under my command, and the second and main reason was that Pohl, who spoke to me, took my word of honor that I should be silent and should not tell anybody at all about the existence of the gas chambers. When I made my first statement I felt still bound by this word of honor which I had given. When I made the second statement in prison, in Celle, these persons to whom I felt bound in honor – Adolf Hitler and Reichsführer Himmler – were no longer alive and I thought then that I was no longer bound."*

The absurdity of this explanation, that in the early stages of his interrogations, Kramer was attempting to maintain the secrecy of things that his interrogators were repeating to him endlessly and which by then filled the Allied press, did not deter Kramer and his lawyer from offering it in court. The logic of Kramer's defense was at base identical to that of Morgen's testimony. Kramer was in the position of attempting to present some story absolving himself from implication in mass murder at Birkenau. The truth that Birkenau was not an extermination camp had no chance of being accepted by the court. That was a political impossibility. To have taken the truth as his position would have been heroic for Kramer but also suicidal, because it would have amounted to making no defense at all in connection with his role at the Birkenau camp. Even if he had felt personally heroic, there were powerful arguments against such heroism. His family, like all German families of the time, was desperate and needed him. If, despite all this, he persisted in his heroism, his lawyer would not have cooperated. No lawyer will consciously choose a suicidal strategy when one having some possibility of success is evident. Kramer's defense, therefore, was that he had no personal involvement in the exterminations at Birkenau. Höss and the RSHA did it. Remember that these proceedings were organized by lawyers seeking favorable verdicts, not by histori-

---

<sup>312</sup> Fyfe, 157.



ans seeking the truth about events.

An incidental matter is the claim that Kramer, as commandant at Natzweiler, had had eighty people gassed there for purposes of medical experiments. These people had supposedly been selected at Auschwitz by unknown criteria and then transported to Natzweiler to be killed, because the bodies were needed fresh in nearby Strassburg. Kramer affirmed this story in his second statement but, because it is (implicitly, but unambiguously) denied in his first statement, I am inclined to believe that it is untrue. However, it is quite possible that some people were executed at Natzweiler when somebody else was commandant, and that the bodies were then used at the anatomical institute in Strassburg (which certainly possessed bodies for its research purposes). In any case, the matter is not relevant to an extermination program.

## Hermann Göring *et al.* at the IMT

The IMT trial is somewhat more complicated to consider, because of the great number of defendants, each one having his own possibilities in regard to excusing himself from any real or imaginary crimes. The trial transcript is not really adequate to study the behavior of the IMT defendants, but the record kept by the Nuremberg prison psychologist, Dr. G. M. Gilbert, and published by him as *Nuremberg Diary*, supplements the transcript to an extent that is adequate for our purposes. Gilbert's book gives an account of the attitudes and reactions of the IMT defendants, not only at the trial but also in the Nuremberg prison. One cannot be absolutely confident in regard to the accuracy of Gilbert's account. Most of the material consists of summaries of conversations the defendants had in the prison, either with each other or with Gilbert. However, Gilbert took no notes on the spot and wrote everything down each day from memory. His manuscript was critically examined by a former employee of the Office of War Information and by the prosecutors Jackson and Taylor. Even with the best will and most impartial disposition, Gilbert could not have captured everything with complete accuracy. His book has a general accuracy, but one must be reserved about its details.

The IMT defendants were arrested shortly after the German capitulation in May 1945, imprisoned separately, and interrogated and propagandized for six months prior to the opening of the IMT trial in November, when they met each other for the first time since the surrender (in some cases, for the first time ever). There are four particularly important observations to make. First, not surprisingly, all except Kaltenbrunner had developed essentially the same defense regarding concentration camp atrocities and exterminations of Jews, whatever the extent to which they might have actually believed such allegations; it was all the fault of Hitler and Himmler's SS. Kaltenbrunner, sitting as a defendant as a substitute for the dead Himmler, was ill when the trial opened and did not join the other defendants until the trial was a few weeks old. When he appeared, the other defendants shunned him, and he said very little to the others during the course of the next ten months.

The second observation is not quite so expected. Indeed, it may be mildly startling; with the exception of Kaltenbrunner and perhaps one or two others, these high ranking German officials did not understand the catastrophic conditions in the camps that accompanied the German collapse, and which were the cause of the scenes that were exploited by the Allied propaganda as “proof” of exterminations. This may appear at first a peculiar claim, but consultation of Gilbert’s book shows it to be unquestionably a valid one (the only other possibility is that some merely pretended to misunderstand the situation). The administration of the camps was far removed from the official domains of almost all of the defendants and they had been subjected to the familiar propaganda since the German surrender. To the extent that they accepted, or pretended to accept, that there had been mass murders, for which Hitler and Himmler were responsible, they were basing their view precisely on the scenes found in the German camps at the end of the war, which they evidently misunderstood or pretended to misunderstand. This is well illustrated by Gilbert’s account of an exchange he had with Göring:<sup>313</sup>

*“Those atrocity films!’ Göring continued. ‘Anybody can make an atrocity film if they take corpses out of their graves and then show a tractor shoving them back in again.’*

*‘You can’t brush it off that easily,’ I replied. ‘We did find your concentration camps fairly littered with corpses and mass graves – I saw them myself in Dachau! – and Hadamar!’*

*‘Oh, but not piled up by the thousands like that –’*

*‘Don’t tell me what I didn’t see! I saw corpses literally by the carload –’*

*‘Oh, that one train –’*

*‘ – And piled up like cordwood in the crematorium – and half starved and mutilated prisoners, who told me how the butchery had been going on for years – and Dachau was not the worst by far! You can’t shrug off 6,000,000 murders!’*

*‘Well, I doubt if it was 6,000,000,’ he said despondently, apparently sorry he had started the argument, ‘ – but as I’ve always said, it is sufficient if only 5 per cent of it is true –.’ A glum silence followed.”*

This is only one example; it is clear from Gilbert’s book that, when the subject of concentration camp atrocities came up, the defendants were thinking of the scenes found in the German camps at the end of the war. It is probably not possible to decide which defendants genuinely misunderstood the situation (as Göring did) and which merely pretended to misunderstand, on the calculation that, if one was not involved with concentration camps anyway, it was a far safer course to accept the Allied claims than to automatically involve oneself by contesting the Allied claims.

Our third observation is in regard to a calculation that must have figured in the minds of most of the defendants during the trial. It seemed probable, or at least quite possible, to them that the Allies were not completely serious about carrying out executions and long prison sentences. The trial was certainly a novelty, and

<sup>313</sup> G.M. Gilbert’s book should be read in its entirety, but pp. 15, 39, 46, 47, 64, 78, 152, 175, 242, 273-275, 291 are of particular interest.

the defendants were well aware that there was considerable hostility to the war crimes trials in the public opinion of the Allied countries, especially in the U.S. and England. Many must have calculated that their immediate objective should be to say or do whatever seemed necessary to survive the transient wave of post-war hysteria, deferring the setting straight of the record to a not distant future when a non-hysterical examination of the facts would become possible.

Fourth, extermination of Jews was only one of the many accusations involved at Nuremberg. In retrospect, it may appear to have been the main charge, but at the time, the principal accusations in the minds of almost everybody concerned responsibilities for “planning, preparation, initiation, or waging of a war of aggression” – so-called “Crimes Against Peace.”

With the preceding four observations in mind, we can see that the behavior of the defendants during the trial was about what one would expect from a diverse collection of dedicated Nazis, technocrats, conservative Prussian officers, and ordinary politicians. In “private,” *i.e.* in prison, when court was not in session, the prisoners were just as guarded in their remarks as they were in public, and there was an abundance of mutual recrimination, buck passing, and back biting. Frank made the worst ass of himself in this respect, but the practice was rather general. The Nazis were not one big happy family. In regard to trial defense strategy, it will suffice to discuss Speer, Göring, and Kaltenbrunner.

Speer’s trial strategy was simple and also relatively successful, because he did not hang. He claimed that his position did not situate him so as to be able to learn of the various alleged atrocities. Even today, he is permitted to get away with this nonsense. In fact, Speer and his assistants were deeply involved in, *e.g.*, the deportations of employable Hungarian Jews in the spring of 1944 for work in underground aircraft factories at Buchenwald.<sup>314</sup> Any rail transport priority given to Hungarian Jews to be exterminated, as opposed to employable Hungarian Jews, would have become known to them, if such had actually happened. If Speer had testified truthfully, he would have declared that he had been so situated that, if an extermination program of the type charged had existed, he would have known of it and that, to his knowledge, no such program had existed. However, if Speer had testified truthfully, he would have joined his colleagues on the gallows.

In his book, Speer gives only one ridiculous piece of “evidence” that he encountered during the war that he now says he should have interpreted as suggesting the existence of an extermination program, and that was the suggestion of his friend Karl Hanke (who was appointed Himmler’s successor as Reichsführer-SS by Hitler in the last days of the war), in the summer of 1944, that Speer never “accept an invitation to inspect a concentration camp in Upper Silesia.” Speer also passes along Göring’s private remark just before the IMT trial about Jewish “survivors” in Hungary: “So, there are still some there? I thought we had knocked off all of them. Somebody slipped up again.”<sup>315</sup> Such a sarcastic crack was understandable under the circumstances, because Göring never conceded the reality of any extermination program and insisted that he had known only of a program of

<sup>314</sup> Hilberg, 599; Reitlinger, 460-463; IMT vol. 16, 445, 520.

<sup>315</sup> Speer, 375-376, 512.

emigration and evacuation of Jews from the German sphere in Europe.

The introduction to Speer's book, by Eugene Davidson, mentions the fact (noted here on page 141) that many Dutch Jews sent to Birkenau, "within sight of the gas chambers," were unaware of any extermination program. They wrote cheerful letters back to the Netherlands.<sup>316</sup> The remarks about Jewish extermination were not in the original version of Speer's manuscript; they were added at the insistence of the publisher.<sup>317</sup>

Unlike the other defendants, Göring assumed throughout the trial that he was to be sentenced to death, and his testimony appears to be the approximate truth as he saw it. Although he never conceded the existence of a program of extermination of Jews, we have seen that he misunderstood what had happened in the German camps at the end of the war and assumed that Himmler had, indeed, engaged in mass murder in this connection. However, he never conceded any number of murders approaching six millions.<sup>318</sup>

An incidental remark that should be made in connection with Göring is that he was not, as legend asserts (and as Speer claimed in private on several occasions during the IMT), a drug addict. The Nuremberg prison psychiatrist, Douglas Kelley, has attempted to set the record straight in this regard. Göring was a military man, had been an air ace in World War I, and had been the last commander of the "Flying Circus" of von Richthofen (the "Red Baron"). Refusing to surrender his unit to the Allies at the end of the war, he returned to Germany and found himself a hero without a profession. Eventually joining the Nazi Party, he naturally, as a holder of the *Pour-le-mérite* (Germany's highest military decoration), soon became a leader of the small party. As such, he was a leader of the putsch of 1923, in which he was wounded in the right thigh. The wound developed an infection which caused him to be hospitalized for a long while, during which time he was injected with considerable amounts of morphine. He developed a mild addiction but cured it shortly after being released from the hospital in 1924. Much later, in 1937, Göring developed a condition of aching teeth and began taking tablets of paracodeine, a very mild morphine derivative that was a common prescription for his condition, and he continued to take the paracodeine throughout the war. His addiction for (or, more exactly, habit of taking) these paracodeine tablets was not severe, because he was taken off them before the IMT by Dr. Kelley, who employed a simple withdrawal method involving daily reductions of the dosage.<sup>319</sup>

To return to the IMT defendants, Kaltenbrunner's position seems to us today to have been somewhat hopeless, and it is probable that his lawyer felt the same way, but he nevertheless had to present some sort of defense, and his defense on the matters that we are interested in rested on two main points.

The first point was that he was head of the RSHA, which was charged with security, and not the head of the WVHA, which administered the concentration camps. He thus claimed that he had had almost nothing to do with the camps. The

<sup>316</sup> Speer, xvii; de Jong.

<sup>317</sup> *New York Times Book Review* (Aug. 23, 1970), 2, 16.

<sup>318</sup> In Göring's testimony, see especially IMT, vol. 9, 515-521, 609-619.

<sup>319</sup> Kelley, 54-58.

only known instance of Kaltenbrunner's involvement with the internal operation of the camps was in his order of March 1945, concerning permission for the Red Cross to establish itself in the camps (how he assumed authority for giving this order we do not know). He made a great deal of this matter in his defense and, rather than setting the record straight in regard to the catastrophic conditions in the camps at the end of the war, he inflated his action in connection with the Red Cross to make it appear to be an act against concentration camps as such, which, of course, he had always deplored anyway, he said.

Kaltenbrunner's second point was that, as everybody would agree, it was his predecessor Heydrich, and not he, who had organized the details of the Jewish policy, whatever that policy was. He took over the RSHA in 1943 with a directive from Himmler to build up the intelligence service of the SD, a fact which he distorted in claiming that, under the new arrangement, in which Himmler was not going to allow anybody to grow to the stature that Heydrich had attained, Kaltenbrunner was to concern himself only with intelligence and not to have any control over the police and security functions of the RSHA, in particular the Gestapo, which sent political prisoners to the camps and also, through Eichmann's office, administered the Jewish deportations. Thus, according to Kaltenbrunner, there was no respect in which he could be held responsible for exterminations of Jews that, he conceded, had taken place just as the Allies charged (except that they had started, according to Kaltenbrunner, in 1940). Indeed, according to him, it was not until the summer of 1943 that he learned of the extermination program that Eichmann of his department was conducting. He learned from the foreign press and the enemy radio. He got Himmler to admit it early in 1944 and then protested, first to Hitler, then to Himmler. The extermination program was stopped in October 1944, "chiefly due to (his) intervention."<sup>320</sup> The manner in which Kaltenbrunner claimed to have learned of the exterminations, while nonsense, is nevertheless consistent with the extreme secrecy that is always said to have been maintained in connection with the extermination program.

Kaltenbrunner's story was complete rubbish, but this fact should not blind us to the serious character of this testimony as defense strategy. Suppose that Kaltenbrunner had testified that no extermination program had existed. In such a case, any leniency shown by the court in the judgment would have been tantamount to that court's conceding the untruth, or possible untruth, of the extermination claim, a political impossibility. By claiming that, while the extermination program had existed, Kaltenbrunner had had no responsibility and had even opposed it, the defense was making it politically possible for the court to be lenient in some sense or was at least making a serious attempt along this line. A few seconds' reflection reveals that this was the only possible strategy for Kaltenbrunner on the extermination charge. The trial was obviously going to end with some death sentences, some acquittals, and some in between dispositions of cases; this was necessary in order to give it the semblance of a real trial. Thus, on analysis, we see that there was perfectly sound lawyer's logic operating in Kaltenbrunner's

---

<sup>320</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 273-276, 335.

defense. That the specific story presented was unbelievable was not very important from this point of view; the manner, in which facts have been treated in connection with these matters, has been endless nonsense anyway. The case of Speer shows that a nonsensical story not only had a chance of being accepted by the IMT, but also by general opinion much later, when there should have been adequate opportunity to see matters clearly.

The ordinary person, and even the informed critic, can easily fail to understand the significance of such things as the Kaltenbrunner testimony, because he fails to grasp the perspective of the defendants, who did not have the historical interests in these trials that we have. Their necks were at stake, and they regarded the trials, quite correctly, as a manifestation of hysteria. Attempting to save their necks meant devising trial strategies to suit the prevailing conditions, and no optimum trial strategy seeks to move the court on matters on which the court is immovable. This also happens in ordinary legal proceedings. Once something had been decided, it had been decided, and the lawyers organize their cases accordingly.

Of course, it is deplorable that Nazis or anyone else should lie in order to promote their personal interests. I have seen scholars tell lies almost as big just to pick up an extra bit of summer salary, and that too is deplorable.

## Oswald Pohl at Nuremberg

At Kramer's trial and at the IMT, the courts were effectively committed *a priori* to the conclusion that Nazi Germany had had a program of exterminating Jews. At the later NMT trials, the courts were committed *a priori* as a formal matter, on account of the legal constraint previously noted (page 43), that statements made in the IMT judgment constituted "proof of the facts stated." The IMT judgment said that millions had been exterminated in German concentration camps, particularly at Auschwitz, which was "set aside for this main purpose"; specifically, 400,000 Hungarian Jews were said to have been murdered there.<sup>321</sup> Thus, defendants and witnesses at the NMT faced a situation similar to that faced by earlier defendants and witnesses, except that it was formalized. Prosecutors were known to redirect the attentions of judges to this legal constraint, when there seemed a chance of its being overlooked.<sup>322</sup>

Here we will take special note of only two cases. Defendant Pohl, of course, did not deny the extermination program; in denying personal involvement in the exterminations, he took advantage of the fact that the Allied charges had naturally been directed at the Gestapo and the SD functions of the SS, which were not in Pohl's domain as head of the WVHA.<sup>323</sup> Even the Höss affidavit and testimony explicitly support him in this position. After all, who ever heard of the *Wirtschafts-Verwaltungshauptamt*? Nevertheless, Pohl was hanged.

<sup>321</sup> IMT, vol. 22, 494-496.

<sup>322</sup> Case 6 transcript, 197.

<sup>323</sup> NMT, vol. 5, 664-676.

The testimony of Münch, a doctor at Auschwitz, is of some interest. He appeared as a defense witness at the Farben trial, having previously been acquitted by a Polish court. This is the witness whom prosecution lawyer Minskoff asked about the leaflets dropped at Auschwitz by Allied planes (p. 143). While Münch testified that he had known about the exterminations while he was at Auschwitz and had even witnessed a gassing, he also testified that people outside the Auschwitz area, that is those in Germany, did not know. Also, the whole thing was arranged “masterfully” so that “someone who visited a plant in Auschwitz twice or three times a year for a period of one or two days” would not learn of the exterminations. Almost all of the defendants, of course, were in the category of those who could not have known, according to Münch, but he did not stop there. He also asserted that, while all of the SS men and prisoners knew of the exterminations, they did not talk to civilians about them for fear of punishment. For example, Farben engineer Faust, whom Münch knew very well at Auschwitz, did not know about the exterminations. Münch also remarked several times that all one could perceive of the exterminations was the odor, “perceptible everywhere,” of the cremations. Nobody at this trial of chemical engineering experts bothered to point out that the chemical industry of the area also created a bit of an odor. An odd feature of Münch’s testimony is his placing of the crematories and the gas chambers “one or one and half kilometers southwest of the Birkenau camp camouflaged in a small woods.”<sup>324</sup>

The Münch testimony is merely another illustration of the manner in which defense cases were formulated. The strategy was to avoid contesting things that the courts were already decided on but to present stories exonerating defendants of personal responsibility. Thus, it was invariably claimed that the extermination program had features that happened to excuse the relevant defendants, but by claiming that such features of the program existed, it was obviously necessary to claim also that the program itself existed.

## Adolf Eichmann

The next trial that is worth examination is the Eichmann trial. It will be recalled that Adolf Eichmann was illegally abducted from Buenos Aires in May 1960 by Israeli agents, who sent him to Israel to become the victim of a “trial” that was to break all records for illegality, because the state conducting the trial had not even existed at the time of the alleged crimes. The illegal courtroom proceedings opened in Jerusalem on April 11, 1961, the Jewish court pronounced the death sentence on December 15, 1961, and the murder was carried out on May 31, 1962.

In order to understand Eichmann’s defense strategy, consider his situation prior to the trial as a lawyer would have seen it. It was basically a political situation involving an Israeli determination to stage a show trial. In capturing Eich-

<sup>324</sup> DuBois, 230-231; NMT, vol. 8, 313-321; Case 6 transcript, 14321-14345.

mann, Israel had spat on Argentine sovereignty and, from a lawyer's point of view, the only hope of securing a favorable verdict (a prison sentence to be later commuted) depended upon world opinion developing so as to encourage Israel to temper its arrogance somewhat with a magnanimous gesture. However, the possibility of such an outcome depended upon presenting a defense whose fundamental acceptance by the Jerusalem court would have been within the realm of political possibility. Thus, just as with the Nuremberg defendants, Eichmann's only possible defense under the circumstances was to deny personal responsibility.

Eichmann conceded the existence of an extermination program, and the first edition of Reitlinger's book was accepted by both sides as approximately descriptive of what had happened. Eichmann's fundamental defense, thus, was that he had merely organized the transports of Jews in obedience to orders that could not be disobeyed. In one respect, his defense was partially successful, for his (accurate) picture of himself as a mere "cog in a machine" has been more or less universally accepted by those who have studied and written about this trial (e.g. Hannah Arendt's book).

Actually, Eichmann inflated himself a bit beyond "cog" status, for a secondary feature of his testimony is that he claimed that he, Eichmann, had done whatever a person as lowly as he could do in order to sabotage the extermination program, and his interpretations of the meanings of many of the documents used in the trial were obviously strained in this respect. A good example was Eichmann's commentary on two particular documents. The first document was a complaint by the commander of the Lodz resettlement camp, dated September 24, 1941, complaining of overcrowding at the camp due to tremendous transports of Jews that were pouring in:

*"And now they face me with a fait accompli, as it were, that I have to absorb 20,000 Jews into the ghetto within the shortest possible period of time, but further that I have to absorb 5,000 gypsies."*

The letter is addressed to the local head of government. The second document is a letter by that local head, dated October 9, 1941, passing on the complaint to Berlin, and adding that Eichmann had acted like a "horse dealer" in sending the Jewish transport to Lodz for, contrary to Eichmann's claim, the transport had not been approved. Eichmann's Jerusalem testimony in regard to these documents was that there were only two places he could have shipped the Jews to, the East (where he was supposed to send them, he said) or Lodz. However, according to him, there were exterminations in the East at that time, but none at Lodz. Being in strong disapproval of the exterminations and doing everything that his low office permitted to thwart them, he shipped the Jews to Lodz despite the inadequate preparations there.<sup>325</sup>

This feature of Eichmann's defense strategy is also illustrated by his testimony regarding the "trucks for Hungarian Jews" proposals of 1944. He naturally attempted to represent efforts on the German side to conclude the deal as being due in no small measure to the force of his initiative, motivated, again, by Eichmann's

<sup>325</sup> Eichmann, session 78, N1-O1; session 98, T1-W1.



desire to save Jews.<sup>326</sup>

It is worth mentioning that the major thrust of the prosecution's cross-examination of Eichmann did not treat wartime events directly. The prosecution's chief effort was to hold Eichmann, in court, to whatever he was supposed to have said to Israeli interrogators during his year of imprisonment prior to the trial and also to what he was supposed to have said to one Sassen in Argentina in 1957. According to Eichmann's testimony, he encountered Sassen, an ex-SS man, in Buenos Aires in 1955. At this time Eichmann was, except within tiny circles, a very much forgotten man. The Eichmann-Sassen relationship eventually led to a project to write a book on the persecutions of the Jews during the war. The book, to be completed and promoted by Sassen, was to be based on tape recorded question-and-answer sessions with Eichmann, but according to Eichmann's testimony, the original form of these sessions could not be retained:

*"[...] when these questions were put to me, I had to reply from time to time, that I did not remember and did not know; but, obviously, this was not the way to write a book [...] and then it was agreed that it did not really matter what I remembered – the main thing was to describe the events as they had happened; then we spoke about poetic license, about license for journalists and authors, which would entitle us to describe the events – even if I did not remember certain details, the essence which would remain would be a description of the events as they had taken place and this is really what was eventually taken down.*

*[Sassen] told me to say something about every point, so that the necessary quantity be obtained.*

*[...] it was also agreed that he, Sassen, would then formulate everything in the form of a book and we would be co-authors in this book."*

Sassen's material eventually appeared, in the autumn of 1960, in *Life* magazine, so it is clear that Sassen's sessions with Eichmann were designed for the primary purpose of producing a marketable book, as distinct from a historical one. Eichmann obviously planned to acquire a share of the profits, but this testimony does not shed any light onto the specific financial expectations that Eichmann and Sassen had.

Sassen transcribed some of the tape recorded material into typewritten form, and Eichmann added comments and corrections in the margins of some of the pages in his own hand. He also composed 83 full pages of handwritten comments. After the appearance of the *Life* articles, the prosecution obtained material from Sassen, namely a photostat of a 300-page typewritten document with marginal comments, apparently in Eichmann's hand, purporting to be a transcript of 62 of 67 tape recorded sessions, and also a photostat of what was said to be the 83 page document in Eichmann's hand. Original documents were evidently not procured, thus raising the possibility of tampering and editing, especially in the case of the 300 page document. In regard to the original tapes, the prosecution commented:

*"We do not know about the tapes themselves – I don't know whether*

---

<sup>326</sup> Eichmann, session 103, Jj1; session 106, V1.

*the people who took part in this conversation kept the tape or whether the tape was erased and re-used for other recordings.”*

The defense challenged the accuracy of the documents, claimed that the majority of marginal corrections were not included in the document, and further claimed that if Sassen himself could be brought to court to testify, it could be proved that:

*“[...] he changed and distorted what was said by the accused, to suit his own aims. He wanted to produce a propaganda book; this can be proved, how the words were distorted.”*

However, the prosecution assured the court that if Sassen were to come to Israel, he would be put on trial for his SS membership.

The court decided to admit the photostats of the 83 pages in Eichmann’s hand, but the prosecution, finding during the course of the rest of the trial that there was virtually nothing in the 83 pages that it could use, made another bid very late in the trial and finally managed to get accepted into evidence the excerpts of the typewritten document which carried handwritten corrections. *Life* magazine, which apparently received the same material from Sassen, treated all of it as unquestionably authentic.<sup>327</sup>

We close this short discussion of the Eichmann trial by reporting Eichmann’s reaction to the allegation, widely publicized, that at the end of the war he had declared that he would “jump gladly into the grave” with the knowledge that five or six million Jews had been killed. Eichmann testified that he had, indeed, made a bitter remark such as this to his staff at the end of the war, but that the five million killed were not “Jews” but “enemies of the Reich,” *i.e.* enemy soldiers, principally Russians. While his defense strategy entailed not contesting the general reality of the extermination program, he insisted that he was in no position to know even the approximate number of Jews killed, and that all remarks attributed to him in this connection (*e.g.* Höttl’s affidavit) are falsely attributed.<sup>328</sup>

## West German Trials

The trials held in West Germany during the Sixties are barely worth mentioning and, moreover, rather difficult to study, on account of the obscurity of the defendants involved. The most publicized, of course, was the “Auschwitz trial” of 1963-1965, and a few words are perhaps in order.

This group of war crimes trials, of which the Auschwitz trial was the most prominent, was held for political reasons in the aftermath of the hysterical publicity surrounding the capture of Adolf Eichmann. One of the first victims was Richard Baer, successor to Höss and last commandant of Auschwitz, who was arrested

<sup>327</sup> Eichmann, session 72, Aal-Kk11; session 73, A1-R1; session 74, Hh1-Iil; session 88, L1-P2 and appendices; session 104, T1-V1; session 105, W1-Z1; *Life* (Nov. 28, 1960), 19+; (Dec. 5, 1960), 146+.

<sup>328</sup> Eichmann, session 85, J1-K1, T1-U1; session 87, M1-O1, Y1; session 88, G1-H1.

on December 20, 1960, near Hamburg, where he was working as a lumberjack. He was imprisoned and interrogated in prison and insisted that the Auschwitz gas chambers were a myth. Unfortunately, he did not live to take this position in court, because he died in prison on June 17, 1963, at the age of 51, apparently from a circulatory ailment, although his wife considered his death rather mysterious.<sup>329</sup>

When the trial finally opened in Frankfurt in December 1963, the principal defendant was one Robert K. L. Mulka, an ex-SS Captain who had served briefly as adjutant to Höss at Auschwitz. Mulka had been tried and sentenced, by a German chamber immediately after the war in connection with his role at Auschwitz, and quite a few of the other 21 defendants at the Auschwitz trial were standing trial for the second time on basically the same charges.

The court, of course, did not ignore legal matters entirely, and it took the trouble to explain that the Bonn Government considers itself the legal successor to the Third Reich, and thus, it was competent to try persons for infringing laws that were in force in Germany during the war. Killing Jews, of course, had been illegal in Nazi Germany, and thus, the majority of the defendants were charged in that respect. In regard to the reasonableness of such a trial, one can do no better than to quote from the opinion of the Frankfurt court itself:<sup>330</sup>

*"This determination of guilt has, however, confronted the court with extraordinarily difficult problems.*

*Except for a few not very valuable documents, almost exclusively only witness testimonies were available to the court for the reconstruction of the deeds of the defendants. It is an experience of criminology that witness testimony is not among the best of evidence. This is even more the case if the testimony of the witness refers to an incident which had been observed twenty years or more ago under conditions of unspeakable grief and anguish. Even the ideal witness, who only wishes to tell the truth and takes pains to explore his memory, is prone to have many memory gaps after twenty years. He risks the danger of projecting onto other persons things which he actually has experienced himself and of assuming as his own experiences things which were related to him by others in this terrible milieu. In this way he risks the danger of confusing the times and places of his experiences.*

*It has certainly been for the witnesses an unreasonable demand for us to question them today concerning all details of their experiences. It is asking too much of the witnesses if we today, after twenty years, still wish to know when, where and how, in detail, who did what. On this basis astonishment was repeatedly expressed by the witnesses, that we asked them for such a precise reconstruction of the past occurrences. It was obviously the duty of the defense to ask about those details. And it is unjust to impute to the defense that it wished to make these witnesses appear ridiculous. On the contrary, we must call to mind only once what endless detail work is performed in a murder trial in our days – how, out of small mosaic-like pieces, the picture of the true oc-*

---

<sup>329</sup> Aretz, 58; Naumann, 8.

<sup>330</sup> Naumann, 8-26, 416-417.

currences at the moment of the murder is put together. There is available for the court's deliberations above all the corpse, the record of the post-mortem examination, the expert opinions of specialists on the causes of death and the day on which the deed must have occurred, and the manner in which the death occurred. There is available the murder weapon and fingerprints to identify the perpetrator; there are footprints he left behind as he entered the house of the slain, and many more details at hand which provide absolute proof to the court that this person was done to death by a definite perpetrator of the deed.

All this was missing in this trial. We have no absolute evidence for the individual killings; we have only the witness testimonies. However, sometimes these testimonies were not as exact and precise as is necessary in a murder trial. If therefore the witnesses were asked, in which year or month an event happened, it was entirely necessary for the determination of the truth. And these dates sometimes presented to the court the only evidence for the purpose of determining whether the event related by the witness did in fact happen as the witness related it, or whether the witness had committed an error or confused victims. The court was naturally aware that it was an extraordinary burden for the witnesses, in view of the camp conditions, where no calendars, clocks or even primitive means of keeping records were available, to be asked to relate in all details what they experienced at the time. Nevertheless, the court had to be able to determine whether an individual defendant did in fact commit a real murder, and when and where. That is required by the penal code.

This was an ordinary criminal trial, whatever its background. The court could only judge according to the laws it is sworn to uphold, and these laws require the precise determination of the concrete guilt of an accused on both the objective and subjective side. The overburdening of the witnesses shows how endlessly difficult it is to ascertain and portray concrete events after twenty years. We have heard witnesses who at first appeared so reliable to the court that we even issued arrest warrants on their declarations. However, in exhaustive examination of the witness declarations in hours long deliberations it was found that these declarations were not absolutely sound and did not absolutely correspond to objective truth. For this purpose certain times had to be ascertained and documents reexamined – whether the accused, who was charged by a witness, was at the camp Auschwitz at all at the time in question, whether he could have committed the deed there, or whether the witness perhaps projected the deed onto the wrong person.

In view of this weakness of witness testimony – and I speak now only of the sworn witnesses whose desire for the truth, the subjective and objective truth, the court was thoroughly confident of – the court especially had to examine the witness testimonies. Only a few weeks ago we read in the newspapers that a member of the Buchenwald concentration camp staff had been convicted of murdering an inmate who, it is clear today, is alive and was certainly not murdered. Such examples should make us think. These cases of miscarriages of justice do not serve to strengthen the respect for the law. On these grounds also the court has avoided whatever could even in the most remote sense sug-

*gest a summary verdict. The court had examined every single declaration of each of the witnesses with great care and all earnestness and consequently is unable to arrive at verdicts of guilty on a whole list of charges, since secure grounds could not be found for such verdicts. The possibilities of verifying the witness declarations were very limited. All traces of deeds were destroyed. Documents which could have given the court important assistance had been burned. [...]*"

Although these admissions on the part of the Frankfurt court should be conclusive in forming one's opinion of such trials, we must add that the court understated the facts of the situation. The great majority of the witnesses were citizens of Soviet bloc countries, with all that such a fact implies regarding their testimonies. The court complained that "this witness testimony was not so accurate and precise as is desirable," but one should observe that it was certainly attempted to organize the memories of the witnesses suitably, for the "Comité International d'Auschwitz" had set up its headquarters in Frankfurt and from there had issued "information sheets" on the terrible things that had happened at Auschwitz. These "information sheets" had been made available to, and had been read by, the witnesses before they testified. There was also a "Comité des Camps" in circulation, and other persons, e.g. the mayor of Frankfurt, made suggestions to the witnesses of varying degrees of directness and subtlety.<sup>331</sup>

The farce extended also into the matters that the court considered in the course of the long trial and the sentences that were imposed. Mulka, found guilty of being second man in the administration of the great extermination camp, of having ordered the Zyklon B on at least one occasion, of having been in charge of the motor pool, which transported the condemned, of having handled some of the paperwork dealing with transports, and of having been involved in the construction of the crematories, was sentenced to 14 years at hard labor, but was released less than four months later on grounds of ill health. Defendant Franz Hofmann, ex-SS Captain who had been in charge of Auschwitz I, received a life sentence for the simple reason that, although found guilty in connection with exterminations, he had really been tried on a charge of having thrown a bottle at a prisoner, who later died from the head injury received. This incident evidently had a greater impact on the court than mass exterminations, which is not surprising, because the bottle episode could clearly be recognized as the sort of thing that happens in penal institutions. Hofmann was sentenced to life imprisonment, but shortly later released anyway on the grounds of his previous detention.<sup>332</sup>

## Precedents for the Trials?

In searching the history books for proceedings comparable to the "war crimes trials," it is not suitable to fasten on prior politically-motivated trials for prece-

---

<sup>331</sup> Latenser, 85-94.

<sup>332</sup> Naumann, 412-413, 418-419, 422-423. Reitlinger, 551, 561.

dents. Such trials, e.g. the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots, lack the hysterical atmosphere of the war crimes trials. Another feature of the usual political trial is that there is generally only one, or at any rate only a few, victims, and the proceedings are not spread over more than two decades. Even the trial of Joan of Arc, which had aspects of hysteria, is not really comparable to the war crimes trials, because only a single person was on trial, but not an entire nation.

In determining precedents for the war crimes trials, only the witchcraft trials of Europe's younger days offer satisfactory comparisons. A most important similarity lies in the fact that the accused in witchcraft trials frequently found it expedient in the contexts, in which they found themselves, to go along with the charges to some extent. In fact, in many cases a partial confession offered the only possible trial strategy. One could not deny the very existence of the sorts of Sabbaths that the popular imagination had decided must have existed. When the sentences of the condemned were carried out, one had scenes like this:<sup>333</sup>

*“On one scaffold stood the condemned Sorceresses, a scanty band, and on another the crowd of the reprieved. The repentant heroine, whose confession was read out, stuck at nothing, however wild and improbable. At the Sabbaths they ate children, hashed; and as a second course dead wizards dug up from their graves. Toads dance, talk, complain amorously of their mistresses' unkindness, and get the Devil to scold them. This latter sees the witches home with great politeness, lighting the way with the blazing arm of an unbaptized infant, etc., etc.”*

The situation was such that one had to feed the fantasies and passions of the judges and the population, and there were even ways of getting ahead by claiming to be a witch, and thus being informed on the activities of certain other witches, knowledgeable on ways of exposing them, etc.

The comparison of the war crimes trials with the witchcraft trials is almost perfect. Both involve large numbers of potential victims, and the possibilities for mutual recrimination are boundless. Most important, both take place in an atmosphere of unreality and hysteria. The person who will not disbelieve those who claim that a modern state was exterminating masses of human beings at a center of chemical industry, employing an insecticide, and that the pervasive stench at that site was due to the associated cremations, is the complete twentieth century equivalent of the person who, in earlier centuries, believe those who claimed that misfortunes were caused by people who conversed with toads, had intercourse with the Devil, etc.

## Torture?

Another important relationship between witchcraft trials and the war crimes trials is that torture of witnesses and defendants played roles in both. Invented testimony at witchcraft trials is usually explained in terms of torture (although our

<sup>333</sup> Michelet, 151-157, 313-314.

reference employed above points out that mass hysteria also provides a completely effective motivation). We know that some people were tortured in connection with the war crimes trials, and we should therefore consider the problem of the extent to which torture might have accounted for testimony, especially defendant testimony, in support of exterminations.

Available evidence indicates that torture was frequently employed in the war crimes trials. We have noted at length, on p. 40, the tortures inflicted on German defendants in the Dachau trials. Very similar scenes took place, under British sponsorship, in connection with the Belsen trial, and Josef Kramer and other defendants were tortured, sometimes to the point where they pleaded to be put to death.<sup>334</sup>

On the other hand, it appears that defendants at the IMT were too prominent to torture, although Julius Streicher was an exception, and it is even said that he was forced to eat excrement. Streicher complained at the IMT that he had been beaten up by Negro soldiers after his arrest. On the motion of prosecutor Jackson, this testimony was stricken from the record because otherwise "the court would have had to conduct an investigation." Streicher was the editor and publisher of a disreputable and quasi-pornographic magazine *Der Stürmer*, which attacked not only Jews, Freemasons, and clerics but on occasion even top Nazis. Streicher once claimed in *Der Stürmer* that Göring's daughter had not been fathered by Göring but by artificial insemination. *Der Stürmer* was considered offensive by nearly all political leaders in Germany, but Streicher had the protection of Hitler out of gratitude for Streicher's having delivered Nuremberg to the Nazi Party. In 1940, Göring arranged for Streicher to be put partially out of action; although *Der Stürmer* was not suppressed, Streicher was deprived of his Party position of *Gauleiter* of Nuremberg. Streicher never held a position in the German Government, before or during the war, and his inclusion in the first row of "defendants" at the IMT was ludicrous.<sup>335</sup>

There was never any general or massive exposé of torture of witnesses and defendants at the NMT trials, but we believe that the fact, noted in the previous chapter (p. 204), that the Nuremberg prosecution did not hesitate to torture witnesses even in connection with a regular U.S. legal proceeding, is strong support for our assumption that torture was employed rather commonly at Nuremberg or, more precisely, employed on witnesses and defendants who played roles in the trials at Nuremberg.

We are inclined to believe that Adolf Eichmann was not tortured by his Israeli captors, at least not for the purpose of forcing him to give specific trial testimony. This view is based on the simple fact that he did not complain, in his trial testimony, that he had been tortured thus, although he did complain, early in his trial testimony, that he had suffered rather rough treatment during the few days immediately after his capture, particularly when his captors forced him to sign a declaration that he had come to Israel voluntarily (and which the prosecution had the audacity to put into evidence at the trial). However, the extreme secrecy that sur-

---

<sup>334</sup> Belgion, 80-81.

<sup>335</sup> Bardèche, 12, 73; Davidson, 44-47, 51.

rounded Eichmann's imprisonment in Israel allows the possibility that he was tortured in some sense, but that he had tactical or other reasons for not charging torture in his testimony.<sup>336</sup>

In considering the problem of torture, it is important to observe that the efficacy of torture in producing testimony having a desired content is rather questionable. We cannot believe that the prosecuting authorities at Nuremberg had any moral compunctions about using torture, but they most probably made the rather obvious observation that, no matter how much you torture a man, you still cannot be absolutely sure what he will say on the witness stand. Exceptions to this statement are provided by the "Moscow trials" of the Thirties and other trials staged by Communists, but the defendants in such cases are always "brainwashed" to the extent that they utterly prostrate themselves before the court when on trial and denounce themselves as the foulest beings on earth.<sup>337</sup> No such attitude is perceptible in the Nuremberg defendants who, despite much untruthful testimony damaging to the Nazi regime in general, always argued their personal innocence.

In examining the torture problem, we must be careful regarding what questions one might ask and what inferences may be drawn from the answers. Obviously, there is the question of whether or not a man was tortured. Second, there is the question of whether or not he testified to the reality of exterminations. Assuming that affirmative answers apply to both questions, it is a *non sequitur* to infer that the former accounts for the latter. This is illustrated by the case of Kramer who, despite torture, spoke the truth in his first statement, and evidently only changed his story when his lawyer explained to him the logical implications of insisting on a story that the court could not possibly accept. On the other hand, if a witness had been tortured, we may infer that the authorities in charge are not to be trusted.

Moreover, one must not make assumptions too quickly in regard to the probable motivations that the Nuremberg jailers might have had for employing torture; the motivation need not have been to produce specific testimony, and may have been either more or less thoughtfully conceived. First, torture might have been employed purely to produce pleasure; the Jews in charge hated their German victims. Second, torture may have been employed merely on the basis of the passing observation that, while it was not guaranteed to be helpful, it also could not hurt matters as long as the proceedings were kept suitably confidential.

A third possible motivation, a far more intelligent one, could have been that torture, while not of much use in producing specific pieces of testimony, could be of assistance in a less specific and more general sense. If my interrogator threatens that he will take steps against my family if I do not cooperate, I may doubt him on the basis that I see no evidence that he either has the necessary power or the necessary cruelty or both. However, if he imprisons me for a year or more, torturing at will, I will eventually believe that he is both powerful and cruel. Thus,

<sup>336</sup> Eichmann, session 75, U1. For the fanatical measures taken to isolate Eichmann from the outside world during his imprisonment in Israel see, e.g., the *London Jewish Chronicle* (Sep. 2, 1960), 15.

<sup>337</sup> Solzhenitsyn has given the definitive account of the historical development of the Communist political "trial." See also *Conquest*, 82-147.



we see that torture, while indeed inadequate in itself to produce the sort of testimony that was produced at Nuremberg, might very well have been employed to achieve a general “softening up” of witnesses and defendants that would help the process of coercion and intimidation at other points.

A few complications are also worth mentioning. First, physical torture is not such a very well defined thing. One could argue that extended imprisonment under unhealthy or even merely uncomfortable conditions with daily interrogation is a form of torture. Another complication is that there are modes of torture, mainly sexual in nature or related to sex, that one could never learn about because the victims simply will not talk about them. Finally we should observe that almost none of us, certainly not this author, has ever experienced torture at the hands of professionals bent on a specific goal, and thus we might suspect, to put it quite directly, that we simply do not know what we are talking about when we discuss the possibilities of torture.

Our basic conclusion in respect to the torture problem is that there is something of an imponderable involved. We believe it likely that torture was employed to achieve a general softening up of the victims, so that their testimonies would more predictably take courses that were motivated by considerations other than torture, and we have analyzed witness and defendant testimony in preceding pages of this chapter on this basis; the effects of and fear of torture do not, in themselves, explain testimony in support of exterminations. We thus tend to disagree with much of the existing literature in this area, which, it seems, places too much weight on the singular efficacy of torture at Nuremberg, although we concede that our analysis of this hard subject is not conclusive. We have similar suspicions that writers on witchcraft trials have also leaped to invalid conclusions on the basis of the two indisputably valid facts that, first, victims in witchcraft trials were tortured and, second, many of these people later testified to impossible happenings. The former does not really account for the latter, but it can be a contributing factor when its effects are added to the more weighty motivations for delivering certain kinds of false testimony.

## Adolf Hitler

We will return to some statements made at trials in due course. There are a few remarks, allegedly made by top Nazis, that should be mentioned. On April 17, 1943, Hitler met Admiral Horthy at Klessheim Castle. Hitler was critical of Horthy’s lenient Jewish policy and, it is said, explained to Horthy that things were different in Poland:

*“If the Jews there did not want to work, they were shot. If they could not work, they had to be treated like tuberculosis bacilli, with which a healthy body may become infected. This was not cruel if one remembers that even innocent creatures of nature, such as hares and deer, which are infected, have to be killed so that no harm is caused by them.”*

The evidence that Hitler said this is the alleged minutes of the meeting and the supporting IMT testimony of Dr. Paul Otto Schmidt, Hitler's interpreter, who normally sat in on such conferences and prepared the minutes. Schmidt testified that he was present at the meeting and that the minutes were genuine and prepared by him. However, in his later book, he wrote that he was not present, because Horthy had insisted on his leaving the room!<sup>338</sup>

There is also a statement in Hitler's political testament :

*"I also made it quite plain that, if the peoples of Europe were again to be regarded merely as pawns in a game played by the international conspiracy of money and finance, they, the Jews, the race that is the real guilty party in this murderous struggle, would be saddled with the responsibility for it.*

*I left no one in doubt that this time not only would millions of grown men meet their death and not only would hundreds of thousands of women and children be burned and bombed to death in cities, but this time the real culprits would have to pay for their guilt even though by more humane means than war."*

This statement is frequently interpreted as an admission of exterminations, but its meaning is at least ambiguous. After all, the payment spoken of was by "more humane means than war." The Jews who had been in Hitler's domain had lost property and position in Europe, and that fact may offer the correct interpretation. Loss of property and position might seem a woefully inadequate payment for the events charged to the Jews, but it is well known that all politicians, before leaving the public scene, like to exaggerate the significance of their works.

There also exists a possibility that the text of the testament was tampered with, because its discovery by British and American authorities was not announced until December 29, 1945, and because only the last page is signed. Only the typewriter and stationery Hitler's secretary used would have been required to make an undetectable alteration.<sup>339</sup>

## Heinrich Himmler

There is a speech allegedly given by Himmler in Posen in October 1943. The translation of the relevant part, as it appears in the NMT volumes, is as follows, with the original German given in some cases.<sup>340</sup>

*"I also want to talk to you, quite frankly, on a very grave matter. Among ourselves it should be mentioned quite frankly, and yet we will never speak of it publicly. Just as we did not hesitate on June 30, 1934, to do the duty we were bidden and stand comrades who had lapsed up against the wall and*

<sup>338</sup> Reitlinger, 450-452; Hilberg, 524; Schmidt, 248.

<sup>339</sup> Last page of testament reproduced by Trevor-Roper, 180. Discovery and text of testament reported in *New York Times* (Dec. 30, 1945), 1; (Dec. 31, 1945), 1, 6. Text also given by Shirer (1947), 180-181.

<sup>340</sup> 1919-PS in IMT, vol. 29, 110-173 (in German). Excerpts in English translation in NMT, vol. 13, 318-327.

*shoot them, so we have never spoken about it and will never speak of it. [...]*

*I mean the evacuation of the Jews (die Judenevakuierung), the extermination (Ausrottung) of the Jewish race. It's one of those things it is easy to talk about, 'The Jewish race is being exterminated [ausgerottet],' says one Party Member, 'that's quite clear, it's in our program – elimination [Ausschaltung] of the Jews and we're doing it, extermination [Ausrottung] is what we're doing.' And then they come, 80 million worthy Germans, and each one has his decent Jew. Of course the others are vermin, but this one is an A-1 Jew. Not one of all those who talk this way has watched it, not one of them has gone through it. Most of you must know what it means when 100 corpses are lying side by side, or 500, or 1,000. To have stuck it out and at the same time – apart from exceptions caused by human weakness – to have remained decent fellows, that is what has made us hard. This is a page of glory in our history which has never been written and is never to be written, for we know how difficult we should have made it for ourselves, if with the bombing raids, the burdens and the depravations of war we still had Jews today in every town as secret saboteurs, agitators, and trouble-mongers. We would now probably have reached the 1916-1917 stage when the Jews were still in the German national body.*

*We have taken from them what wealth they had. I have issued a strict order, which SS Obergruppenführer Pohl has carried out, that this wealth should, as a matter of course, be handed over to the Reich without reserve. We have taken none of it for ourselves. [...] We had the moral right, we had the duty to our people, to destroy this people (dieses Volk umzubringen) which wanted to destroy us. But we have not the right to enrich ourselves with so much as a fur, a watch, a mark, or a cigarette, or anything else. Because we exterminated (ausrotteten) a germ, we do not want in the end to be infected by the germ and die of it. [...] Wherever it may form, we will cauterize it."*

The evidence that Himmler actually made these remarks is very weak. The alleged text of the Posen speech is part of document 1919-PS and covers 63 pages in the IMT volumes. The quoted portion occurs in a section of 1-1/2 pages length which stands about mid-way in the text under the heading "Jewish evacuation." The manuscript of the speech, which bears no signature or other endorsement, is said (in the descriptive material accompanying the trial document) to have been found in Rosenberg's files. It was put into evidence at the IMT as part of document 1919-PS, but it was not stated, during the IMT proceedings, where the document was supposed to have been found, and nobody questioned Rosenberg in connection with it. On the other hand, Rosenberg was questioned in regard to 3428-PS, another document said to have been found in his files (which is discussed briefly below), and he denied that it could have been part of his files.<sup>341</sup> It is further claimed that during Case 11 "the Rosenberg files were rescreened and 44 records were discovered to be a phonographic recording of Himmler's Poznan speech of October 4, 1943."<sup>342</sup> The records are supposed to be document NO-

<sup>341</sup> IMT, vol. 11, 561.

<sup>342</sup> NMT, vol. 13, 318.

5909 and were put into evidence during the testimony of defendant Gottlob Berger, SS General, former head of the SS administrative department, Himmler's personal liaison with Rosenberg's Ministry for the Occupied East, and chief of POW affairs toward the end of the war. In his direct examination, Berger had testified that he had known nothing of any extermination program and also that Himmler had indeed delivered an "interminable" speech at Posen in 1943, to an audience of higher SS leaders which included himself. However, he denied that document 1919-PS was an accurate transcript of the speech, because he recalled that part of the speech had dealt with certain Belgian and Dutch SS leaders who were present at the meeting, and<sup>343</sup>

*"[...] that is not contained in the transcript. I can say with certainty that he did not speak about the Ausrottung of the Jews, because the reason for this meeting was to equalize and adjust these tremendous tensions between the Waffen SS and the Police."*

In the cross examination prosecutor Petersen played a phonograph recording of somebody speaking the first lines of the alleged speech, but Berger at first denied that the voice was Himmler's and then, after a second playing of the same lines, he said that it "might be Heinrich Himmler's voice." The records were then offered in evidence and more excerpts, including the one dealing with Jewish evacuation, which is quoted above, were played in court. Berger was not questioned further, however, on the authenticity of the voice and was excused immediately after the playing of the records. It was only with some reluctance that the court accepted these records in evidence:

*"Judge Powers, Presiding: Well, I think that there is enough evidence here, prima facie, that the voice is the voice of Himmler to justify receiving the document in evidence. There is no evidence, however, that it was delivered at Poznan or any other particular place. The discs will be received in evidence as an indication of Himmler's general attitude."*

The only "prima facie" evidence for the authenticity of the voice (at only one point in the speech), as far as I can see, was the Berger statement at one point that the voice "might be Heinrich Himmler's."

In our judgment, the prosecution did not submit one bit of evidence that the voice was that of Himmler or even that the Posen speech, which everyone would agree dwelled on sensitive subjects, was recorded phonographically. Thus, the authenticity of these phonograph recordings has not even been argued, much less demonstrated.

Reitlinger remarks that a "partial gramophone recording" of the Posen speech exists, but he does not say what part still exists.<sup>344</sup> I have not pursued the question any further, because I would not be qualified to evaluate such recordings if they were produced.

Note that these recordings, claimed to have been belatedly discovered in a dead man's files, were put into evidence at the same "trial," Kempner's circus, which the analysis had already conclusively discredited on independent grounds.

<sup>343</sup> NMT, vol. 13, 457-487.

<sup>344</sup> Reitlinger, 317.

In addition, it seems quite peculiar that Himmler would have allowed the recording of a speech containing material that he “will never speak of [...] publicly,” and then, despite his control of the Gestapo, have seen these recordings fall into the hands of his political rival Rosenberg. On the basis of these considerations and also on account of the fact that it is very difficult to believe that Himmler would have wasted the time of so many high SS leaders by delivering the supposed text in document 1919-PS (a most general discussion of the war), one can be sure that we have another forgery here. However, parts of the alleged speech may be authentic, and some parts may have been delivered during the Posen speech or on other occasions.

It is true that Pohl testified in Case 4 that he was present at the Posen speech (probably true) and that Himmler did deliver the remarks concerning extermination of the Jews.

However, Pohl’s real point was a ludicrous one. We have noted that Pohl’s basic trial strategy was to attempt to exploit the fact that the extermination charges had been thrown specifically at the Gestapo and the RSHA, and he was quick to pounce on such things as the Höss affidavit as absolving him in regard to exterminations. His defense strategy had the same basic logic as the strategies of all defendants we have examined, except for Göring. Thus, Pohl’s testimony concerning the Posen speech came in the context of his declaration that the speech was his first information about the exterminations! In other words, the exterminations were allegedly so far removed from his official responsibilities that it required a declaration by Himmler for him to learn of them. He naturally further testified that he shortly later protested to Himmler but was told that it was “none of your business.” Thus was expressed merely Pohl’s defense strategy of putting self-serving interpretations on that which was passing as fact in court.<sup>345</sup>

A lesser point should be made before we leave the subject of the Posen speech. It is possible to argue that the text may be genuine at his point but that by “*Ausrottung*” Himmler merely meant “uprooting” or some form of elimination less drastic than killing. The principal basis for such an argument would be that *Ausrottung* is indeed explicitly equated in the text with *Judenevakuierung* and with *Ausschaltung*. The corpses referred to could easily be interpreted as German corpses produced by the Allied air raids, for which the Nazis often claimed the Jews were ultimately responsible. On the other hand, it can be noted that if the remarks are authentic then Himmler regarded it as a right and a duty *dieses Volk umzubringen*, and the comparison with the bloody purge of 1934 at the outset of the remarks seems to justify taking “*Ausrottung*” in its primary sense of extermination. Thus, while such an argument could be made, it would not be very solid.

The conclusive point is that in being asked to believe that the text is genuine we are, in effect, being asked to believe Kempner.

---

<sup>345</sup> NMT, vol. 5, 666, 675.

## Joseph Goebbels

Finally, there are a number of remarks in *The Goebbels Diaries* but, as the “Publisher’s Note” explains, the “diaries were typed on fine water-marked paper” and then “passed through several hands, and eventually came into the possession of Mr. Frank E. Mason.” Thus, the authenticity of the complete manuscript is very much open to question, even if the authenticity of much of the material can be demonstrated somehow. Interpolation with a typewriter is simple. The original clothbound edition of the “*Diaries*” even contains a U.S. government statement that it “neither warrants nor disclaims the authenticity of the manuscript.”

Wilfred von Oven, who was an official in the Goebbels Ministry and became, after the war, the editor of the right wing German language Buenos Aires journal *La Plata*, had come forward with a curiously eager endorsement of the authenticity of *The Goebbels Diaries*. However, the net effect of his comments is in the reverse direction, for he tells us that (a) the diaries were dictated from handwritten notes (which were subsequently destroyed) by Goebbels to *Regierungsrat* Otte, who typed them using the special typewriter, having characters of almost 1 cm height, that was used for typing the texts that Goebbels used when he gave speeches (!) and (b) Oven “often observed” Otte, at Goebbels order, “carefully and precisely as ever” burning these pages toward the end of the war after having made microfilms of them. The point of the latter operation, as Goebbels is said to have explained to Oven in the April 18, 1945, entry in the latter’s diary (which was published in 1948/1949 in Buenos Aires), was that Goebbels “had for months taken care that his treasure, his great secret, result and accumulation of a more than twenty year political career, his diary, will remain preserved for posterity but not fall into unauthorized hands.”

This strange story of Oven’s at least throws some light on the reference to an unusual typewriter in Louis P. Lochner’s Introduction to the *Diaries*. If Oven’s account is true, then it is possible that persons unknown obtained the special typewriter or a facsimile and a set of the microfilms and manufactured an edited and interpolated text. However, it is next to impossible to believe that Goebbels’ diaries were indeed transcribed as Oven has described.<sup>346</sup>

## The *Einsatzgruppen*

The remaining part of the extermination legend is that the *Einsatzgruppen* exterminated Russian Jews in gasmobiles and by mass shootings. This is the only part of the legend, which contains a particle of truth.

At the time of the German invasion of Russia in June 1941, there was a Führer order declaring, in anticipation of an identical Soviet policy, that the war with Russia was not to be fought on the basis of the traditional “rules of warfare.” Necessary measures were to be taken to counter partisan activity, and Himmler was

<sup>346</sup> Lochner, 126, 138, 147f, 241, viii. Oven’s remarks are in *Nation Europa* (Apr. 75), 53-56.

given the power to “act independently upon his own responsibility.” Everybody knew that meant executions of partisans and persons collaborating with partisans. The dirty task was assigned to four *Einsatzgruppen* of the SD, which had a total strength of about 3,000 men (*i.e.* of the order of 500 to 1,000 men per group). Knowledgeable authorities, incidentally, have accepted that such anti-partisan operations were necessary in the Russian theater, where the enemy had no regard for the “rules.”<sup>347</sup>

We have had occasion to note in several instances that Jews did, in fact, pose a security menace to the German rear in the war. The Red Cross excerpt makes this quite clear. The task of the *Einsatzgruppen* was to deal with such dangers by all necessary means, so we need not be told much more to surmise that the *Einsatzgruppen* must have shot many Jews, although we do not know whether “many” means 5,000, 25,000 or 100,000. Naturally, many non-Jews were also executed.

However, the claim goes beyond this and asserts a *dual* role for the *Einsatzgruppen*; they were charged not only with keeping the partisan problem under control but also with exterminating all Jews (and gypsies). Common sense alone should reject the notion that the *Einsatzgruppen*, which had a total strength of about 3,000 men, as a matter of general policy, spent their time and effort pursuing objectives unrelated to military considerations. We are again offered a fact for dual interpretation.

The story is that there was no written order to exterminate the Jews, but that the *Einsatzgruppen* commanders got their orders orally and at different times. Ohlendorf commanded Group D in southern Russia, and he got his orders orally from Streckenbach in June 1941. Rasch of Group C, operating to the immediate north of Ohlendorf, did not get his orders until August 1941. Groups A and B operated around the Baltic states and to the south-east of the Baltic States, respectively, and were commanded by Stahlecker and Nebe, respectively.<sup>348</sup>

The main evidence for exterminations is a huge amount of documentary evidence which is simply funny. There is the celebrated document 501-PS, which the Russians possessed at a show ‘trial’ that they staged in December 1943.<sup>349</sup> One part is said to be a letter to Rauff in Berlin, written by an SS 2nd Lieutenant Becker. This is apparently the only document claimed to be signed by Becker, who is said to have been dead at the time of the IMT trial. It reads:<sup>350</sup>

*“The overhauling of the Wagen by groups D and C is finished. While the Wagen in the first series can also be put into action if the weather is not too bad, the Wagen of the second series (Saurer) stop completely in rainy weather. [...] I ordered the Wagen of group D to be camouflaged as house trailers. [...] the driver presses the accelerator to the fullest extent. By doing that, the persons to be executed suffer death from suffocation and not death by dozing off as was planned.”*

<sup>347</sup> Veale, 220-224; Reitlinger, 83, 198; Dawidowicz, 125.

<sup>348</sup> Reitlinger, 82-84, 199-201; Hilberg, 187-188, 194-195.

<sup>349</sup> Reitlinger, 213.

<sup>350</sup> IMT, vol. 3, 560; vol. 26, 102-105. Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 140ff.

The text of the document is as spurious sounding as one should expect the text of such a document to be; it was allegedly written by an obscure 2nd Lieutenant and fortuitously fell into the hands of the Russians in 1943! Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, in *The Gulag Archipelago*, mentions the case of the Bavarian Jupp Aschenbrenner, whom the Russians persuaded to sign a similar declaration that he had worked on wartime gas vans, but Aschenbrenner was later able to prove that, at the time he had supposedly been working on the vans, he was actually in Munich studying to become an electric welder.<sup>351</sup>

The most frequently cited evidence is a collection of documents purporting to be daily and other reports of the *Einsatzgruppen* to Himmler and Heydrich for the period June 1941 to May 1942. Document numbers are 180-L – said to be a report of Stahlecker found in Himmler’s files<sup>352</sup> – 2273-PS – said to be another Stahlecker report on actions up to January 31, 1942, “captured by Russians in Riga” (Stahlecker was killed in March 1942)<sup>353</sup> – 119-USSR, and many others, too numerous to list, most having numbers around NO-3000. Beside telling of regular anti-partisan activities, the reports tell of individual actions of mass executions of Jews, with numbers of victims usually running in the thousands. It is indicated, in most cases, that many copies, sometimes as many as a hundred, were distributed. They were mimeographed, and signatures are most rare and, when they occur, appear on non-incriminating pages. Document NO-3159, for example, has a signature of a R. R. Strauch, but only on a covering page giving the locations of various units of the *Einsatzgruppen*. There is also NO-1128, allegedly from Himmler to Hitler reporting, among other things, the execution of 363,211 Russian Jews in August-November 1942. This claim occurs on page 4 of NO-1128, while initials said to be Himmler’s occur on the irrelevant page 1. Moreover, Himmler’s initials were easy to forge: three vertical lines with a horizontal line drawn through them.<sup>354</sup>

In connection with these matters, the reader should be informed that, when examining printed reproductions of documents in the IMT and NMT volumes, a handwritten signature not be assumed unless it is specifically stated that the signature is handwritten; “signed” generally means only a typewritten signature. Document 180-L, for example, is reproduced in German in the IMT volumes, and excerpts in English are reproduced in the NMT volumes. In both cases signatures are indicated, but the actual document merely has “gez. Dr. Stahlecker” (signed Dr. Stahlecker) typewritten in two places.<sup>355</sup>

There are two documents said to have been authored by Hinrich Lohse, Reichskommissar for the Ostland, who was also the person to whom Wetzel’s “Brack remedy” letter was addressed (see p. 215). One of the documents deals with *Sonderbehandlung* and was alluded to in Chapter 4 (p. 146). Like Wetzel, Lohse was never called as a witness at Nuremberg. Unlike Wetzel, however, Lohse stood

<sup>351</sup> Solzhenitsyn, 112n.

<sup>352</sup> IMT, vol. 3, 559.

<sup>353</sup> Reitlinger, 201, note 70 on page 611.

<sup>354</sup> NMT, vol. 13, 269-272 (excerpts only).

<sup>355</sup> IMT, vol. 37, 670-717; NMT, vol. 4, 154.



trial before a German court and was sentenced in 1948 to ten years imprisonment. However, he was released in 1951 on grounds of ill health and awarded a pension, which was shortly later disallowed on account of public protest. As for the comments attributed to him, Reitlinger remarks that they “saved him from the Allied Military Courts and perhaps the gallows” for, while they speak of atrocities, they are so worded as to put the author of the documents in opposition to the crimes. The document dealing with *Sonderbehandlung* is a letter from Lohse to Rosenberg dated June 18, 1943. The actual document, 135-R, seems to be claimed to be an unsigned carbon copy of the correspondence, found in SS files. The relevant passage reads:<sup>356</sup>

*“That Jews are sonderbehandelt requires no further discussion. But that things proceed as is explained in the report of the Generalkommissar of 1 June 1943 seems scarcely believable. What is Katyn compared to that?”*

Three unsigned reports supposedly received from the Generalkommissar (Wilhelm Kube, Generalkommissar for White Russia) are attached to the document.

The second Lohse document is 3663-PS and is one of several documents bearing the major irregularity of having been processed by the Yivo (Yiddish Scientific Institute) of New York before being submitted as Nuremberg trial documents. There are about 70 such documents said to have been found in the Rosenberg Ministry in September 1945 by Sergeant Szajko Frydman of the U.S. 82nd Airborne Division. Frydman, however, was a staff member of the Yivo both before and after his service in the Army. Indeed, the Yivo was so active in producing documents supposedly found in the Rosenberg Ministry that it may very well have some enlightening information on the origins of their supposed text of Himmler’s Posen speech. The first part of the document is written on the stationery of the Ministry. It is a letter to Lohse, dated October 31, 1941, with a type-written signature by Dr. Leibbrandt and an illegible handwritten endorsement by somebody else. It reads:

*“The RSHA has complained that the Reichskommissar for the Ostland has forbidden executions of Jews in Libau. I request a report in regard to this matter by return mail.”*

The second part of the document is the reply, handwritten on the reverse side of the first part, supposedly in the hand of Trampedach and initialed by Lohse (with a letter “L” about 1-1/2 inches high). It reads:

*“I have forbidden the wild executions of Jews in Libau because they were not justifiable in the manner in which they were carried out.*

*I should like to be informed whether your inquiry of 31 October is to be regarded as a directive to liquidate all Jews in the East? Shall this take place without regard to age and sex and economic interests (of the Wehrmacht, for instance, in specialists in the armament industry)? Of course, the cleansing of the East of Jews is a necessary task; its solution, however, must be harmonized with the necessities of war production.*

<sup>356</sup> Hilberg, 252n; Reitlinger, 232-233. documents 135-R and 3633-PS reproduced in Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 190ff.

*So far, I have not been able to find such a directive either in the regulations regarding the Jewish question in the 'Brown Portfolio' or in other decrees."*

Obviously, Lohse could not have any conceivable reason to contest the authenticity of these documents because, though they suggest exterminations, they emphatically excuse him.

Another document from the Yivo is 3428-PS, supposedly a letter from Kube to Lohse, reporting shipments of German, Polish, and other Jews to the Minsk area and the liquidation of some of them. From the mimeographed summary examined, it is not clear whether or not the document is supposed to have a handwritten signature. Wilhelm Kube was assassinated in September 1943.<sup>357</sup>

Other documents that are relevant are numbered 3660-PS through 3669-PS (excepting 3663-PS). The documents are attributed to various people, e.g. Kube and Gewecke, and in every case the descriptive material accompanying the document specifies that the location of the original is unknown and that only a photostat is available. With only a couple of exceptions, there are no handwritten signatures.

Even Reitlinger seems puzzled by the existence of these reports and other documents, because he remarks:<sup>358</sup>

*"It is not easy to see why the murderers left such an abundant testimony behind them, for in spite of their wide circulation list, Knobloch's [the Gestapo official who edited the reports] reports seem to have been designed primarily to appeal to Himmler and Heydrich. Thus, in addition to much juggling with the daily death bills in order to produce an impressive total, there are some rather amateur essays in political intelligence work."*

It is the "amateur essays" that convince one of forgery here; the contents of these reports are ridiculous in the selection of things reported. To give a few examples from excerpts reproduced in NMT volume 4:<sup>359</sup>

*"The tactics, to put terror against terror, succeeded marvelously. From fear of reprisals, the peasants came a distance of 20 kilometers and more to the headquarters of the Teilkommando of Einsatzgruppe A on foot or on horseback in order to bring news about partisans, news which was accurate in most of the cases. [...]"*

*In this connection, a single case may be mentioned, which proves the correctness of the principle 'terror against terror.' In the village of Yachnova it was ascertained on the basis of a report made by the peasant Yemelyanov and after further interrogations and other searches that partisans had been fed in the house of Anna Prokovieva. The house was burned down on 8 August 1941 at about 21 hours and its inhabitants arrested. Shortly after midnight partisans set light to the house of the informer Yemelyanov. A detachment sent to Jachnowa on the following day ascertained that the peasant woman Ossipova had told the partisans that Yemelyanov had made the report, which had caused our action.*

<sup>357</sup> Hilberg, 709; Reitlinger, 560; 3428-PS in NMT, vol. 4, 191-193.

<sup>358</sup> Reitlinger, 213-214.

<sup>359</sup> NMT, vol. 4, 168-169, 187, 190.

*Ossipova was shot and her house burned down. Further, two 16-year-old youths from the village were shot because, according to their own confession, they had rendered information and courier service to the partisans. [...]*

*[...] Several Jews who had not been searched thoroughly enough by the Lithuanian guards drew knives and pistols and uttering cries like 'Long live Stalin!' and 'Down with Hitler!' they rushed upon the police force of whom 7 were wounded. Resistance was broken at once. After 150 Jews had been shot on the spot, the transport of the remaining Jews to the place of execution was carried through without further incident.*

*In the course of the greater action against Jews, 3,412 Jews were shot in Minsk, 302 in Vileika, and 2,007 in Baranovichi.*

*The population welcomed these actions, when they found out, while inspecting the apartments, that the Jews still had great stocks of food at their disposal, whereas their own supplies were extremely low.*

*Jews appear again and again, especially in the sphere of the black market. In the Minsk canteen, which serves the population with food and is operated by the city administration, 2 Jews had committed large-scale embezzlements and briberies. The food, which was obtained in this way, was sold on the black market."*

It is not difficult to see why these documents exist: without them, the authors of the lie would have no evidence for their claims except testimony. We have seen that with Auschwitz there was an abundance of material facts to work with and whose meanings could be distorted: shipments of Jews to Auschwitz, many of whom did not return to their original homes, large shipments of a source of hydrogen cyanide gas, elaborate cremation facilities, selections, the stench. The situation with the *Einsatzgruppen* was different; there was only one fact: the executions. Standing alone, this fact does not appear impressive as evidence, and this consideration was no doubt the motivation for manufacturing these documents on such a large scale. This is in contrast to the Auschwitz hoax, for which forgery of documents is not nearly so prominent and where the forgeries were accomplished with more care. With Auschwitz, we are dealing with a lie manufactured by Washington, but with the *Einsatzgruppen*, we are dealing with one manufactured by Moscow, and the hand is correspondingly heavier.

It is worth mentioning that the "gasmobiles" were not charged in Soviet propaganda until the middle of the war. Massacres of Jews were claimed, of course, early in the development of the propaganda, and the *New York Times* story of April 6, 1942 (Chapter 3, p. 91), is an example. The massacres are not claimed to have taken place via gasmobiles. A contemporary Soviet propaganda production was the book *We Shall Not Forgive!* (Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1942). The book opens with a summary, presented by Molotov on April 27, 1942, of the crimes that the Germans had supposedly committed in their invasion of Russia. The remainder of the book elaborates the charges with commentaries and photographs, with quite a few obvious phonies in the collection. Since the Germans are charged with virtually every crime imaginable, they are naturally charged with pogroms and massacres of Jews, but gasmobiles do not appear in the

charges. As far as we can see, the first claims of gasmobile exterminations on Russian territory (as distinct from claims of gasmobiles at Chelmno in Poland) came in July 1943 during a Soviet trial of 11 Russians accused of having collaborated with the Germans at Krasnodar. This suggests that the Russian claims may have been inspired by the gas chamber propaganda that had started in the West late in 1942. In any case, the late appearance of the gasmobile charges, just as in the case of the Auschwitz propaganda, is further proof that the charges are inventions.<sup>360</sup>

There is also a certain amount of testimony that should be mentioned. At the risk of belaboring a perfectly simple point, let us again observe what had been pointed out here from many different angles: that a witness testifies in court to the truth of  $X$ , under conditions where the court is already committed to the truth of  $X$ , is historical evidence of absolutely nothing.

The most frequently referred to testimony is that of Ohlendorf, an SS Lieutenant General and an economist who had had some differences with Himmler and consequently found himself assigned to command group D for one year – summer 1941 to summer 1942 – in southern Russia. Ohlendorf was the most literate of the people involved in this matter.

At the IMT, when other people were on trial, Ohlendorf had appeared as a prosecution witness and had testified in agreement with the extermination claims.<sup>361</sup> He testified that he had received oral orders to add extermination of Jews to his activities, that gasmobiles were used to exterminate women and children, that document 501-PS was authentic (Becker's letter), and that the Wehrmacht was implicated in these things. Thus, this charge regarding the *Einsatzgruppen* was part of the IMT judgment, which even stated that Ohlendorf exterminated Jews with group D.<sup>362</sup> As we have seen, these statements in the judgment constituted "proof of the facts stated" when Ohlendorf, no doubt contrary to his expectations, was put on trial as the principal defendant in Case 9. In view of the legal constraints involved here, nobody's position could have been more hopeless than Ohlendorf's at his own trial.

Ohlendorf's NMT testimony was simply contradictory; he was stuck with his IMT testimony, which the prosecution was mindful of holding him to, but he tried to squirm out anyway, and the result was a story having no coherency whatever.<sup>363</sup> He retracted his earlier statement that there had been specific extermination orders, but under cross examination he said that he was killing all Jews and gypsies anyway, but that this was just an anti-partisan operation, not part of a program to exterminate all Jews and gypsies on racial or religious grounds. However, the total number of persons of all categories executed by group D during his year in Russia was only 40,000, and not the 90,000 that he had testified to at the IMT and which the NMT prosecutor attempted to hold him to. Either figure, of course, especially the former, makes some sense, if the executions were only in connec-

<sup>360</sup> *New York Times* (Jul. 16, 1943), 7.

<sup>361</sup> IMT, vol. 4, 311-355.

<sup>362</sup> IMT, vol. 22, 478-480, 491-494, 509-510, 538.

<sup>363</sup> NMT, vol. 4, 223-312.

tion with anti-partisan measure, but make no sense at all if one is supposed to be executing all Jews and gypsies at the same time, including women and children.

Ohlendorf's NMT testimony is thus hopelessly contradictory, as it was bound to be in the circumstances, in which he found himself. One should note, however, that Ohlendorf did not testify to the reality of any executions, which his court was not formally committed, *a priori*, to accepting as factual anyway. The only part of Ohlendorf's testimony that may be of value is his attack on the *Einsatzgruppen* reports as "edited."

Ohlendorf's testimony contrasts with that of Haensch, an SS Lieutenant Colonel who was in command of a *Sonderkommando* in group C for about seven weeks. The fact that Haensch had not testified previously when others were on trial and the fact that his lower rank made the *a priori* constraints on Case 9 of lesser effect in his case, gave him a freedom that Ohlendorf did not enjoy. He testified that absolutely nobody, in giving him his orders, had ever mentioned Jews as such in connection with executive activities of the *Einsatzgruppen* and that his *Sonderkommando* had not, as a matter of fact, had a policy of executing Jews as such. He estimated that his *Sonderkommando* executed about sixty people during his period of service. All of these claims were completely in conflict with what are said to be the reports of the *Einsatzgruppen*, as the court pointed out in detail in the judgment, concluding that in connection with Haensch:<sup>364</sup>

*"[...] one can only dismiss as fantastic the declaration of the defendant that his predecessor who had admittedly executed thousands of Jews under the Führer Order, and whose program Haensch was to continue, said nothing to Haensch about that program. And when Haensch boldly uttered that the first time he ever had any inkling of the Führer Order was when he arrived in Nuremberg six years later, he entered into the category of incredulousness which defies characterization."*

Ohlendorf and Haensch were both sentenced to hang. Ohlendorf's sentence was carried out in 1951, but Haensch's sentence was commuted to fifteen years. Presumably, he was out sometime during the Fifties.

Of course, the basic plea of all defendants in Case 9 as well as in almost all other cases was that whatever they did was done in obedience to orders that could be disobeyed only under circumstances that would have resulted in the execution of the disobedient person. Incidentally, in my opinion this is a perfectly valid defense, and it may have been this consideration that played a role in whatever inducements were offered to Germans to become prosecution witnesses at the IMT trial; it did not imply his guilt or, at least, it logically did not, if it was done in obedience to orders. In fact, this was the case in the German military law that the German witnesses were familiar with. Disobedience of even an illegal order was a serious and punishable offense. People such as Höss and Ohlendorf had, no doubt, reasoned that their testimony at the IMT had incriminated them only in the sense of perjury, an offense that they knew the Allied tribunals would never charge them with. Ohlendorf's attempts to ingratiate himself with the U.S. prosecutors

---

<sup>364</sup> NMT, vol. 4, 313-323,547-555.

did not, moreover, end with the IMT for he was also used, after his own trial and while he was under sentence of death, as a prosecution witness against Wehrmacht generals in Case 12.

Personal guilt, obviously, is not involved, if the actions demanded or suggested by the accusers would have led to the clearly inevitable death of the accused. I suspect that every accuser of the *Einsatzgruppen* would have obeyed orders to participate in the air raids on Hamburg, Dresden, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki (none of which, incidentally, had credible military motivations).

However I do not want to create an impression that I am denying that the *Einsatzgruppen* executed apparent civilians, including women and children, in connection with their activities in Russia. All experience with anti-partisan warfare, whether conducted by the British, the French, or the Americans, suggests – quite independently of the tainted (to put it mildly) evidence of the trials at Nuremberg – that such things happened. In the Vietnam war, Americans did much of this with napalm and then made a big fuss over the fact that one obscure Lieutenant had been caught doing it with bullets.

Neither am I trying to create an impression that, actually, everybody is very brutal, but a thorough discussion of the problems involved would carry us far afield, so it will not be attempted; only the essentials can be outlined here.

It is an unhappy fact that partisan, irregular, or guerilla warfare, together with the measures taken to suppress such operations, is not only the dirtiest business in existence but has also been a regular feature of twentieth century history. It is dirty business even when the two sides are highly civilized and culturally similar. A good example is the British campaign against the Irish rebellion of 1916-1921, where both sides acted with remarkable brutality.

If one adds to the fact of guerilla warfare that at least one side is drawn from a primitive, uncivilized, or semi-civilized population, then one has a situation that it is most difficult for an ordinary civilized person to grasp, if he has no direct experience of it. It is too easy for us, sitting in the warmth of our living rooms, to generate moral indignation over operations, which involve the killing of “apparent civilians, including women and children.” The typical West European or American has lived in a culture, in which certain standards of charity, kindness, and honor have been taken for granted, and it is difficult for him to understand that certain fundamental assumptions about other people would not hold in a context such as guerilla warfare in Asia or Russia; the viciousness involved exceeds the imagination. To give just one example drawn from our Vietnam experience: what do you do, if a child, despite signaled warnings to stay away, is obstinately approaching you asking for food or candy, and it is known that there is a good chance that there is a grenade attached to him?

Of course, many needless brutalities always occur in such circumstances, but one should attempt to understand the situation.

What I am denying with respect to the *Einsatzgruppen* is that one can give any credence to the story told by the trials evidence, which, while it is somewhat variable on some points, has the basic feature of asserting that the *Einsatzgruppen*, which had a total strength of about 3,000 for the anti-partisan operations for all of

occupied Russia, regularly and as a matter of policy pursued a second set of objectives not related to military considerations, those objectives (exterminations) requiring substantial means for their attainment. We can, especially in view of the obvious forgery and perjury which has been practiced in connection with making this claim, dismiss all of that as propaganda. What did in fact happen, can only, most probably, be approximately grasped on account of the scantiness of reliable evidence. Unfortunately, it would appear that the events in Russia will never be established with exactitude, and that these episodes will remain partially in darkness.

# Chapter 7: The Final Solution

## The German Policy and the Wannsee Conference

We have shown that the exterminations are a propaganda hoax, *i.e.*, we have shown what did not happen to the Jews. To complete our study, we should show what did, in fact, happen to the Jews.

The problem of what happened to European Jews is a fairly easy one, if one wishes only a general answer, but a very difficult, indeed probably impossible problem, if one demands statistical accuracy. To answer the question in general, all one need do is consult the relevant German documents. What the German leaders were saying to each other about their policy is obviously the first authority one should consult.

The general nature of German Jewish policy is very simple to discover; it is all set out in NMT volume 13. The U.S. Prosecution in the Wilhelmstrasse Case presented a document, NG-2586, which consists of several parts, each part being some document important in the development of German Jewish policy. In fact, one part, NG-2586-J, is a summary of the other parts and, thus, a handy summary of the policy. One can do no better than simply reproduce the text, a memo by Martin Luther (Horst Wagner's predecessor), dated August 21, 1942:<sup>365</sup>

*"1. The principle of the German Jewish policy after the seizure of power consisted in promoting with all means the Jewish emigration. For this purpose, in 1939, Field Marshall Göring in his capacity as Plenipotentiary for the Four Year Plan established a Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration, and the direction was given to SS Lieutenant General Heydrich in his capacity as chief of the Security Police. The Foreign Office is represented in the committee of the Reich Central Office. The draft of a letter to this effect to the Chief of the Security Police was approved by the Reich Foreign Minister as 83/24 B in February 1939.*

*2. The present war gives Germany the opportunity and also the duty of solving the Jewish problem in Europe. In consideration of the favorable course of the war against France, D III proposed in July 1940 as a solution – the removal of all Jews from Europe and the demanding of the Island of Madagascar from France as a territory for the reception of the Jews. The Reich Foreign Minister has basically agreed to the beginning of the preliminary work for the deportation of the Jews from Europe. This should be done in close cooperation with the offices of the Reichsführer-SS (compare D III 200/40).*

---

<sup>365</sup> NMT. vol. 13, 243-249.



*The Madagascar plan was enthusiastically accepted by the RSHA, which in the opinion of the Foreign Office is the agency which alone is in the position technically and by experience to carry out a Jewish evacuation on a large scale and to guarantee the supervision of the people evacuated, the competent agency of the RSHA thereupon worked out a plan going into detail for the evacuation of the Jews to Madagascar and for their settlement there. This plan was approved by the Reichsführer-SS. SS Lieutenant General Heydrich submitted this plan directly to the Reich Foreign Minister in August 1940 (compare D III 2171). The Madagascar plan in fact had been outdated as the result of the political development.*

*The fact that the Führer intends to evacuate all Jews from Europe was communicated to me as early as August 1940 by Ambassador Abetz after an interview with the Führer (compare D III 2298).*

*Hence, the basic instruction of the Reich Foreign Minister, to promote the evacuation of the Jews in closest cooperation with the agencies of the Reichsführer-SS, is still in force and will therefore be observed by D III.*

*3. The administration of the occupied territories brought with it the problem of the treatment of Jews living in these territories. First, the military commander in France saw himself compelled as the first one to issue on September 27, 1940, a decree on the treatment of the Jews in occupied France. The decree was issued with the agreement of the German Embassy in Paris. The pertinent instruction was issued directly by the Reich Foreign Minister to Ambassador Abetz on the occasion of a verbal report.*

*After the pattern of the Paris decree, similar decrees have been issued in the Netherlands and Belgium. As these decrees, in the same way as German laws concerning Jews, formally embrace all Jews independent of their citizenship, objections were made by foreign powers, among others protest notes by the Embassy of the United States of America, although the military commander in France through internal regulation had ordered that the Jewish measures should not be applied to the citizens of neutral countries.*

*The Reich Foreign Minister has decided in the case of the American protests that he does not consider it right to have military regulations issued for making an exception of the American Jews. It would be a mistake to reject objections of friendly states (Spain and Hungary) and on the other hand to show weakness toward the Americans. The Reich Foreign Minister considers it necessary to make these instructions to the field commanders retroactive (compare D III 5449).*

*In accordance with this direction, the Jewish measures have been given general application.*

*4. In his letter of June 24, 1940 – Pol XII 136 – SS Lieutenant General Heydrich informed the Reich Foreign Minister that the whole problem of the approximately three and a quarter million Jews in the areas under German control can no longer be solved by emigration – a territorial final solution would be necessary.*

*In recognition of this, Reich Marshall Göring on July 31, 1941, commis-*

sioned SS Lieutenant General Heydrich to make, in conjunction with the interested German Control agencies, all necessary preparations for a total solution of the Jewish problem in the German sphere of influence in Europe (compare D III 709 secret). On the basis of this instruction, SS Lieutenant General Heydrich arranged a conference of all the interested German agencies for January 20, 1942, at which the State Secretaries were present from the other ministries and I myself from the Foreign Office. In the conference General Heydrich explained that Reich Marshall Göring's assignment to him had been made on the Führer's instruction and that the Führer instead of the emigration had now authorized the evacuation of the Jews to the East as the solution (compare page 5 of the enclosure to D III 29/42 Secret). State Secretary Weizsäcker had been informed on the conference; for the time being the Reich Foreign Minister had not been informed on the conference, because SS Lieutenant General Heydrich agreed to holding a new conference in the near future in which more details of the total solution should be discussed. This conference has never taken place due to Lieutenant General Heydrich's appointment as acting Reich Protector of Bohemia and Moravia and due to his death.

In the conference on January 20, 1942, I demanded that all questions concerned with countries outside Germany must first have the agreement of the Foreign Office, a demand to which SS Lieutenant General Heydrich agreed and also has faithfully complied with, as in fact, the office of the RSHA handling Jewish matters had, from the beginning, carried out all measures in frictionless cooperation with the Foreign Office. The RSHA has in this matter proceeded indeed almost over-cautiously.

5. On the basis of the Führer's instruction mentioned under '4' (above), the evacuation of the Jews from Germany was begun. It was urged that at the same time these Jews should also be taken who were nationals of the countries which had also undertaken Jewish measures. The RSHA accordingly made an inquiry of the Foreign Office. For reasons of courtesy, inquiry was made by way of the German legations in Bratislava [Slovakia], Zagreb [Croatia], and Bucharest [Romania] to the Governments there as to whether they wanted to recall their Jews from Germany in due time or to agree to their deportation to the ghettos in the East. To the issuance of this instruction, agreement was given before dispatch by the State Secretary, the Under State Secretary in Charge of the Political Division, the Director of the Division for Economic Policy and the Director of the Legal Division (compare D III 336 Secret).

The German Legation in Bucharest reports with reference to D III 602 Secret, that the Romanian government would leave it to the Reich Government to deport their Jews along with the German Jews to the ghettos in the East. They are not interested in having the Romanian Jews return to Romania.

The Legation in Zagreb has informed us that the Croat Government expresses gratitude for the gesture of the German Government; but it would appreciate the deportation of its Jews to the East (compare D III 624 Secret).

The Legation in Bratislava reported with reference to D III 661 Secret that the Slovak Government is fundamentally in agreement with the deportation to

*the eastern ghettos. But the Slovak claims to the property of the Jews should not be endangered.*

*The wire reports have also been submitted, as customary, to the Reich Foreign Minister's Bureau.*

*On the basis of the reports of the Ministers, I have informed the RSHA with reference to D III 661 Secret that the Jews of Romanian, Croat, and Slovak nationality could also be deported; their property should be blocked. The Director of the Political Division, Section IV of the Political Division, Section IX of the Legal Division and Section IV of the Division for the Economic Policy have cosigned the document. Accordingly, the deportations of the Jews from the occupied territories was undertaken.*

*6. The number of Jews deported in this way to the East did not suffice to cover the labor needs there. The RSHA therefore, acting on the instruction of the Reichsführer-SS, approached the Foreign Office to ask the Slovak Government to make 20,000 young, strong Slovak Jews from Slovakia available for deportation to the East. The German Legation in Bratislava was provided, by D III 874, with proper instruction. The instruction was signed by the State Secretary, the Under State Secretary in charge of the Political Division, and Section IV of the Political Division.*

*The Legation in Bratislava reported re D III 1002 that the Slovak Government has taken up the suggestion eagerly; the preparatory work could be begun.*

*Following up this pleased concurrence of the Slovak Government, the Reichsführer-SS proposed that the rest of the Slovak Jews also be deported to the East and Slovakia thereby be made free of Jews. The Legation was, re D III 1559 Ang. II, provided with proper instruction. The draft of the instruction was signed by the State Secretary; after its dispatch it was submitted for their information to the bureau of the Reich Foreign Minister and the Under State Secretary in charge of the Political Division.*

*As the Slovak Episcopacy meanwhile raised objections to the deportation of the Jews before the Slovak Government, the instruction carries the express statement that in no case must there develop internal political difficulties on account of the evacuation of the Jews in Slovakia. By the telegraphic report, re D III 2006, the Legation reported that the Slovak Government, without any German pressure, has declared itself agreeable to the deportation of all Jews and that the State President agreed personally to the deportation. The telegraphic report was submitted to the bureau of the Reich Foreign Minister. The Slovak Government had furthermore agreed that it will pay as a contribution to the cost entailed RM 500 for every evacuated Jew.*

*In the meantime 52,000 Jews have been removed from Slovakia. Due to church influences and the corruption of individual officials 35,000 Jews have received a special legitimation. However, Minister President Tuka wants the Jewish removal continued and therefore has asked for support through diplomatic pressure by the Reich (compare D III 3865). The Ambassador is authorized to give this diplomatic help in that he may state to State President Dr. Tiso that the exclusion of the 35,000 Jews is a surprise in Germany, the more*

so since the cooperation of Slovakia up to now in the Jewish problem has been highly appreciated here. This instruction has been cosigned by the Under State Secretary in charge of the Political Division, and the State Secretary.

7. The Croat Government is likewise fundamentally agreeable to the removal of the Jews from Croatia. It especially considers the deportation of the four to five thousand Jews from the Italian occupied Second zone (centered around Dubrovnik and Mostar) to be important, as they represent a political burden and their elimination would serve the general pacification. The removal can of course take place only with German aid, as difficulties are to be expected from the Italian side. There have been practical examples of resistance to the Croat measures by Italian officials on behalf of well-to-do Jews. Furthermore, the Italian Chief of Staff in Mostar has said that he cannot approve the removal since all the people living in Mostar have been assured of the same treatment.

Since meanwhile according to a telephone communication from Zagreb, the Croat Government has given its written approval of the proposed measure, Minister Kasche thinks it right to begin with the removal, and in fact to begin for the whole country. One could therefore take the risk of having difficulties develop in the course of the action, so far as concerns the zone occupied by Italians.

A report for the Reich Foreign Minister to this effect (D III 562 Secret) has been held up by State Secretary von Weizsäcker since he considered an inquiry should first be made at the Embassy in Rome. The answer has not been received.

The problem of the Italian Jews has come up in the same way in connection with the evacuation of the Jews in France.

Ambassador Abetz points out in connection with the deportation in preparation from the Occupied French Territory that there was an urgent political interest to take the foreign Jews first in the evacuation measures. Since these Jews were regarded as foreign bodies, they were already especially hated and passing them over and giving them thereby a quasi privileging would cause bad feeling, the more so since among them were to be found responsible instigators of Jewish terror and sabotage acts. It was regrettable that the Axis appeared exactly in this point to pursue no uniform policy.

If the evacuation of the foreign Jews were not immediately possible, the Italian Government should be for the time being asked to repatriate their Jews from France.

On the Italian side, economic interests appear to play a decisive role. The safeguarding of these interests, however, is entirely possible, so that on this point there needs to be no obstacle to the planned solution.

On this question of the Italian Jews in France a conference record of July 24, re D III 562 Secret, has been submitted to the Reich Foreign Minister.

8. On the occasion of a reception by the Reich Foreign Minister on November 26, 1941, the Bulgarian Foreign Minister Popoff touched on the problem of according like treatment to the Jews of European nationalities and

pointed out the difficulties that the Bulgarians had in the application of their Jewish laws to Jews of foreign nationality.

The Reich Foreign Minister answered that he thought this question brought up by Mr. Popoff not uninteresting. Even now he could say one thing to him, that at the end of this war all Jews would have to leave Europe. This was an unalterable decision of the Führer and also the only way to master this problem, as only a global and comprehensive solution could be applied and individual measures would not help very much. Furthermore, one should not attribute too much worth to the protests on behalf of the Jews of foreign nationality. At any rate, we would not let ourselves be taken in any further by such protests from the American side. He – the Reich Foreign Minister – would have the problem described by Mr. Popoff investigated by the Foreign Office.

The Reich Foreign Minister commissioned me to undertake the investigation promised (compare D III 660g) [document NG-4669].

I should like to make reference to my basic conference memorandum of December 4, 1941, re D III 660 Secret, which I am dispatching, together with the proper files. This conference memorandum was held up by the State Secretary, because he considered a further examination by the Legal Division first necessary. In their opinion the German-Bulgarian trade and shipping pact was not in agreement with the German-Bulgarian arrangements proposed by me. I therefore notified the German Legation in Sofia, re D III 497 Secret, under the date of June 19, in reference to the suggestion of the Bulgarian Foreign Minister Popoff at his reception to contact the Bulgarian Government and find out whether it was prepared to come to an agreement in the Jewish problem that there should be no rights from the trade and shipping pact given effect in favor of the Jews in the promise of reciprocity.

If the question is put from the Bulgarian side as to whether Germany is ready to deport Jews from Bulgaria to the East, the question should be answered in the affirmative, but in respect to the time of the departing should be answered evasively. This decree was cosigned by the State Secretary, the Under State Secretary, the Director of the Political Division, the Director of the Division for Economic Policy, Section IV of the Political Division, Section IV of the Division for Economic Policy, and also by Ribbentrop. The Legation exchanged notes with the Bulgarian Government and reported that the Bulgarian Government is fundamentally prepared in the problem of the evacuation to sign an agreement with us. Thereby the basis is given to include the Bulgarian Jews in the Jewish measures. (D III 559 Secret and 569 Secret).

9. The Hungarian Government has not yet been approached with respect to the Jewish removal, because the status of the Hungarian legislation up to the present does not promise a sufficient success.

10. In accordance with the agreement of the Romanian Government mentioned under '8' the evacuation of the Romanian Jews from Germany and the occupied territories was begun, whereupon various Romanian consulates and the Romanian Minister in Berlin, who had no instructions from their Government, intervened. Ambassador von Killinger was therefore asked for clarifica-

tion. The Legation seems to have made use of the Jewish advisor assigned to it, Richter, for this purpose. He is a person to whom the Romanian Government confirmed its earlier agreement to the inclusion of the Romanian Jews in the German measures and to whom the Deputy Ministry President Mihai Antonescu informed of the request of the Marshall that the German agencies should also carry out the removal from Romania itself and should be then immediately with the transport of the Jews from the areas Arad, Timisoara and Turda.

For details may I refer to my conference memorandum of August 17 as D III 649.

11. At the request of the governments concerned, the legations in Bratislava, Zagreb and Bucharest have been assigned advisors for Jewish affairs. They have been made available at the request of the Foreign Office by the RSHA. Their assignment is for a limited time. It ends as soon as the Jewish problem in the country concerned can be regarded as solved in the German sense. Originally it was regarded as solved as soon as the country concerned has issued Jewish laws similar to the German ones.

Accordingly Richter was recalled from Romania last year by the RSHA.

At the urgent request of the legation in Bucharest, Richter was again assigned to the legation despite the objection of the RSHA. This was done with the express intention of having him remain there until the actual final solution in Romania (D III 1703 Secret and 1893 Secret).

Since all negotiations with the Romanian Government went through the Foreign Office, the report of SS First Lieutenant Richter submitted by the Reichsführer-SS should be considered only as an internal work report to the RSHA. The unusual procedure of having the confirmation of a final conference in the handwriting of the Deputy Minister President was sharply objected to immediately through the directive of the 17th of this month; the official handling of the affair must be carried out immediately. The files have been submitted there already under D III 659 Secret.

The intended deportations are a further step forward on the way of the total solution and are in respect to other countries (Hungary) very important. The deportation to the Government General is a temporary measure. The Jews will be moved on further to the occupied Eastern Territories as soon as the technical conditions for it are given.

I therefore request approval for the continuation of the negotiations and measures under these terms and according to the arrangement made.

Signed: LUTHER”

The material starting with the words “If the question is put from the Bulgarian side [...]” and ending with the words “The files have been submitted there already under D III 659 Secret,” is deleted in NMT volume 13. In section 4 the date of June 24, 1940, for document Pol XII 136 appears, from the context, to be in error; it should be 1941.

This is not a solitary document; not only is it a summary of a certain number of documents spelling out the Jewish policies of the German Government, but all

documents bearing on Jewish policies, except for those we have identified as forgeries, fall within the scheme implied by it. The “final solution” meant the expulsion of all Jews from the German sphere of influence in Europe. After the invasion of Russia, its specific meaning was the resettlement of these Jews in the East. The German documents at every level (among those that have survived) express this unambiguously, a fact which is conceded even by the bearers of the extermination legend, who are forced to declare that this must just be code terminology for extermination.<sup>366</sup>

Actually, in the discussions prior to this chapter, we have had several occasions to refer to this program of resettlement to the East. Its most important expression has been in the Red Cross excerpt which, despite its ambiguous remarks about “extermination,” presents a picture in rather close accord with the story told by NG-2586-J. At Theresienstadt, the Red Cross wondered if the place “was being used as a transit camp and asked when the last departures for the East had taken place.” In Slovakia the Jews had been subject to “forced immigration towards the territories under German control.” A large number of Romanian Jews had been resettled in the East, but things did not work out and many returned, although there had been adequate opportunity to exterminate them, if such had been the policy. Despite the several vague and ambiguous remarks about “extermination,” which we noted in Chapter 5 (p. 179), the undeniable effect of the Red Cross *Report* is to confirm that the Germans were doing what their documents say they were doing.

The German documents are not only confirmed by neutral authority; we have seen that they are even confirmed by hostile sources. In Chapter 4 (p. 139), we discussed the Theresienstadt Jews sent to Auschwitz, as related by the WRB report. The manner of their treatment makes sense only if Birkenau was serving as a transit camp for them. Moreover, the Israeli source cited on page 140 reported that Theresienstadt Jews were, indeed, being sent to the East. Thus, even hostile sources report that the Germans were doing what their documents say they were doing.

What is described in NG-2586-J is the program as it existed starting in early 1939. Actually, on account of the pressures against the Jews between 1933 and 1939, the great majority of German-Austrian Jews had emigrated before the outbreak of the war. The Germans had not cared very much where the Jews emigrated to. Palestine seemed a good possibility on account of the British Balfour Declaration of 1917, but negotiations with the British on this did not go very well, because the British wished to maintain good relations with the Arabs who, at that time, constituted the bulk of the population of Palestine. Nevertheless, there was some steady Jewish emigration from Europe to Palestine, but this was finally cut to a trickle by the policy announced by the British White Paper of May 1939.<sup>367</sup>

The Madagascar project, fantastic as it seems today, was taken quite seriously by the Germans, although nothing ever came of it. The war with Russia which started in June 1941, opened up obvious new resettlement possibilities, and this

---

<sup>366</sup> Hilberg, 619 or 621.

<sup>367</sup> Sachar, 365-368, 412-417; John & Hadawi, vol. 1, 295-326.

resulted in Göring's famous letter to Heydrich regarding the "final solution of the Jewish question," dated July 31, 1941:<sup>368</sup>

*"As supplement to the task that was entrusted to you in the decree dated January 24, 1939, namely to solve the Jewish question by emigration and evacuation in a way, which is the most favorable in connection with the conditions prevailing at the time, I herewith commission you to carry out all preparations with regard to organizational, factual, and financial viewpoints for a total solution of the Jewish question in those territories in Europe under German influence.*

*If the competency of other central organizations is touched in this connection, these organizations are to participate.*

*I further commission you to submit to me as soon as possible a draft showing the organizational, factual, and financial measures already taken for the execution of the intended final solution of the Jewish question."*

It is customary to quote this letter with deletion of the reference to "emigration and evacuation."<sup>369</sup> The planned Jewish emigration to the eastern territories of not only the German Jews but also the Jews in the "territories in Europe under German influence" was a relatively extensive project and so, in accord with Göring's reference to the "competency of other central organizations," Heydrich called a special conference, the "Wannsee Conference", which was finally held on January 20, 1942. Representatives of several branches of the German Government attended the conference. Eichmann was the next to lowest ranked person at the conference. The minutes of the conference, NG-2586-G, are lengthy, but the heart of the project was expressed as follows:<sup>370</sup>

*"Meanwhile, in view of the dangers of an emigration during the war and in view of the possibilities in the East, the Reichsführer-SS and the Chief of the German Police had forbidden the emigrating of the Jews.*

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

*These actions are of course to be regarded only as a temporary substitute; nonetheless here already the solution of the Jewish problem is of great importance.*

[...]

*Under proper direction the Jews should now in the course of the final solution, be brought to the East in a suitable way for use as labor. In big labor gangs, with separation of the sexes, the Jews capable of work are brought to these areas and employed in road-building, in which task undoubtedly a great part will fall out through natural diminution.*

*The remnant that finally is able to survive all this – since this is undoubtedly the part with the strongest resistance – must be given treatment accordingly, since these people, representing a natural selection, are to be regarded*

<sup>368</sup> NMT, vol. 13, 169-170.

<sup>369</sup> E.g. Shirer (1960), 964.

<sup>370</sup> NMT, vol. 13, 212-213. Poliakov & Wulf (1955), 119-126.



*as the germ cell of a new Jewish development, if they are allowed to go free. (See the experience of history.)*

*In the program of the practical execution of the final solution, Europe is combed through from the West to the East. The Reich area, including the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, will have to be taken in advance, alone for reasons of the housing problem and other social-political necessities.*

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

*An important provision for the whole execution of the evacuation, so SS General Heydrich explained further, is the exact establishment of the category of persons who are to be included.*

*It is intended not to evacuate Jews over 65 years of age, but to remove them to a ghetto for the aged – Theresienstadt is under consideration.*

*Along with these old-age classes – of the perhaps 280,000 Jews who on 31/10/1941 were in the Old Reich and in Austria, perhaps 30% are over 65 years old – there will also be taken to the ghettos for the aged the Jews who are serious war-wounded cases and Jews with war decorations (Iron Cross, First Class). With this appropriate solution the many potentials for exceptions will be eliminated with one blow. [...]*

*In connection with the problem of the effect of the Jewish evacuation on the economic life, State Secretary Neumann stated that the Jews employed in war-important industries could not be evacuated for the present, as long as there were no replacements available.*

*SS General Heydrich pointed out that these Jews, in accordance with the directive approved by him for the execution of the current evacuations, would not be evacuated.*

*State Secretary Dr. Bühler states that the Government General would welcome the initiation of the final solution of this problem in the Government General, because here for once the transport problem plays no out-of-the-ordinary role, and here labor commitment considerations would not hinder the course of this action. [...] Furthermore, of the approximately two and one half million Jews here in question the majority of cases were unfit for work. [...] He had only one request, that the Jewish problem in this territory be solved as quickly as possible.”*

Here is unambiguous documentary evidence that no extermination program existed; the German policy was to evacuate the Jews to the East. It did not, moreover, require the capture of German documents to expose this fact. It was well known during the war and, during the resettlement program's early states, it was reported and commented on countless times in the Allied press. In the case of Vienna Jews deported to Poland in early 1941, the *New York Times* even remarked that they “found their new homes much more comfortable than they expected or even dare hope.” Later reports on the resettlement program did not describe it so favorably, but the press at least reported approximately what was going on.<sup>371</sup>

<sup>371</sup> See particularly the *New York Times* (Feb. 28, 1941), 4; (Oct. 18, 1941), 4; (Oct. 28, 1941), 10; (Feb. 9, 1942), 5; (Mar. 15, 1942), 27; (Aug. 6, 1942), 1.

Rothe, incidentally, had taken the position that the Wannsee Conference is itself a propaganda myth. His principal reason for this is his belief, for which he presents respectable evidence, that Heydrich was in Prague on January 20, 1942. However, the date attributed to the conference and the document said to be the minutes of the conference are so consistent with everything else that is known about the German policy that we believe that Rothe is mistaken on this point.<sup>372</sup>

The only factual aspect of the program of evacuation to the East which is generally consistent with the extermination claims is that many Jews sent to the camps in Poland did not return, at least not to their former homes. This, apparently, had been the reason why many people with more or less first hand information about certain individuals have accepted the extermination claims. However, the situation is basically simple. These camps were obviously serving as transit camps for the program of evacuation to the East. We have observed that at Birkenau there was a special compound that served as a transit camp for Theresienstadt Jews, and that Dutch Jews also passed through Auschwitz (Chapter 4, p. 139). The concentration camp at Lublin also played this incidental role on occasion.<sup>373</sup> Treblinka, which was a labor camp but does not appear to have been administered by the WVHA, clearly served also as a transit camp, especially for Warsaw Jews. As with Auschwitz, Reitlinger finds the alleged facts put forward concerning gasings at Treblinka difficult to reconcile with one another. Sobibor was explicitly called a transit camp.<sup>374</sup>

It may astonish the reader that the documents we have reviewed, which constitute very strong evidence that no extermination program existed, are not passed over in silence by the bearers of the extermination legend, but are thrust boldly into our faces as evidence that an extermination program *did* exist. Not only is this the implicit idea conveyed by the collection of documents in NMT volume 13; Reitlinger and Hilberg are quite serious in considering these documents relevant to an extermination program. Thus, the “evacuation to the East” is claimed as a code term for extermination.

On account of the fact that a fixed feature of the extermination legend is that one of the tasks of the *Einsatzgruppen* in Russia was the extermination of the Jews, the bearers of the legend are committed to the view that the policy of extermination had been settled on by the summer of 1941. Thus, although Göring’s letter of July 31, 1941, to Heydrich specifically states that the “final solution” is a program of emigration and evacuation, and although it makes specific reference to the program, which existed from 1939, which both Reitlinger and Hilberg concede was an emigration program, both authors must and do take the position that this was really an extermination order. They are apparently not bothered by the fact, noted by them, that deportations of Reich Jews to Russia and the Baltic states had started in the autumn of 1941.<sup>375</sup>

Continuing to keep faith with their fundamental commitment, the Wannsee

---

<sup>372</sup> Rothe, 173-196.

<sup>373</sup> NO-1611 and NO-1882 in NMT, vol. 5, 616-619.

<sup>374</sup> Reitlinger, 149, 279; Hilberg, 318, 619 or 621.

<sup>375</sup> Reitlinger, 84-97; Hilberg, 262-263.

Conference of January 1942 is also interpreted as a veiled discussion of extermination, although the evacuation program, of which the minutes of the Conference speak, was in fact in progress. Both authors lay stress on the reference to the “remnant that finally is able to survive all this” and are to be “given treatment accordingly.” This passage could mean any number of things. The version of the Wannsee Conference minutes that is printed in NMT volume 13, incidentally, has the phrase “if they are allowed to go free” deleted by the editors. This suggests that the editors may have interpreted the passage as a recommendation that the “remnant” should be “allowed to go free.” In commenting on the Wannsee Conference minutes, Reitlinger remarks that “Heydrich was discreet enough not to mention the rest,” and that “the drafting of circumspect minutes was one of the major arts of Hitler’s Reich.” Hilberg resolves the lack of clarity of meaning of some of the passages (from his point of view) by remarking that “we know from the language of the *Einsatzgruppen* reports that he meant killing.”<sup>376</sup> This amounts to making the extraordinary claim that Hitler’s Reich was “circumspect” regarding the language used in the minutes of secret conferences, but not circumspect regarding the language used in the widely distributed *Einsatzgruppen* reports. In any case, these passages in what is said to be the minutes of the Wannsee Conference are the only passages in the documents describing German Jewish policy for which a sinister interpretation is possible, although many interpretations are possible.

The excessively strained interpretations of these documents are factors, added to the several discussed in Chapter 4, which forced Reitlinger to declare that Höss must have really meant the summer of 1942 as the date of receiving his extermination orders from Himmler. Reitlinger and Hilberg both assume that the deportations to the east were for the purpose of killing the Jews there, in one way or another, and that the gas chambers in Poland were established in mid-1942 as a change in the method of killing. We have seen that this theory does not harmonize with the dates associated with the planning of and preliminary work on the Auschwitz crematories that are supposed to have been designed for the exterminations. Thus, the claim that the documents should be interpreted as meaning other than what they say leads one into irresolvable contradictions and difficulties, but such would also be the result, if comparable practices were applied to the interpretation of recipes, road signs, mathematical formulae, etc.

There is no point in discussing further these efforts to make these documents mean other than what they say. The German policy, the “final solution,” was to resettle Jews in the occupied territories in the East. This is what their documents say, and the program spoken of in these documents is confirmed by neutral sources and even, to a significant extent, by hostile sources. By way of additional confirmation, it is worth mentioning passages by Grayzel in his *History*. In one paragraph he says that the Germans were doing what their documents say they were doing:

*“They followed this up with wholesale deportations. They set aside a number of places in Eastern Europe in which they concentrated Jews from other*

---

<sup>376</sup> Reitlinger, 102-109; Hilberg, 264-265; NMT, vol. 13, 213.

*lands, in line with the avowed Nazi policy of 'freeing' all of Europe from Jewish influence."*

In the next paragraph Grayzel contradicts this statement by saying that the Germans were doing what the Allied propaganda said they were doing: exterminations, gas chambers, etc. Grayzel makes no attempt to resolve the contradiction.<sup>377</sup>

It may be wondered why the authors of the hoax have presented us with documents which describe, in very general terms, what the German policy was. The hoaxers were confronted with (a) the fact that Europeans were told by the Germans, at the time of the deportations, that the Jews were to be resettled and (b) the fact that the resettlement program had been reported in the Allied press and (c) the fact that, in regard to the documents, it was necessary to make a choice among three possibilities: presenting no high level documents dealing with the Jewish policy, presenting forged high level documents dealing with the policy, and presenting selected high level documents dealing with the policy. Under the circumstances, the third of the three possibilities was obviously to be preferred. It was clearly better to present a genuine document, signed by Göring and speaking of the "final solution" of the Jewish question, than to present a forged document or no document. Although the final solution is specified as "emigration and evacuation," it was considered not possible to avoid the fact that the Nazis described their program in such terms. Thus, today the bearers of the extermination legend merely claim that all of this was code terminology.

One must not pass over the important work of R. L. Koehl, who is that strange bird, a professional academic historian writing in or near a field completely dominated by non-historians. The main value of Koehl's work is in putting Poland into proper focus and perspective.

During the war years, Germany undertook to change the composition of the populations near its eastern borders. The main instrument of this program was the RuSHA (*Rasse- und Siedungshauptamt*, Race and Settlement Main Office) of the SS. The basic policy was to move selected Reich Germans and ethnic German communities of Eastern Europe (*Volksdeutsche*) into the conquered territories contiguous to Germany. Jews and Poles were expelled from these areas and sent to various places, in some cases to the farms the ethnic Germans had vacated, to special Eastern ghettos, and also to certain special "Z villages" in Poland.

Koehl explicitly endorses the reality of the extermination program, but his account of it is most peculiar:<sup>378</sup>

*"The official version insisted that the Jews were going to be moved further east into conquered Soviet territory to remove them more effectively from the German sphere of life. Like many other German pronouncements, this one contained several grains of truth: (1) train-loads of Jews from the Reich were sent as far east as possible for liquidation, often at the hands of non-Germans such as the Ukrainians or the Baltic peoples. (2) The Poles were, in Rosenberg's early plans as Minister for the East, to be considered for reset-*

<sup>377</sup> Grayzel, 785-786.

<sup>378</sup> Koehl, 131-132.

*tlement in the Soviet area (Smolensk), thus freeing the General Government for German settlement.”*

Koehl does not provide any evidence for the killings by Ukrainians or the Baltic peoples; the sources cited at this point make no such claims. Then in referring to the extermination camps:<sup>379</sup>

*“In the fall and winter of 1941-1942, the last 240,000 Jews of the annexed provinces were removed to the newly constructed extermination camps at Kolo, Belzec, Majdanek, and Sobibor.”*

The list excludes Auschwitz, which comes up in Koehl’s book only in a remark about some Germans sent there for punishment, in connection with “Action Reinhardt” (to be explained below) and also in the following:<sup>380</sup>

*“[Dr. Klukowski] stated that of 691 villages in the county of Zamosc, 297 were wholly or partly evacuated by July 1943. He estimated that 110,000 Poles and Jews were removed from the area, males and females of working age going to forced labor in the Auschwitz Hydrogenation Plant, the rest going to the other 394 (‘Z’) villages.”*

One may draw one’s own conclusions. Koehl’s book is recommended to the reader who wishes a detailed view of Nazi population policies, especially in their relations to German nationalism, Nazi racial ideology, and internal Nazi party politics.

## Numbers Deported: Whence and Whither

Many European Jews were deported East, and we should now take a closer look at this program of deportations. There are several obvious questions: who was deported, how many, to where, what was life like where they were sent, and what happened to them. To some extent only partial or provisional answers are possible here.

First, we should consider the numbers and origins of the Jews involved in this resettlement program. Here we run into the problems discussed in Chapter 1; counting Jews can be difficult. However, it is not statistical accuracy we seek here but order of magnitude or approximate figures that can be used to show that, on the basis of verifiable data, the Jews who were deported could easily have survived after all. It will thus be satisfactory to merely accept certain figures offered by Reitlinger and by Hilberg for the purposes of discussion, although one can pick quarrels with them (as one can with Rassinier’s study). The figures are estimates of numbers *killed*; it is understood that here we assume that these people had merely been resettled in the East. In the case of Reitlinger we employ his higher estimate.<sup>381</sup>

---

<sup>379</sup> Koehl, 146.

<sup>380</sup> Koehl, 130, 184.

<sup>381</sup> Reitlinger, 533-546; Hilberg, 670.

**Table 8: Numbers of resettled Jews**

	REITLINGER	HILBERG
Germany	180,000	160,000
Austria	60,000	53,000
Czechoslovakia	251,000	271,000
Denmark		1,000
France	65,000	70,000
Belgium	28,000	50,000
Luxembourg	3,000	2,000
Norway	700	1,000
Holland	102,700	120,000
Italy	8,000	17,000
Yugoslavia	58,000	63,000
Greece	60,000	62,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>816,400</b>	<b>870,000</b>

To some extent these figures are based on German documents, notably the “Korherr Report,” documents NO-5193-8; to some extent neutral sources are involved, such as the Dutch Red Cross with the Holland figures. There is also a certain amount of demographic speculation involved. However, I believe that at least the totals given are of the correct order.

We do not admit Hungary into the list, because those said by both Reitlinger and Hilberg to have been exterminated are pure invention; they were not even deported East. Somewhat fewer than 100,000 were sent to Germany for labor toward the end of the war; quite a few of these must have perished in the chaotic conditions of the last months, but the number is essentially impossible to arrive at.

Romania is also supposed to have lost 200,000-370,000 Jews via extermination, but as Reitlinger remarks, such figures are “conjectural” on account of “the lack of reliable information.” Conceded to be in the same category are the largest groups of allegedly exterminated Jews: 2,350,000-3,300,000 from Poland and 400,000-700,000 from the USSR. These figures are pure demographic speculation, with absolutely no supporting data other than the declarations of post-war Communist governments.

These figures will be considered further below. At this point we merely recall that the Jews deported from France and Belgium were not French or Belgian Jews (pp. 104, 109), but that those deported from Holland were almost all Dutch Jews (p. 109). The reason for this appears to have been a mere legal technicality. France and Belgium had formally surrendered to the Germans and formal armistice terms were agreed to. In Holland, the Queen had merely fled to England and thus the Germans viewed Holland as being without an independent state.<sup>382</sup> German rights in Holland were correspondingly more extensive. Of course, the Germans intended to eventually expel all Jews from Europe, but they naturally started with the ones for which the minimum of legal difficulties existed.

The excerpt of the Red Cross *Report*, which we examined in Chapter 5, is cer-

<sup>382</sup> Reitlinger, 367, 377.

tainly in conflict with the extermination claims in the case of the Romanian Jews. It is reasonable to assume that the bulk of the Jews in Soviet controlled territory that was occupied by the Germans after June 22, 1941, escaped into the interior before the arrival of the latter, a belief that is also held by Reitlinger (page 241). In any case, there is no evidence that the Germans did more than adopt the sort of guarded and hostile attitude toward the Jews who remained, which was implied by the partisan menaces discussed in the preceding chapter. The Polish Jews constituted the majority of the Jews moved around by the Germans and present, on account of their location and circumstances, the greatest difficulties to any detailed analysis of the matter. We can only reconstruct in general outline what happened to them.

We first remark that, while it is convenient here to distinguish between Russian and Polish Jews, the real distinction is most slight, if it could be said to exist at all. Before World War I, both sets of Jews were subjects of the Russian Empire.

The first relevant events involving Polish Jews were due to Russian, rather than German measures. Germany and Russia partitioned Poland in 1939, the eastern half and thus a large portion of the Polish Jews thereby coming under Soviet rule. These Jews were the objects of a Russian resettlement program whose broad features have been described by Korzen in an article published by the Israeli Government. Korzen's article is of some importance to the matters treated in this chapter.<sup>383</sup>

Briefly, what happened is that "hundreds of thousands" of these Jews were dispersed throughout the Soviet Union in an evacuation program which commenced in June 1940. At first, many were sent to labor camps, but after September 1941, a serious effort was made "to convert the refugees into Soviet citizens and prevent their leaving the Soviet Union." The dispersion was as far as Central Asia and even to the Far East. Details are difficult to develop, and Korzen pleads for more interest in research into the matter. Many became Soviet citizens, some trekked back to Poland after the war and in many cases proceeded on to Israel. Korzen remarks that the Jews who remained in Poland as leaders of the new Communist regime were put under pressure "to change their names to purely Polish-sounding ones as well as to keep their Jewish origin secret". Some eventually arrived at places such as Persia and India via Shanghai. The Joint Distribution Committee of New York maintained contact with the refugees in the Soviet Union during the war and assisted their movements after the war.

It is also known that a large number of Jews, given by one source as 300,000, fled from western to eastern Poland in 1939 when the Nazis invaded the former.<sup>384</sup> Thus, a significant fraction, perhaps as many as a third, of the Polish Jews had been moved beyond reach of the Germans before the outbreak of war between Russia and Germany in June 1941.

Although there had been a limited German resettlement program earlier, notably for Vienna Jews, the Nazi resettlement program began with earnestness in the autumn of 1941. If Polish Jews are excluded but Romanian Jews included in our immediate considerations, we see that the Germans moved at most a million Jews to settlements or ghettos in the occupied East. From the locations that have been

---

<sup>383</sup> *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 3, 119-140.

<sup>384</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 63.

mentioned, we can get a fairly good idea of where these settlements were located: Riga – Minsk – Ukraine – Sea of Azov (north of the Black Sea) forms a connected and plausible line on a map.

While we have a good idea of where these settlements were, we know little else about them other than that they existed. As one should naturally expect, the Allied occupation destroyed the relevant German records and documents, so that only scraps survive that deal with the resettlement program in terms more specific than, say, the Luther memorandum (NG-2586-J reproduced above). Indeed, Steengracht's defense made a serious effort to produce such documents at Nuremberg, but the best it could do relative to the eastern camps was to submit two documents into evidence. The first, Steengracht 64,<sup>385</sup> is a letter from Eichmann, dated June 5, 1943, to the Foreign Office for the attention of Thadden. It concerns the Jewish camps in the east and some articles that had appeared in various European magazines concerning them. It appears that "fantastic rumors" in Slovakia concerning these camps were being given credence by some people there, and in addition to citing the magazine articles, Eichmann remarked:

*"[...] to counteract the fantastic rumors circulating in Slovakia about the fate of the evacuated Jews, attention should be drawn to the postal communications of these Jews with Slovakia [...], which for instance amounted to more than 1,000 letters and postcards for February/March this year. Concerning the information apparently desired by Prime Minister Dr. Tuka about the conditions in Jewish camps, no objections would be raised by this office against any possible scrutinizing of the correspondence before it is forwarded to the addressees."*

The second Steengracht document, Steengracht 65 (also going under the number NO-1624), is somewhat more effective in giving a picture of the situation of the Jews in the occupied east. It is an order, dated August 20, 1943, by the chief of the RuSHA (Race and Settlement Main Office), SS General Hildebrandt, relative to associations between Germans and Jews in the occupied east and to the permissible ways in which the latter could be employed. It reads:

*"It has been pointed out to me by various sources that the behavior of German offices in the occupied Eastern territories toward Jews had developed in such a way in the past months as to give rise to misgivings. In particular, Jews are being employed in jobs and services, which, in consideration of maintaining secrecy, should only be assigned to absolutely reliable persons, who should appear to be the confidential representatives of the German offices in the eyes of the indigenous population. Unfortunately, in addition to this, there is allegedly personal association of Reich Germans with Jewesses, which exceeds the limits that must be strictly observed for ideological and racial reasons. It is said to concern native Jews as well as Jews and Jewesses who have been deported from the Old Reich to the occupied Eastern territories. This state of affairs has already led to the fact that Jews are exploiting their apparently confidential positions in exchange for the supply of preferential rations*

<sup>385</sup> Steengracht 64 in NMT, vol. 13, 300; NO-1247 cited by Reitlinger, 308, and quoted by Hilberg, 254. Steengracht 65 (or NO-1624) does not appear to be reproduced anywhere.



*by the indigenous population. It is said that recently, when apprehensions were expressed in the East about a German retreat, indigenous persons endeavored to ingratiate themselves particularly with those Jews employed in German offices, in order to ensure better treatment at the hands of the Bolsheviks. The decent section of the indigenous population viewed these events with great disapproval, because it saw in them the contradiction between National Socialist principles and the actual attitude of the Germans.*

*Owing to improper labor assignment of Jews, the esteem of the Greater German Reich and the position of its representatives are being harmed and the necessity for effective police security of the occupied Eastern territories prejudiced. Grave dangers could arise particularly from the fact that the Jews are utilizing the jobs assigned to them for espionage and propaganda in the service of our enemies.*

*I therefore request that the subordinate offices in the occupied Eastern territories be given the following instructions:*

*1) Jews and persons of a similar status may only be employed in manual labor. It is prohibited to employ them in office work (such as bookkeeping, typewriting, card indexing, registration). Strict attention must be paid to the fact that they will not be given work, which would permit them to draw conclusions on matters that are to be kept secret.*

*2) It is forbidden to employ Jews for general or personal service, for the discharging of orders, for the negotiation of business deals, or for the procuring of goods.*

*3) Private association with Jews, Jewesses, and persons of a similar status is prohibited as well as any relations beyond those officially necessary."*

The "persons of a similar status" referred to were probably mainly gypsies. We assume that Steengracht's counsel made a thorough search of the documents which had been allowed to survive at Nuremberg. Hildebrandt's order to the RuSHA merely repeated, verbatim, a Kaltenbrunner order of August 13, 1943, to all German offices in the occupied eastern areas (document NO-1247). The failure of Steengracht to use NO-1247 was probably due to its being nearly identical to NO-1624.

Such documents are only a pathetic scrap from what must have been extensive written records dealing with the Jewish settlements in the East. The first was probably allowed to survive because it speaks of "fantastic rumors" in circulation in Slovakia. The other two probably just slipped through because their implications were not sufficiently obvious.

In Boehm's book *We Survived*, Jeanette Wolff, a German Jewess who was a leader of the German Social Democratic Party, has contributed an article on her experiences after being deported to Riga in Latvia. Her tale of gratuitous beatings by the SS, sex orgies, and drunkenness is not believable. Her article is worth noting, however, because it shows that there was a large system of settlements, ghettos, and camps for Jews in the vicinity of Riga. These settlements quartered not only Latvian Jews, but also large numbers of Jews deported from Germany and other European countries. Of course, in Chapter 4 (p. 140) we noted the There-

sienstadt source who reported that the Nazis were deporting Jews to Riga and other places throughout the course of the war. Nazi documents dealing with the Riga settlement have not survived.

## The Polish Ghettos

One can see, in general outline, what happened to the Polish (and Latvian and Lithuanian) Jews by consulting the “holocaust” literature, which has been contributed by “survivors.” In the larger towns and in the cities, the Jews within Poland were quartered in ghettos, which existed throughout the war. In Poland, there were particularly large ghettos at Lodz (Litzmannstadt), Warsaw, Bialystok, Lwow, and Grodno; in Lithuania, at Vilna and Kovno; in Latvia, as we noted above, at Riga. Although the “survivor” literature offers endless ravings about exterminations (frequently of a sort not reconcilable with the legend, *e.g.*, gas chambers in Cracow in December 1939), it also offers enough information for one to grasp approximately how things were. In each ghetto, there was a Jewish Council, *Judenrat*, which was the internal government of the ghetto. The ghetto police were Jewish and responsible to the *Judenrat*. The *Judenrat* usually counseled cooperation with the Germans because, under the circumstances, it saw no other plausible course. The Germans made frequent demands for labor details drawn from the ghetto, and the *Judenrat* then drew up the lists of people to be thus conscripted. There were also resistance organizations in the larger ghettos, usually well armed, whose members often viewed the *Judenrat* as composed of German stooges.<sup>386</sup>

Dawidowicz’s book devotes several chapters to conditions in the Polish ghettos. Although the initial policy of the Germans, immediately after occupying Poland, had been to forbid Jewish schools, this policy was soon abandoned and Jewish children received an essentially regular education in schools operated either privately or under the authority of the *Judenrat*. Cultural activities for adults – literary, theatrical, musical – helped alleviate the otherwise unhappy features of ghetto life. The Jewish social welfare agency was the ZSS (dissolved in mid-1942 by the Germans but shortly later reconstituted as the JUS, *Jüdische Unterstützungsstelle*), which drew supplies of food, clothing, and medicine from the German civil administration and which also maintained contact, through the German Red Cross, with foreign organizations that provided money and supplies. Before the U.S. entry into the war, the bulk of such external funds came from the Joint Distribution Committee in New York, but after December 1941 this was no longer legally possible.

Despite the protected status of the ZSS-JUS, it sometimes provided cover for illegal political activities. The various political organizations – Socialist, Communist, Zionist, Agudist – were connected with the resistance organizations, whose

---

<sup>386</sup> In the “survivor” literature, see in particular Glatstein *et al.*, 25-32, 43-112; Gringauz (1949 & 1950); Friedman & Pinson.

activities ranged from active sabotage to propaganda and, on occasion, to armed resistance. Extermination propaganda started in underground publications slightly earlier than it started being generated by the World Jewish Congress (see Appendix E), but it was not believed by the Jewish population, because nothing in their experiences supported it; letters received from Jews deported East reassured friends and relatives. As Dawidowicz writes in her introductory chapter on the problems posed by the “holocaust” for historical research:

*“One impediment was the inadequacy of Jewish documentation, despite its enormous quantity. [...] The absence of vital subjects from the records may be explained by the predicament of terror and censorship; yet, lacking evidence to corroborate or disprove, the historian will never know with certainty whether that absence is a consequence of an institutional decision not to deal with such matters or whether it was merely a consequence of prudential policy not to mention such matters. The terror was so great that even private personal diaries, composed in Yiddish or Hebrew, were written circumspectly, with recourse to Scripture and the Talmud as a form of esoteric expression and self-imposed reticence.”*

As is clear from all studies of German population policies in Poland, e.g. those of Dawidowicz and of Koehl, there was a constant moving about of Jews, in accordance with the general German policy of concentrating them as far east as practicable. According to the “Korherr Report” of March 1943, 1,449,692 Jews had been transported “out of the East provinces to the Russian East.” It is further specified that 90% of these had passed through camps in the General Government, and the others had passed through camps in the Warthegau (presumably meaning mainly Lodz). The huge ghetto of Warsaw was liquidated in the spring of 1943, and most of the Jews were sent further east, with Treblinka serving as a transit camp for this resettlement. This was only accomplished, however, after fierce Jewish resistance and a battle that received world publicity while it was raging. The resettlement, however, was not complete, because there were always at least some Jews at the site of the ghetto and, as remarked above, all of the larger ghettos existed in some degree throughout the war.

When a resettlement was announced to a ghetto, it was the duty of the *Judenrat* to draw up the lists of those to be resettled. With only rare exceptions, the Jews being resettled went along peacefully, because it was well known that the “resettlement” was just that.

It appears that epidemics were common in the ghettos. The Germans attributed them to “a lack of discipline” on the part of the Jews. They took what countermeasures they could and, as the *New York Times* reported on at least one occasion, “many ambulances were sent to Warsaw to disinfect the ghetto.”<sup>387</sup>

While the general eastward movement of these Jews is an established fact, the data to reconstruct exactly what numbers were sent where does not exist. The important point to note, however, was that it is almost certain that the greater number of Polish Jews were completely cleared out of all of pre-war Poland except the

---

<sup>387</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 18, 1941), 4.

most eastern part. Because the territory of post-war Poland is made up of what had been eastern Germany and western and central Poland (Russia acquiring what had been eastern Poland), this means that most Jews had, indeed, been removed from what is today referred to as Poland. In connection with the large ghettos, which are mentioned above, it is worth noting that Lwow, Grodno, Vilna, Kovno, and Riga were all absorbed into the Soviet Union after the war, and that Bialystok is now at the extreme eastern side of Poland. If there were about three million Jews in Poland before the war then, when one takes into account the numbers, which fled to the Soviet Union in 1939, those who were deported by the Russians in 1940, those who managed to slip into such countries as Slovakia or Hungary, and those who might have perished in epidemics, we see that there were at most two million Polish Jews in scattered ghettos in German controlled territory, and that the greater number of these people had been sent to territory considered Soviet after the war.

Thus we see, in general outline sufficient for our purposes, the actual nature of the so-called “final solution of the Jewish problem.” It is not necessary here to attempt to fill in much more detail, and the ultimate prospects for providing great detail are questionable in any case. That this “solution” was really in no sense “final” and that the Jews would have returned with a change in the political climate, is not so extraordinary. Twentieth century governments invariably give their projects bold and unrealistic labels: Peace Corps, Alliance for Progress, Head Start, war to end wars, etc.

## What Happened to Them?

It remains to consider what happened to all of these people. Here again we have a situation, in which there exists much less data than one would hope for. However, we have enough information to reconstruct what happened to an extent suitable for our purposes. Actually, we must consider several possibilities in this respect. The following are the reasonable possibilities.

1. The Germans liquidated many while in retreat, because these people could be considered manpower to be employed against the Germans. It is necessary to consider this as a reasonable possibility because we have noted that the Germans had, indeed, considered this aspect of the matter seriously enough to make it difficult for Jews to emigrate from Europe.

However, there are two things working strongly against the possibility that the Germans liquidated on a significant scale while in retreat. First, the most able workers, who were also of military age, had already been picked out for labor and were being employed by the Germans in various ways. Second, and most importantly and simply, if the Germans had carried out such liquidations on a large scale, the Allies would have charged them with it. The Allies would have had material for legitimate extermination charges rather than the “gas chamber” nonsense.

While the evidence indicated that the German authorities did not carry out large scale liquidations of Jews while in retreat, common sense and a feel for the conditions that existed should cause us to assume that there were numerous massacres of Jews carried out by individuals and small groups acting on their own. Some German, Hungarian, or Romanian troops, and some East European civilians, their anti-Jewish feelings amplified by the disastrous course of the war, no doubt made attacks on Jews at the time of the German retreats. It is known that earlier in the war, when East Europeans had attempted to start pogroms, the German authorities had restrained and suppressed them.<sup>388</sup> However, under conditions of chaotic retreat, the Germans were probably much less concerned with anti-Jewish pogroms.

2. The Russians liquidated many. We list this only because Russia is such an enigma and its actions in the populations area often seem very arbitrary. However, there is no evidence for liquidations at the hands of the Russians, and one should doubt this possibility.

3. Many perished on account of conditions in the camps or ghettos. This is a most serious possibility. We have seen that health conditions can be very unstable in camps and that the situation can be very sensitive to any sort of chaos or shortage of necessities. Moreover, we have observed that the ghetto conditions, whether the Germans were at fault or (as the Germans claimed) the Jews were responsible, were favorable to epidemics even early in the war when the Germans had the general situation under control in other respects. Therefore, there is a good possibility that many Jews in ghettos perished in the chaotic conditions that accompanied the German retreats. Also, Korzen believes that many of the 1940 exiles to Russia died in the Russian camps they were sent to, so it is possible that many ghetto Jews perished on account of Soviet ways of administering the ghettos after they fell into Russian hands.

4. Many were dispersed throughout the Soviet Union and integrated into Soviet life somewhere. This is a most likely possibility, because it is well established that the Soviet Union encouraged the absorption of Jews during and immediately after the war. For example, we have noted that this was the policy exercised toward the 1940 deportees. Another example is what happened with respect to the Carpatho-Ukraine, before the war a province of Czechoslovakia and annexed by the Soviet Union after the war. Ten thousand Jews, former residents of the Carpatho-Ukraine, had the status of refugees in Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1946. Russia insisted that these Jews be repatriated to the Soviet Union. Although such a step was contrary to the existing agreements on refugees, the Soviet pressure on President Benes was great enough to force him to yield.<sup>389</sup>

One should also note the existence, within the Soviet Union, of the specifically Jewish "autonomous state" of Birobidzhan, which is in the Soviet Far East on the Amur river on the border of Manchuria. Birobidzhan had been established by the Soviets in 1928 as a Jewish state. Immediately after the war, there existed in New

---

<sup>388</sup> The best source to consult to see the nature of and motivation for the anti-Jewish pogroms, and the German measures to suppress them, seems to be Raschhofer, 26-66. See also Burg (1962), 50.

<sup>389</sup> *New York Times* (Apr. 31, 1946), 8. [correction needed for date, ed.]

York the “Einstein Fund of Ambijan” (acronym for American Birobidzhan Committee), whose purpose was “to help refugee colonization of Birobidzhan.” There were other operations in New York, which aided Jews resettled in Birobidzhan immediately after World War II.

There were also Jewish organizations, such as the Joint Distribution Committee, which aided Jews in other parts of the Soviet Union, and there also existed in New York the Committee for Aid to Minsk and Neighboring Towns. There also existed UNRRA programs in White Russia (Byelorussia) and Ukraine, which will be commented on below. These efforts to aid Jewish refugees in the Soviet Union had the public support of prominent Jews, *e.g.* Albert Einstein expressed appreciation to the Soviet Government for helping “hundreds of thousands of Jewish people” by giving them a home in the USSR.<sup>390</sup>

While the Soviet Union encouraged the absorption of Jews, it also made a specific agreement with the Communist government of Poland for the repatriation of those who had been Polish citizens on September 17, 1939. The agreement, made in July 1945, specifically included those resident on territory annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940 and provided that such people could either elect Soviet citizenship or Polish citizenship. With respect to Jews, it was eventually decided that the deadline for making the choice was June 30, 1946.

As we noted in Chapter 1 (p. 31), Reitlinger concedes that the post-war Jewish population of the Soviet Union might very well have exceeded the pre-war figure, on account of the addition of Polish (and Baltic and other) Jews. He regards the *Jewish Observer* estimate of 500,000 Polish Jews who elected to remain in the Soviet Union as “very conservative,” and concedes huge and insuperable uncertainties in this connection. Thus, although the Russians were willing to let Polish Jews leave before the June 30, 1946, deadline, they nevertheless encouraged their absorption into the Soviet Union. This could account for an enormous number of the Jews who had been resettled to the East by the Germans. It is pointless, however, to try to infer anything from alleged population statistics offered by the Russians or by Jewish organizations.<sup>391</sup>

5. Many of the uprooted Jews might have returned to their original homes or at least to their original homelands in Europe. We have seen that the Russians were willing to allow Polish Jews to leave the Soviet Union, and we should assume that a similar policy was practiced toward Jews of other nationalities. It is only possible but not probable that the Soviet Union absorbed all of the Jews who had been deported East by the Germans from Germany, the Netherlands, etc.

At first thought, it might appear that the clearly logical course after the war for any uprooted Jew would have been to return to his original country of residence. This is not the case, however, for various reasons. For one thing, in perhaps the majority of cases there was nothing to return to. The main reason for this was the German program called “Action Reinhardt,” in which Jews deported to the East were deprived of almost all of their property; their furniture, any livestock, busi-

<sup>390</sup> *New York Times* (Jul. 20, 1945), 9; (Sep. 7, 1945), 5; (Nov. 25, 1945), 32; (Mar. 10, 1946), 2; (Apr. 17, 1946), 27; (May 13, 1946), 18; (May 17, 1946), 5; (Dec. 2, 1946), 5.

<sup>391</sup> Reitlinger, 534, 542-543; *New York Times* (Jul. 8, 1945), 1; (Mar. 24, 1946), 3.

ness property, their jewelry, any clothing they could not carry as luggage, and all but about \$25 of any ordinary currency they had were simply confiscated in the course of resettlement (some of the business property might have been resettled with them). The camps at Lublin and Auschwitz were principal gathering and processing points for much of this property, wherever it had actually been confiscated.<sup>392</sup> Thus, many Jews, having neither property nor relatives at their original homes, had no very compelling reasons for returning to them. The German program had truly been one of uprooting.

Another aspect of the situation was that, in late 1945 and in 1946, there was much talk about anti-Jewish pogroms allegedly occurring with great frequency in Poland and other East European countries. If these reports were true, then the pogroms were a powerful inducement to the Jews to leave. If these reports were merely Zionist propaganda having little, if any, basis in fact, then one can infer that the Zionists were engaging in operations designed to move Jews out of eastern Europe. Thus, whether the reports of pogroms were true or false, they suggest a movement of Jews out of eastern Europe.

At the Yalta meeting in 1945, Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin had agreed that "it would be impossible for Jewish refugees to return to Poland and be reintegrated into its normal life."<sup>393</sup> While it is certain that many Jews returned to their homelands, there were solid facts and also, apparently, much propaganda discouraging them from doing so. If this is true and if it is also true that a significant number of Polish Jews left Soviet territory, then many of them must have proceeded through Poland to other destinations. This is the case. The Zionist political leadership had other destinations in mind for them.

6. Many of the Jews eventually resettled neither in the Soviet Union nor in their original countries but elsewhere, mainly in the U.S. and Palestine. We all know this to be true, but there is some uncertainty in the numbers involved, principally in the case of the U.S. immigrants. Until November 1943, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service recognized a category "Hebrew" among "races and peoples," but in that month this practice was stopped, and no official records of Jewish immigration have been kept since then.<sup>394</sup>

Another problem in accounting in detail for Jewish movements around the time of the end of the war is that we run right into the War Refugee Board and the UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration) in attempting to examine this subject. It will be recalled that the WRB was set up in early 1944 as an apparently joint venture of the U.S. State, Treasury, and War Departments, but that it was, in fact, under the control of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau. The Board was granted the extraordinary power of appointing special attachés with diplomatic status. Another very irregular feature was that the WRB worked very closely with private organizations. Collaboration with the Joint Distribution Committee and the World Jewish Congress and several other Jewish and Zionist organizations was extensive. Some non-Jewish organizations were also involved,

---

<sup>392</sup> Koehl, 198-199; NMT, vol. 5, 692-741; vol. 4, 954-973.

<sup>393</sup> *New York Times* (Jun. 28, 1945), 8.

<sup>394</sup> Davie, 33.

notably the American Friends Service Committee. The WRB and the three U.S. government departments involved with the WRB were specifically “authorized to accept the services or contributions of private persons or organizations.”<sup>395</sup> We therefore have a rather slippery entity involved here, engaged in both propaganda and relief work, with the rights of a government operation when an official status seemed convenient and the rights of a private organization when a private status was advantageous.

Relief activities were carried on by the WRB from about mid-1944 to mid-1945, at which time the operations of an international character fell almost entirely into the hands of the UNRRA. This organization had been set up in November 1943 and had operated until March 1949. Its first director, appointed by Roosevelt, was Herbert Lehman, ex-Governor of New York State and a leading New Deal Democrat. Roosevelt’s reported logic for choosing Lehman was as follows:<sup>396</sup>

*“It would be a fine object lesson in tolerance and human brotherhood to have a Jew head up this operation, and I think Herbert would be fine.”*

Lehman was succeeded in early 1946 by Fiorello LaGuardia, ex-Mayor of New York City. Although LaGuardia’s father was not Jewish and he naturally found it profitable to court the huge New York Italian vote, LaGuardia really counts as a Jewish Zionist politician and is essentially treated as such by the Encyclopedia Judaica. Thus, we can be sure that the crowd involved here is basically the same as with the WRB. Also, we again have a slippery entity, this time because it is a so-called international organization. For example, when Congress demanded in September 1945 that the General Accounting Office be allowed to examine the UNRRA operations (the U.S. was said to be paying about two-thirds of the costs of UNRRA, but the fraction was probably somewhat higher), Lehman told it to mind its own business.<sup>397</sup>

The UNRRA operations were far-flung. Most of the UNRRA aid went to Eastern Europe, and the amount sent to Poland was second only to that sent to China. Aid was also sent to White Russia and Ukraine.<sup>398</sup>

By mid-1944, the WRB and the UNRRA were operating a large system of refugee camps in North Africa, Italy, and Palestine. These camps were almost exclusively for Jews. Starting in 1944, extensive evacuations of Jews from Europe to these camps were in progress. Many were evacuated from the Balkans via Istanbul, and there was also a Black Sea route through Istanbul. Entry into the U.S. or countries of South America was sought and obtained for many of these people while the war was still in progress. It was in this context that the camp at Oswego, NY, right next to the Canadian border, was established. In addition, many who had not initially been put into one of the camps in Palestine managed to reach that destination anyway.<sup>399</sup>

---

<sup>395</sup> US-WRB (1945), 3-4, 12-13.

<sup>396</sup> Rosenman, 399.

<sup>397</sup> *New York Times* (Sep. 21, 1945), 7.

<sup>398</sup> *New York Times* (Dec. 23, 1945), 1.

<sup>399</sup> US-WRB (1945), 9, 16-45, 61-69, 72-74.



After Germany collapsed, the UNRRA administered DP (displaced persons) camps, mainly in the British and American zones of occupation in German and Austria. Of course, there were many non-Jews in these camps, but the Jews had a privileged position and in many cases were quartered in houses or hotels, which had been requisitioned for them.<sup>400</sup>

The UNRRA operations in Germany were one of the scandals of the occupation era. Notorious were the raids on German homes for the purposes of “rescuing” children. It had been the Nazi policy in eastern Europe, when orphans fell into their hands, to conduct a racial examination in order to select Aryan orphans for adoption by German families. These children were being raised exactly as German children were and became the innocent victims of the UNRRA terror. It is not known what happened to them.<sup>401</sup>

The behavior of the DPs in the UNRRA camps was abysmal. As the most prominent historian of the U.S. military government in Germany wrote:<sup>402</sup>

*“They not only consumed large quantities of food, but they exhibited many of the psychoneurotic traits, which must be expected from people who have undergone the tribulations that many of the displaced persons suffered. It was commonplace for them to allege that they were not receiving the consideration that they deserved from the Allied authorities. They often objected to the camps, in which they were living, maintaining that it reflected on their position to be lodged in camps. Some urged that the best German houses be cleared of their occupants and placed at the disposal of the displaced persons, especially the Jews. They refused to assist in some instances in keeping their quarters reasonably habitable, taking the position that it was not their responsibility to make any effort to help themselves. During this period, the actual care of the displaced persons was handled for some months by UNRRA, but final responsibility remained with military government, and it had to give attention to the charges made in the press as to inadequate treatment.*

*Moreover, the displaced persons continued their underground war with the German population, despite all their promises and the efforts exerted by UNRRA and the American Army personnel. Forages into the countryside never ceased; some displaced persons took advantage of every opportunity to pick a quarrel with the Germans. With German property looted, German lives lost, and German women raped almost every day by the displaced persons, widespread resentment developed among the populace, especially when they could not defend themselves against the fire-arms which the displaced persons managed to obtain.”*

In one well publicized incident, Jewish and Polish DPs, with the assistance of some U.S. Army personnel, forced German townspeople to dig up recently buried bodies and, while beating and kicking the Germans, forced them to remove decayed flesh and clean the bones.<sup>403</sup>

---

<sup>400</sup> John & Hadawi, vol. 2, 34.

<sup>401</sup> Koehl, 219-220.

<sup>402</sup> Zink, 121-122.

<sup>403</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 26, 1946), 5.

## Zionism Again

We are interested, however, in the political role that these DP camps played, and the simple fact of the matter is that the Jewish DP camps and other living quarters served as transit and military training camps for the invasion of Palestine.

The world had an opportunity to learn this fact as early as January 1946. As happens on occasion in “international organizations,” the nominal head of the UNRRA operations in Germany, British General Sir Frederick E. Morgan, was his own man and not a Zionist stooge. While he had real control only over a part of the UNRRA German operations, he knew most of what was going on and made a public issue of it. At a press conference in Frankfurt, he charged that an organized Jewish group was sponsoring an exodus of Jews from Poland into the U.S. zone in Germany. He ridiculed “all the talk about pogroms within Poland,” pointing out that Jews arriving in trainloads in Berlin were well fed, well dressed, and had plenty of money:

*“They certainly do not look like a persecuted people. I believe that they have got a plan, a positive plan, to get out of Europe.”*

Morgan added that their money was to a great extent occupation marks, printed by the Russians. It may be recalled by the reader that one of the most spectacular acts of Soviet agent Harry Dexter White, whom we encountered in Chapter 3 (pp. 88, 122) as the boss of the U.S. Treasury’s international operations, was his transmission to the Russians of the plates of the U.S. occupation currency.

Chaim Weizmann denounced Morgan’s statement as “palpably anti-Semitic,” and Rabbi Wise declared that it savored of Nazism at its worst and was reminiscent of the fraudulent *Protocols of Zion*. UNRRA headquarters in the U.S. announced that Morgan had been dismissed, but Morgan denied this. Wise, Henry Monsky (president of B’nai B’rith), and other prominent Jews then huddled with Lehman and “assured Governor Lehman that it was unwise under the circumstances to press the case against Morgan,” since Morgan apparently had enough evidence to support his statement.

Later in 1946, there was an inquiry into the Jewish problem by an Anglo-American committee, which determined that Morgan had under-estimated the situation. In the Jewish DP camps

*“faces changed from day to day and new persons answered to old names on the nominal roles as the Zionist Organization moved Jews ever nearer to Palestine.”*

The Jews, mainly Polish, were pouring into western Germany from the East and passing through the UNRRA operated camps. In these camps, many of them received military instruction for the invasion of Palestine from uniformed non-commissioned officers of the British and U.S. armies. Although it was the case that almost none actually wanted to go to Palestine but to the U.S., every means of forcing immigration to Palestine was employed. Summing up his association with UNRRA, General Morgan wrote in his memoirs (*Peace and War*, 1961):

*“To serve such an outfit is beyond description.”*

Years later, Zionist authors conceded Morgan’s charge in laudatory accounts

of the organized exodus of Jews from Europe.<sup>404</sup>

In August 1946, LaGuardia fired Morgan for charging that UNRRA served as “an umbrella covering Russian secret agents and criminal elements engaged in wholesale dope-peddling and smuggling.” Morgan was replaced by Meyer Cohen of the Washington office of UNRRA. This action was taken at a time when there was a great deal of well-publicized conflict between UNRRA and military authorities in Germany. LaGuardia had come to Germany at the time, in order to deal with various problems, Morgan being one of them. At a news conference held immediately after he fired Morgan, LaGuardia had an angry exchange with Hal Foust of the *Chicago Tribune*, whom we encountered in Chapter 1 (p. 45). Foust had asked how much money nations other than the U.S. had contributed to UNRRA. LaGuardia, however, would answer none of Foust’s questions, on the grounds that Foust’s “dirty, lousy paper would not print it anyway.” To Foust’s repeated requests for the information, LaGuardia shrieked “Shut up!”<sup>405</sup>

Morgan had not been the first high ranking Allied officer to collide with the Zionists. In the summer of 1945, the “Harrison report” to the White House had asserted that Jews in the U.S. zone in Germany were treated almost as badly as they had been under the Nazis. Although many Jews in the camps publicly ridiculed these claims, General Eisenhower, the Supreme Allied Commander, visited General George S. Patton, Jr. (U.S. Third Army commander and military governor of Bavaria), and “read the riot act to him and astounded him by saying that he meant it when he said that Germans were to be ousted from their homes, if necessary, to make their victims comfortable.” Shortly later, Eisenhower relieved Patton of his duties, allegedly because Patton had said in public that too much fuss was being made about ousting Nazis from key positions, that the distinction between Nazis and non-Nazis was similar to the distinction between Republicans and Democrats, and that the key to a successful occupation of Germany lay in showing the Germans “what grand fellows we are.” This was just the most publicized instance of the widespread “reluctance of occupation authorities on the operational level to act as tough as the policies enunciated by the heads of state in Berlin and by General Eisenhower himself.” Patton was assigned to command a group writing a military history, but he was in an automobile accident in December 1945 and died two weeks later from complications.<sup>406</sup>

Eisenhower’s attitude toward Zionists had always been most friendly. Shortly before the end of the war, the Zionist organizer Ruth Klieger, a native of Romania who had emigrated to Palestine before the war, had visited Eisenhower’s SHAEF headquarters in Paris in order to explain to Judge Rifkind, Eisenhower’s adviser on DP matters, her mission of organizing transports of Jews to Palestine from Germany. She was made a U.S. Army colonel on the spot and given the papers necessary for her mission in Germany. Eisenhower’s services did not end there, because the troop transport ship *Ascania*, owned by SHAEF and manned under orders from Eisenhower’s command, was then put at the disposal of the Zionists,

<sup>404</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 88-89; John & Hadawi, vol. 2, 23-26, 34-36; *Morgenthau Diary*, 79.

<sup>405</sup> *New York Times* (Aug. 14, 1946), 10; (Aug. 21, 1946), 1, 5; (Aug. 23, 1946), 18.

<sup>406</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 1, 1945), 2; (Oct. 2, 1945), 1; (Oct. 3, 1945), 1.

and 2,400 Jews were taken to Palestine in it. The British met it on arrival but did not want complications with SHAEF, so they allowed the passengers to enter Palestine. Eisenhower later became President of the United States.<sup>407</sup>

As suggested above, the Jews who left the Soviet Union for Poland did not, for the most part, remain in that country very long. Supported by the Joint Distribution Committee and related Jewish organizations (contributions to which were tax-deductible in the U.S.),<sup>408</sup> the Jews moved on to Germany and, in some instances, Czechoslovakia, spurred on by Zionist propaganda of all sorts. There was the talk, which we have noted, of pogroms, and there was also, no doubt, a widespread idea among the Jews that all were bound for the U.S. From Germany, many did indeed eventually depart for the U.S. But many others moved on to Italy, where there were also UNRRA camps for them, or to France, which earned a reputation at that time for marked friendliness to the Zionist cause. From Czechoslovakia the Jews moved on to Italy or to Vienna and from Vienna to ports in Italy, or Yugoslavia, or to Budapest, Belgrade, and points near Palestine. In all this hectic illegal movement there was, of course, no respect paid to such things as legitimate passports or identity papers. Greek identity papers were manufactured on a large scale, and many Jews posed as Greeks returning home from Poland. When the Greek government learned of this, they sent an official to investigate, but the official was an active Zionist himself and merely informed the Zionist Organization that he could cover up the past illegalities but that the “Greek” angle would have to be discarded. It had, however, served so well that in Czechoslovakia, border guards, who thought that they had learned from the large number of “Greeks” that they had processed what members of that nationality looked like, got suspicious and made arrests when real Greeks appeared.<sup>409</sup>

In the beginning of the mass movements, the Zionist Organization had found that the Jews were too undisciplined and demoralized to serve as members of an effective movement. They therefore settled on the method of the propaganda of hatred to boost the fighting morale of the Jews in the various camps; they began “to instill into these Jews a deep dislike and hatred for the German and, indeed, for their entire non-Jewish environment, for the *goyim* around them.” In the winter of 1946, the Anglo-American investigation committee visited the Jewish camps in Germany and was “overwhelmed by this *anti-goyism* among the camp inmates, by the impossibility of maintaining any contact between the displaced Jews and the British and American peoples.”<sup>410</sup>

The U.S. occupation authorities in Germany were naturally very concerned about the fact that so many people, so tenuously classified as “refugees,” were pouring into their area of responsibility, but were reluctant to speak out too loudly or bluntly, for fear of the sort of abuse that had been heaped on Patton and Morgan. However, the constant increase in the “refugee” population was creating problems that could not be ignored. In June 1946, a group of U.S. editors and

---

<sup>407</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 101-103.

<sup>408</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 97-98.

<sup>409</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 85-88.

<sup>410</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 81-83.

newspaper executives arrived in Frankfurt as the first stop in a tour of Germany and were told by “high United States officers” that Jews were flooding into the U.S. zone at the rate of 10,000 per month, thereby creating a “grave problem.” It was said that “many of them are coming from Russia, and if they join those in Poland in an apparent mass movement toward Palestine, we may have to look after 3,000,000 of them.” Of particular interest in this statement is where “many” of the Jews were coming from, and the fact that the U.S. Army authorities felt it plausible to use a figure of 3,000,000 (not a misprint). They were, of course, exaggerating the situation in order to provoke some sort of relevant action, for there was never any possibility that 3 million Jews would enter the U.S. zone in Germany. Nevertheless, their use of such a figure and their specifying that “many” of the Jews were “coming from Russia” are worth noting.<sup>411</sup>

The problem got so much attention that in early August 1946 the American military governor, General McNarney, announced that “the United States border patrol will not permit Jewish refugees from Poland to enter the United States zone in organized truckloads and trainloads.” McNarney added, however, that “if persecutees come across the borders individually, of course, it is a different matter, and we will accept them.” It may have surprised many observers that this seemingly unimportant qualification was so satisfactory for the Zionists that, shortly later, Rabbi Wise and other prominent Zionists publicly lauded “the attitude of Gen. Joseph T. McNarney [...] toward the entire problem.” The puzzle was resolved the following November, when it was reported that a record 35,000 Jews entered West Germany from Poland (the greater part of them to the U.S. zone) in September and that the “trickle” that existed in November amounted to “150 to 200 persons daily.”<sup>412</sup>

In the news stories of this period, it was frequently the case that the Jews “returning” from Russia to Poland were described as consisting mainly of the 1940 deportees to the Soviet Union. Such a press treatment was to be expected, because the others were supposed to be dead, but such interpretations may be disregarded, although, as Korzen remarks, this group included 1940 deportees.

During 1946, the U.S. Senate War Investigating Committee sent its chief counsel, George Meader, to Germany to investigate the U.S. occupation policies. Meader’s report, which charged, *inter alia*, widespread immorality and racketeering in the Army, was suppressed as a result of “tremendous pressure by the White House, State and War Departments, and Senator Arthur Vandenberg” and a threat of resignation by General Clay, but the contents eventually were made public anyway. The report was very critical of the entire practice of accommodating the Jews who were pouring in from Poland, because they were not really refugees (in the sense of having been stranded in Germany at the end of the war) but part of the mass movement of people that was being sponsored by private groups on behalf of a specific political cause, Zionism. The U.S., therefore, was “financing a political program” by receiving these Jews in the German DP camps, although that program had never been submitted to the Congress for consideration. In the

<sup>411</sup> *New York Times* (Jun. 24, 1946), 12.

<sup>412</sup> *New York Times* (Aug. 10, 1946), 4; (Aug. 27, 1946), 6; (Nov. 2, 1946), 7.

**Table 9: Palestine population**

YEAR	MOSLEMS	JEWS	CHRISTIANS	OTHERS
1924	532,636	94,945	74,094	8,263
1929	634,811	156,481	81,776	9,443
1934	747,826	282,975	102,407	10,793
1939	860,580	445,457	116,958	12,150
1944	994,724	528,702	135,547	14,098

U.S., therefore, there was concern with and opposition to the substantial support that U.S. “refugee” policy was giving to the Zionist cause, but it was too late and too little to have any significant influence on events.

In his report, Meader complained of the difficulty of getting the Jewish (as distinct from non-Jewish) DPs to do any work or even help fix up their own dwellings. Nevertheless, they constantly complained that things were not being done as well as they thought they could be done. Meader also pointed out that illegal activities and crimes of violence by DPs were numerous. He remarked that the U.S. had agreed to accept as immigrants 2,250,000 refugees from Europe.<sup>413</sup>

It is of only slight value to report here the figures that were being given for the number of Jewish DPs. In the autumn of 1946, it was said that there were 185,000 Jewish DPs in camps in West Germany. When one adds those in Austria, the figure would exceed 200,000. It is also said that there were over 400,000 Jewish refugees in Western Europe on July 1, 1947.<sup>414</sup> However, such figures do not say very much, because the camps for Jews and other refugees really served as transit camps and, in the case of the Jews, there was the constant movement toward the U.S. and Palestine, largely illegal or “unofficial” in the case of the latter destination and possibly in the case of the former destination as well.

The principal, but not sole, destinations of the Jews who left Europe were Palestine and the U.S., so we should attempt to estimate the numbers involved. Palestine population figures kept by the British authorities are probably accurate up to some point in 1946, see table 9.<sup>415</sup>

In late 1946, there were supposed to be 608,000 Jews and 1,237,000 Moslems, Christians, and “Others.” Past this point, accurate British figures do not exist, on account of the large extent of illegal immigration, as the British gradually lost control of the situation. In any event, by the time some of the dust had settled in July 1949, the Israeli Government reported that there were 925,000 Jews in Israel. These were predominantly Jews of European origins, the large scale immigration of Jews from North Africa and Asia having been a subsequent development promoted by the Israeli Government. By 1957, there were about 1,868,000 Jews in Israel, and 868,000 Arabs had fled to neighboring countries since the Jewish takeover.<sup>416</sup>

It is worth pausing here to remark that many people have a very mistaken pic-

<sup>413</sup> *New York Times* (Dec. 2, 1946), 3; (Dec. 3 1946), 13.

<sup>414</sup> *New York Times* (Nov. 2, 1946), 7; Kimche & Kimche, 95.

<sup>415</sup> John & Hadawi, vol. 2, 45, 179.

<sup>416</sup> *World Almanac* (1950), 193; (1958), 364-365; Prittie, 149-150; McDonald, 142-143.

ture of Zionism and Israel. It is now widely assumed that Zionism was born at the end of World War II, when large numbers of European Jews, having decided that they could no longer live in Europe, invaded a previously all-Arab Palestine and drove the Arab inhabitants out. In fact, Zionism, the movement for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, has a history that starts in the late nineteenth century. By 1917, Zionism was such a potent political force that Britain, locked in bloody struggle with Imperial Germany, made the “Balfour Declaration,” effectively promising Palestine to the Jews, in return for Jewish support in the war. Since Britain also had certain agreements with the Arabs, Palestine became the “too often promised land.”

Zionist organizations promoted the movement of Jews to Palestine after World War I, and during the Thirties, as the population figures above suggest, Palestine had become perhaps the biggest headache of British foreign policy, which faced the impossible task of reconciling the Jewish and Arab claims to Palestine. It was during the late Thirties that Zionism found itself actively cooperating with the Gestapo, which met regularly with Zionist representatives and even helped in the provision of farms and facilities to set up training centers in Germany and Austria for Jewish emigrants. The Zionists and the Gestapo had the same objective of getting Jews out of Europe.<sup>417</sup>

The consequence of World War II did not create Zionism as an effective political movement; they merely gave Zionism the world political victory it needed for the final stage of the takeover of Palestine. All world power had fallen to the U.S. and the Soviet Union, both of which were most friendly to the Zionist cause at the time. Under the circumstances, the Arab position was hopeless, because it depended on the firmness and political independence of a Britain that was almost prostrate politically and economically.

## Migration to the USA

While it is possible to get a presumably fair idea of the extent of Jewish immigration into Palestine, one encounters what amounts to a stone wall in attempting to determine this for the U.S. We have seen that the policy of classifying immigrants as “Hebrews” was dropped in the same month of 1943 that the U.S. government went into the business of processing DPs on a large scale through the creation of UNRRA. Immediately after the war, there was naturally much Jewish pressure for the admission of great numbers of Jewish immigrants, and in December 1945, President Truman announced that there would be an acceleration in the immigration process in order to allow a higher rate of admission. While Truman regretted that the unused quotas from the war years were not cumulative and could not be applied to future admissions, he pledged that all outstanding immi-

---

<sup>417</sup> Kimche & Kimche, 15-19. Editor’s note: cf. Francis R. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*.

**Table 10: U.S. government immigration data**

AREA	REGULAR IMMIGRATION		DPS	TOTAL
	1941-1950	1951-1960	1948-1952	FROM AREA
Austria	24,860	67,106	8,956	100,922
Belgium	12,189	18,575	951	31,715
Czechoslovakia	8,347	918	12,638	21,903
Denmark	5,393	10,984	62	16,439
Estonia	212	185	10,427	10,824
France	38,809	51,121	799	90,729
Germany	226,578	477,765	62,123	766,466
Greece	8,973	47,608	10,277	66,858
Hungary	3,469	36,637	16,627	56,733
Italy	57,661	185,491	2,268	245,420
Latvia	361	352	36,014	36,727
Lithuania	683	242	24,698	25,623
Netherlands	14,860	52,277	64	67,201
Poland	7,571	9,985	135,302	152,858
Romania	1,076	1,039	10,618	12,733
USSR	548	584	35,747	36,879
Yugoslavia	1,576	8,225	33,367	43,168

gration quotas and regulations would be respected.<sup>418</sup> If they were indeed respected, then the effect on Jewish admissions would nevertheless have been secondary because they entered under the categories of the various nationalities: German, Austrian, Dutch, Polish, etc. However, the existing regulations did not permit the admission of as many persons as was desired, so shortly after the war, there was special legislation relating to the admission of DPs, in which “existing barriers were set aside.” The legislation also set up a “Displaced Persons commission” to assist in the resettlement of the immigrants and, according to the account of the Commission, over 400,000 such persons were resettled in the U.S. in the period 1948-1952 (the period specified in the legislation). The official account goes on to claim that only 16 percent of these 400,000 were Jewish, but that is just the official account of a government which had taken specific steps to assure that the relevant data would not exist.<sup>419</sup>

For what it is worth, we summarize here the more relevant parts of the immigration data that the U.S. government has published, see table 10.<sup>420</sup>

We have only given the numbers for selected European countries, *i.e.* those countries that may have contributed many *uprooted* Jews, although there is a difficulty involved here, as we shall see shortly. The total for Hungary 1951-1960 does not seem to include those who entered on account of special legislation

<sup>418</sup> *New York Times* (Dec. 23, 1945), 1.

<sup>419</sup> US Displaced Persons Commission, v, 248.

<sup>420</sup> This data comes ultimately from the *Annual Report* of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service. In this case, I employed the summaries given in the *Information Please Almanac* (1969) and the *Statistical Abstract of the US* (Sep. 72).



passed in connection with the refugees from the Hungarian rebellion in 1956, about 45,000 of whom were admitted to the U.S. It is worth mentioning that 285,415 persons entered the U.S. from Europe in the years 1954-1971 under various other provisions for refugees.

For reasons that will be clear when we attempt to interpret this data, we note the immigration totals from the various continents:

**Table 11: Immigration totals by continent**

AREA	REGULAR IMMIGRATION		DPS	TOTAL FROM AREA
	1941-1950	1951-1960	1948-1952	
Europe	621,704	1,328,293	405,234	2,355,231
Asia	31,780	147,453	4,016	183,249
N.&S. America	354,804	996,944	307	1,352,055
Africa	7,367	14,092	107	21,566
Pacific	19,242	16,204	10	35,456
Totals	1,034,897	2,502,986	409,674	3,947,557

An important point in interpreting this data is that, in the case of regular immigration in the years 1941-1950 and 1951-1960, the country of origin is defined as the country of last permanent residence, while in the case of the DP's who entered in U.S. in 1948-1952, the country of origin is the country of birth.

That nationality was the country of last permanent residence in the case of regular immigration makes these figures particularly difficult to interpret. This is well illustrated by the total 766,466 who entered the U.S. from Germany, more than 90 percent on the regular quota basis. If we imagine a German Jew as a Jew who actually was raised in Germany and had possessed German citizenship, then only a fraction of the 766,466 could have been Jews, for the simple reason that the greater number of the estimated 500,000 or 600,000 German Jews had emigrated before the war. In order to get some idea of the number of German Jews who might have immigrated into the U.S. after the war, recall that the Jews deported east by the Germans from France and Belgium were almost all German Jews who had emigrated from Germany before the war. Thus, if we accept Reitlinger's figures, the total German Jews deported to the east might have been around 250,000. If, say, half went to Palestine after the war, then it would appear that no more than about 125,000 of the "Germans" who entered the U.S. could have been Jews. However this calculation is upset by the simple observation that the status of "permanent resident" might have been conferred on many of the Jews of several nationalities who were quartered under various conditions in Germany immediately after the war. The period was not noted for strict adherence to legalities, so it is safe to assume that somewhat more than 125,000 of these "Germans" were Jews. Likewise with the figures for Italy.

The haziness of the concept of "permanent resident" is also the reason for the inclusion of immigration figures from such places as North and South America and Asia. We should not expect that the uprooted Jews were particularly scrupulous in regard to legal credentials, and we have seen this illustrated in the case of the "Greeks" who passed through Czechoslovakia. It should not have been diffi-

cult to arrange for the creation of credentials which declared Jews to have been permanent residents of various South American countries, and possibly also of Canada. A side trip to the country in question while en route to the U.S. might have been necessary, but such a trip would have been scenic anyway. South American countries would probably have been happy to cooperate, because the Jews were not in the process of settling with them, and there was no doubt bribe money as well.

For these reasons, I believe that one is perfectly safe in assuming that at least 500,000 uprooted Jews entered the U.S., and the correct figure is probably higher. Since the area of New York City is the home of millions of Jews, a few hundred thousand could have moved there alone, and nobody would have observed more than the fact that he, personally, was aware of a few Jews who came to New York from Europe after the war.

In this analysis we have assumed, of course, that the great masses of Jews who resettled after the war were uprooted Jews and did not include statistically significant portions of, say, French Jews, who had no more reason to leave France than Jews in the U.S. have to leave that country. The net result of the Nazi Jewish resettlement policies was that a great number of Jews, uprooted from their homes, came into the power of Zionist-controlled refugee relief organizations, which were able to direct these masses of Jews to destinations chosen for political reasons.

## Recapitulation

This is as far as the demographic analysis need be carried here, and it is probably essentially as far as it could be carried in any case. If we assume that at the end of the war there were about three million uprooted Jews whose situations had to be disposed of somehow by the Allies, then it is possible that one-half million emigrated to the U.S., one-half million went to Palestine, one million were absorbed by the Soviet Union, 750,000 settled in Eastern Europe excluding the Soviet Union, and 250,000 settled in Western Europe. On the other hand, the correct figures, including those offered here as data, may very well be somewhat different. The treatment presented here is guaranteed to be valid in a general way, but statistical accuracy cannot be attained.

If we attempt to estimate the number who perished, on account of the chaotic conditions in the camps as the Germans retreated, on account of epidemics in the ghettos during more normal periods, on account of pogroms or massacres that might have taken place especially while the Germans were retreating, on account of *Einsatzgruppen* executions, and on account of unhealthy conditions in the concentration camps in Germany, especially at the very end of the war (which affected only Jewish political prisoners and ordinary criminals and the young adult Jews who had been conscripted for labor and sent to the concentration camps), we again have, in my opinion, an impossible problem on our hands. Rassinier's esti-

mate is about a million Jewish dead, but one can take very many exceptions to his arguments. A figure of a million Jewish dead, while possible, seems rather high to me. However, given the vast uncertainties involved, I really have no taste for arguing the matter one way or another.

One should feel no need to apologize for such confessions of statistical ignorance. Korzen, in his study of the Polish Jews dispersed by the Russian deportations of 1940, confesses large and important areas of ignorance in his study, especially in regard to numbers, and he had the friendly offices of the Israeli government to help with his research. A study such as the present one necessarily labors under severe handicaps regarding relevant statistics. Indeed, I was surprised that it was possible to reconstruct statistical and quantitative aspects even to the incomplete extent presented here. The most powerful groups on earth have sought to distort the record of what actually happened to the Jews of Europe during the Second World War.

## J. G. Burg

In his memoirs, J. G. Burg (Josef Ginsburg) has presented a story completely consistent with the historical record. At the outbreak of war in September 1939, he was resident in Lemberg, Poland. He immediately fled with his family to Czernowitz, Romania, in the province of Bukovina, which the Red Army occupied in June 1940. A year later, the German attack on Russia drove out the Red Army, and Ukrainian bands started conducting pogroms, which were halted by German and Romanian troops. Later, Ginsburg and his family were deported east to Transnistria, where life was at least bearable. A Mr. Kolb of the Swiss and International Red Cross visited their settlement in early 1943.

After the German defeats mounted, there was growing tension between the Germans and Romanians, and many Romanians attempted to befriend the Jews. The German-Romanian front started to collapse in mid-1944, and Ginsburg and family returned to Czernowitz. Everywhere there was chaos, starvation, and the Russian terror. Even after the end of the war, conditions were not very good, so in 1946, Ginsburg and family moved on to Breslau and then proceeded to an UNRRA DP camp near Munich in the U.S. occupation zone of Germany. In the camp, almost all Jews were naturally very interested in the possibility of proceeding to the U.S., because they knew that many Jews were doing just that. However, the Zionist leadership attempted by all means to divert their interest from the U.S. to Palestine. To the question "Can one emigrate to the U.S. and remain a Zionist?," a Professor Spiktor replied:

*"Whoever emigrates to the US in this hour of destiny, can not only be no Zionist, he also thereby forsakes his own Jewish people."*

Six months later, Professor Spiktor emigrated to the U.S. Ginsburg and his family went to Palestine with many of the other Jews from the camp.

## Conclusions

We are now very close to the end of our study. The thesis of this book has been proved conclusively. The Jews of Europe were not exterminated, and there was no German attempt to exterminate them. The Germans resettled a certain number, and these people were ultimately resettled again in accordance with Allied programs. Although various statistical details are missing from our analysis, it is possible to reconstruct quantitative aspects of the problem to a satisfactory degree.

The Jews of Europe suffered during the war by being deported to the East, by having had much of their property confiscated, and, more importantly, by suffering cruelly in the circumstances surrounding Germany's defeat. They may even have lost a million dead.

Everybody in Europe suffered during the war, especially the people of central and eastern Europe. The people who suffered most were the losers, the Germans (and Austrians), who lost 10 million dead due to military casualties, Allied bombings, the Russian terror at the end of the war, Russian and French labor conscriptions of POW's after the war, Polish and other expulsions from their homelands, under the most brutal conditions, and the vengeful occupation policies of 1945-1948.<sup>421</sup>

## Himmler Nailed it Perfectly

The "gas chambers" were wartime propaganda fantasies completely comparable to the garbage that was shoveled out by Lord Bryce and associates in World War I. The factual basis for these ridiculous charges was nailed with perfect accuracy by Heinrich Himmler in an interview with a representative of the World Jewish Congress just a few weeks before the end of the war:<sup>422</sup>

*"in order to put a stop to the epidemics, we were forced to burn the bodies of incalculable numbers of people who had been destroyed by disease. We were therefore forced to build crematoria, and on this account they are knotting a noose for us."*

It is most unfortunate that Himmler was a "suicide" while in British captivity, because had he been a defendant at the IMT, his situation would have been such that he would have told the true story (being fully informed and not in a position to shift responsibility to somebody else), and books such as the present book would not be necessary, because the major material could be read in the IMT trial transcript. But then, you see, it was not within the bounds of political possibility that Himmler live to talk at the IMT.

That Himmler's assessment of the gas chamber accusations is the accurate one should be perfectly obvious to anybody who spends any time with this subject, as

---

<sup>421</sup> Aretz, 337-346.

<sup>422</sup> Reitlinger, 521.

we have seen especially in Chapter 4. In particular, Hilberg and Reitlinger should have been able to see this before completing even fractions of their thick books, which are monumental foolishness.

## Chapter 8: Remarks

### Miscellaneous Objections

We close this work with a few miscellaneous remarks, most of which deal with some objections that may arise in certain situations.

An objection that one highly intelligent critic actually expressed was that he thought that my story was similar to ones he had read about “flying saucers” and “divining rods.” The reaction was startling, but it was at least understandable. Years of propaganda have so associated Nazi Germany with the six million legend that denial of the legend seems at first almost as preposterous for many people as denying that World War II happened at all. Nevertheless, the objection is not one that can be answered, except by pointing out that our account does not involve the supernatural or extraterrestrial or, indeed, anything more unusual than people lying about their political enemies. With this critic, one can only ask that he attempt to say something intelligent.

The most consequential objection to this work will be that I have employed the “holocaust” literature, in particular the books by Reitlinger and Hilberg, as sources, although I have also denounced such books as “monumental foolishness.” This objection is a serious one, because I would be the first to hold that, once the extermination legend had been buried, these books will become significant only as supreme examples of total delusion and foolishness and will be referenced only in connection with the great hoaxes of history. However, our task here is precisely to bury the legend, and the only way to do that is by considering the story that has been advanced, and this amounts to analyzing the case put forward by Reitlinger and Hilberg. The only practical way of exposing the hoax is by considering the claims that have been put forward by the extermination mythologists.

There was a second reason for employing Reitlinger and Hilberg as sources. In this work, great weight had been placed on providing documentation that a reader without access to a large library can confirm on his own. Unfortunately, this desire could not be entirely satisfied, because a good part of the analysis relies on documents and publications that are not readily available without going through complicated borrowing procedures. In order to partially overcome this difficulty, I have used Reitlinger and Hilberg as sources on many such points, but I have only done this in cases where I have been able to confirm their remarks. I have not adopted the practice of assuming that anything that Reitlinger or Hilberg says that helps my case must be true. For example, in connection with our discussion in Chapter 5 (p. 188) concerning the date of the first Allied air raid at Auschwitz, I gave reasons for the conclusion that the first raid did not occur before August

1944. It would have been dishonest to merely reference Hilberg on this point, because Hilberg believes that the first raid occurred in December 1944 and is obviously confused on this point.<sup>423</sup>

Another reason for the frequent referencing of Reitlinger and Hilberg is my sincere wish that the reader would take a look at such books; it is only then that the reader can become completely convinced that the hoax is a hoax. In this connection one can recommend a typical procedure that the reader may go through to confirm the matter in a general way. First, get a copy of Hilberg's book. On pages 567-571, Hilberg presents a magnificent discussion of the alleged role of the Zyklon B in the exterminations, and on page 619 or 621, he points out that the German documents speak only of a program of deportations to the East and associated operations. It is also useful to read his discussion of what the Nuremberg trial documents say happened in Hungary, 509-554, and to note the document numbers he cites in this connection. Next find, if possible, a copy of Reitlinger's book, first or second edition. On pages 158-159 (150 in the first edition), he reproduces the text of document NO-4473, in which he notes that the "gas chamber" that allegedly existed in the building which contained Crematory II at Auschwitz was described as a "*Vergasungskeller*" in the original German. On pages 118, 121 and 182 (112, 114-115 and 169 in the first edition) Reitlinger remarks on the "mystery" that "at certain periods, entire transports (of Jews) were admitted" into Auschwitz. Reitlinger also briefly mentions the chemical industry at Auschwitz, pages 109 and 492 (105 and 452 in the first edition). Hopefully, the reader will undertake a more thoroughgoing confirmation, but the above would be a good start.

Some people may assume, fallaciously, that opinions expressed by Jews and Germans on the subject of the "Final Solution" carry nearly authoritative weight.

Under circumstance where the subject of this book is being discussed by a group of people, a seemingly potent argument – because it is so laden with emotion and can upset the decorum of the group – may be offered by a Jew who claims to have lost some relative or close acquaintance in the "holocaust," and he may even have knowledge that the supposedly missing relative had been sent to Auschwitz, Treblinka, or some such place.

There are several ways to react to such a point. An obvious possibility is that the man is lying. However, it is more probable that he is telling the truth as he knows it. Assuming that his story is valid, there is only one sense in which it can be valid. That is, all he can claim is that he or his family lost contact with some relative in Europe during the war and never heard from that person again. Obviously, such data does not imply the existence of a Nazi extermination program.

That contact was lost during the war was almost inevitable, either because it was difficult for Jews deported to the east to communicate with people in allied countries, or because it was difficult or impossible to communicate from the east to points farther west during the chaotic last year of the war. Thus, the only point of interest in such a case is the claim that contact was not reestablished after the war.

---

<sup>423</sup> Hilberg, 632.

The simplest explanation is that the relative did indeed perish somewhere in Europe during the war, or in a concentration camp, from causes that have been covered in this book, along with an indeterminate number of other persons of central and east European nationalities.

The second possibility is that the relative survived the war, but did not reestablish contact with his prewar relations. One possible, although not very likely, motivation for such a failure to reestablish contact could have been some prohibition on such correspondence imposed by the Soviet Government on those Jews who had been absorbed into the Soviet Union.

A more important and more plausible motivation for failing to reestablish contact held when a separation of husband and wife was involved. A very large number of marriages are held together by purely social and economic constraints; such constraints didn't exist for a great number of the Jews uprooted by the German policies and wartime and postwar conditions.

In many cases deported Jewish families were broken up for what was undoubtedly intended by the Germans to be a period of limited duration. This was particularly the case when the husband seemed a good labor conscript; just as German men were conscripted for hazardous military service, Jews were conscripted for unpleasant labor tasks. Under such conditions, it is reasonable to expect that many of these lonely wives and husbands would have, during or at the end of the war, established other relations that seemed more valuable than the previous relationships. In such cases, then, there would have been a strong motivation not to reestablish contact with the legal spouse. Moreover, none of the "social and economic constraints," which we noted above, were present, and Jews were in a position to choose numerous destinations in the resettlement programs that the Allies sponsored after the war. This possibility could account for a surprisingly large number of "missing" Jews. For example, suppose that a man and wife with two small children were deported, with the man being sent to a labor camp and the wife and children being sent to a resettlement camp in the East. Let us suppose that the wife failed to reestablish contact with her husband. We thus seem to have four people reported dead or missing; the husband says his wife and children are presumably dead and the wife says her husband was lost. However, this one separation of husband and wife could account for even more missing Jews, for it is likely that the parents and other relatives of the wife, on the one hand, and the parents and other relative of the husband, on the other, would also have lost touch with each other. Thus, one had some number of people on the husband's side claiming that some number of people on the wife's side are missing, and vice versa. Obviously, the possibilities of accounting for "missing" Jews in this way are practically boundless.

It is said that the *Yad Vashem* archives in Jerusalem now have the names of between 2.5 and 3 million Jewish "dead from the Nazi holocaust." The data have supposedly been "collected on one-page testimony sheets filled in by relatives or witnesses or friends." Of course, it is in no way possible to satisfactorily substantiate this production of the Israeli government, which certainly cannot be claimed to be a disinterested party in the question of the number of Jews who perished.



There is no doubt that many Jews died during the war, so we should expect that a part of the *Yad Vashem* claim is valid, but it is also the case that there is no possible way to distinguish, in this data, between Jews who actually died during the war and Jews with whom the signers of the “testimony sheets” have merely lost contact. The data is particularly meaningless when it is a “friend” who has contributed a declaration; I have lost contact with a great many former friends and acquaintances, but I assume that nearly all are still alive. Indeed, the use of the testimony of “friends” for the purpose of gathering the *Yad Vashem* data shows that the data is mostly meaningless; such “friends” have no more basis for declaring their missing acquaintances dead than I do.<sup>424</sup>

I have no idea what is meant by the “witnesses” who signed the testimony sheets. There is also a better than negligible possibility that some signers of these declarations invented missing friends and relative for any of a number of possible motivations, and it is even possible that some of the signers never existed.

To summarize our reaction to the claims of Jews regarding persons said to be victims of the “holocaust,” such claims are no doubt valid to some extent, because many Jews died, but the hard data possessed by Jews who report such losses, when they are reporting truthfully, is not conclusive in regard to the deaths of the persons involved, and certainly in no way implies the existence of a Nazi extermination program.

## Postwar Germany and Willy Brandt

One must be careful in interpreting the fact that Germans, themselves, seem to believe in the exterminations. Certainly, most individual Germans seem to concede the myth, and not all do so in order to stay out of trouble. However, it is clear that the German people were no better situated to see the truth than anybody else. Many might, indeed, have observed local Jews being deported, not to return after the war, and this may have given some an even more vivid conviction in support of the extermination hoax than that which holds generally. The basic observation to make relative to the views of individual Germans is that the standard sort of “information” on this subject has been available to them, and they are thus just as innocently deluded as other nationalities.

The West German government, which, by interminable war crimes trials, now being held thirty or more years after the alleged crimes, by instruction in the schools, and now by means of naked terror, as shown in the Stäglich episode,<sup>425</sup>

<sup>424</sup> Colorado Springs *Sun* (Jan. 30, 1973), 6.

<sup>425</sup> As a punishment for publishing his recollections of Auschwitz, Stäglich’s pension as a retired judge was reduced by 20% for five years; *Nation Europa* (Coburg), August 1975, p. 39. The reduction of Stäglich’s pension was “naked terror” by the standards of 1975. That action against Stäglich was mild in comparison to what was to come. Later on, the University of Göttingen revoked Stäglich’s Dr.-jur. degree for having published his research results in the book *Der Auschwitz Mythos*, which was seized and destroyed by the German authorities; German Federal Constitutional Court, ref. 1 BvR 408f./83; Wigbert Grabert (ed.), *Geschichtsbetrachtung als Wagnis*,

does everything possible to keep the lie propped up and to prevent open discussion, is a different matter, because the cause for its behavior is not innocent misunderstanding. The basic fact is that the claim of the Bonn government to be a German government is somewhat tenuous. The entire political structure of West Germany was established by the U.S. government. This includes the control of the newspapers and other media, the control of the schools, and the constitution of this *Bundesrepublik*. As a puppet creation, this “German” political establishment necessarily had an interest in the lies of the conquerors and behaved accordingly. That is very simple, and this situation is perfectly illustrated by the career of the man who was Chancellor of West Germany during the greater part of the time when this book was being written: Herr Willy Brandt (an alias – Brandt’s real name is Herbert Ernst Karl Frahm – Frahm was his mother’s maiden name).

Marxist Brandt left Germany after the Hitler takeover and acquired Norwegian citizenship. After the German invasion of Norway in 1940, he slipped into neutral Sweden and eventually was given a position in the press corps there. It was none other than Willy Brandt who, during the war, was transmitting the concocted propaganda stories that had supposedly originated in Stockholm and ended up on the pages of the *New York Times*.<sup>426</sup>

After the defeat of Germany, Brandt naturally decided that the atmosphere back home had improved, so he returned to Germany, resumed German citizenship, and entered West Berlin politics as a Social Democrat. He eventually became Mayor of West Berlin and acquired a press aide, Hans Hirschfeld, a German Jew who, along with Kempner, Marcuse, *et al.*, had been employed in the OSS during the war. During the 1961 espionage trial in the U.S. of R. A. Soblen, which resulted in Soblen being sentenced to life imprisonment, a government witness, Mrs. J. K. Beker, who had been a courier in a Soviet espionage ring during the war but had turned FBI informer later, testified that she had carried information from Hirschfeld to Soblen for transmission to Moscow. Mrs. Beker was the principal government witness, so the obvious answer of the defense should have been to produce Hirschfeld. Indeed, Soblen’s defense counsel said that he had attempted to convince Hirschfeld to come to the U.S. to testify, but Hirschfeld declined, at first on the grounds that the publicity associated with his appearance as a witness could hurt Brandt, who was engaged in an election campaign. Hirschfeld was also concerned about the possibility that he might be charged with some sort of offense if he journeyed to the U.S. Brandt, in New York during the controversy involving Hirschfeld, naturally defended his former close associate, who had by that time been living in retirement in Germany.

In order to give the defense every opportunity to make a case for Soblen, the government offered Hirschfeld immunity against prosecution for “any past acts or transactions” if he would come to the U.S. to testify, adding only that Hirschfeld

---

Grabert, Tübingen 1984; *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 36(3) (1988), p. 18; *ibid.*, 36(1) (1988), p. 7, *ibid.*, 31(1) (1983), pp. 19f., *ibid.*, 29(3) (1981), p. 38. Re. the recent escalation of naked terror in Germany, see Germar Rudolf’s article “Discovering Absurdistan” in *The Revisionist*, 1(2) (May 2002), pp. 203-219.

<sup>426</sup> *New York Times* (Aug. 12, 1972), 23.

could be prosecuted for any perjury committed in a retrial of Soblen. Hirschfeld nevertheless declined to appear in Soblen's defense.<sup>427</sup>

Brandt eventually became Chancellor of West Germany and won the Nobel Peace Prize for 1971 for his efforts to build friendlier relations with the eastern bloc, his "*Ostpolitik*." Brandt seemed to be riding high, but by 1974, various Brandt policies had brought his Social Democratic Party to a new low in popular esteem, and even SPD politicians in long term SPD strongholds expressed the belief that they were going to lose their next elections. Fortuitously for the SPD, the Günter Guillaume scandal erupted in late April with Guillaume's arrest as an East German espionage agent. Although it had been known that Guillaume had been a member of an East Berlin espionage organization, he had been cleared by the Brandt government for a high post in the inner circle of Brandt's associates and advisers. The scandal brought Willy Brandt's downfall with his resignation on May 7, 1974. Brandt was succeeded by Helmut Schmidt, whose leadership terminated the decline of the SPD.<sup>428</sup>

Clearly, a career such as Brandt's postwar career is possible only in a country in which treason has become a normal part of political life, so it is not in the least surprising that the Bonn government is a defender of the hoax.

An interesting objection is the claim that nobody would dare invent such a tale as the six million legend; nobody had the extraordinary imagination required, and even if he did, the obvious risks in telling such gigantic lies should dissuade him. The argument amounts to the claim that the mere existence of the legend implies the truth of its essentials, so I suppose we can classify it as the hoaxers' ontological argument.

What is interesting about this objection is its superficially logical quality. Indeed, I imagine that this calculation accounts in good measure for the widespread acceptance of the legend; people assume that nobody would be so brazen as to invent such lies. Nevertheless, the logic is not sound, for history affords us numerous examples of popular acceptance of gigantic lies, and in this connection we can again cite witchcraft hysteria as precedent for the psychological essentials of the six million hoax.

## The Talmud

It is ironic that Hitler anticipated the psychology of the "big lie" in his remarks on the subject in Chapter X of *Mein Kampf*. It is also ironic that the most mind-boggling invented accounts of exterminations appear in the Jewish Talmudic literature in connection with the last two of the three great Jewish revolts against the Roman empire, the Diaspora revolt of 115-117 AD and the Palestine revolt of 132-135 AD. In connection with the Palestine revolt of 66-70 AD, the Talmudic

---

<sup>427</sup> *New York Times* (Oct. 6, 1961), 10; (Oct. 14, 1961), 10; (Oct. 17, 1961), 35; (Nov. 4, 1961), 11; R. H. Smith, 237n.

<sup>428</sup> *New York Times* (May 8, 1974), 16.

writings do nothing more than bewail the loss of the Temple in Jerusalem and discuss the implications of the loss for Jewish law. A good discussion of the three revolts is given in Michael Grant's *The Jews in the Roman World*.

According to the ancient accounts (mainly Cassius Dio, who wrote around 200 AD, and Eusebius, the early fourth century Bishop of Caesarea), the Diaspora revolt started in Cyrenaica (northeast Libya) at a time when the Emperor Trajan had, for the purpose of annexing Parthia and its valuable Mesopotamian territory, constituted a huge eastern army at the price of withdrawing many small contingents that had served to keep order in various parts of the Empire. The Jews attacked the Greek and Roman civilian populations, and it is said they killed 220,000 in Cyrenaica, amusing themselves in various gruesome ways. The revolt then spread to Egypt, where the Jews killed an unknown number, and to Cyprus, where they are said to have killed 240,000. In Alexandria, however, the predominantly Greek population gained control of events and are said to have massacred the Jews of that city. Recent archaeological evidence indicates that the ancient accounts are not exaggerated.<sup>429</sup>

The Talmud says almost nothing about this revolt, except to give the number of Jews killed in Alexandria as "sixty myriads on sixty myriads, twice as many as went forth from Egypt," *i.e.* 1,200,000 on the assumption that addition and not multiplication is intended. The killings are blamed on "the Emperor Hadrian," which may be due to the fact that Hadrian was at the time the commander of Trajan's eastern army and succeeded Trajan as Emperor when Trajan died in 117, possibly before the final suppression of the revolt.

The figure given for the number of Jewish victims is obviously exaggerated, for, while it is usually difficult to be more than approximately correct in estimating the populations of ancient cities, Alexandria of the period had a population of 500,000 or more, with an upper bound of one million a reasonable one to assume, because that was the approximate population of the city of Rome, a figure concerning which there is also some uncertainty, but if Rome ever attained a population significantly greater than one million, it never got near two million.<sup>430</sup> The 1,200,000 martyred Jews may seem a brazen invention, but you haven't seen anything yet.

The next great revolt was in Palestine in 132-135 and was a serious attempt by its leader, Bar-Kokhba, to set up a Jewish state with himself as king, although he eventually claimed to be the Messiah. During the revolt, he made laws, issued money, and performed the other regular functions of government.

Bar-Kokhba's end came in 135. Jerusalem not being suitable to withstand a siege, he led the remnant of his army to the village of Bethar (the present Bittir), which is located on high ground about 10 miles southwest of Jerusalem, 25 miles from the Dead Sea and 35 miles from the Mediterranean. The dimensions of the ancient town were roughly rectangular, with a north-south length of about 600 meters and an east-west width of about 200 meters. The south half of the town

<sup>429</sup> Fuks.

<sup>430</sup> *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 10, 296; Packer; Carcopino, 16-21; T. Frank, vol. 2, 245; vol. 4, 158f; vol. 5, 218n.

was fortified.<sup>431</sup> These dimensions plus the fact that the estimates for the Jewish population of Palestine of the time range from a low of 500,000 to a high of 2.5 million make it unlikely that Bar-Kokhba's Bethar army numbered as many as 50,000 men.<sup>432</sup>

The Romans laid siege to Bethar in the summer of 135, and Bar-Kokhba's resistance collapsed in August. The Romans broke into the fortress and Bar-Kokhba was killed in that final battle.

For general reasons, it seems unlikely that the Romans carried out a massacre of the Jewish population of Bethar. The only "evidence" for a general massacre occurs in the Talmudic literature (including in this context the *Midrash Rabbah*), which for reasons unknown comments extensively on the siege of Bethar and its supposed aftermath. Except where noted, the Talmudic passages are reproduced in the Appendix to the book *Bar-Kokhba* by the archaeologist Yigael Yadin. The size of Bar-Kokhba's Bethar army is given as 200,000 men. Bar-Kokhba is said to have been so tough that, when the Romans catapulted missiles into his fort, he would intercept the missiles with his knee with such force that he would knock them back into the faces of the astonished Romans, killing many. The *Talmud* goes on to claim that the number of Jews killed by the Romans after the fortress fell was 4 billion "or as some say" 40 million, while the *Midrash Rabbah* reports 800 million martyred Jews. In order to reassure us that these figures are given in earnest, the necessarily accompanying events are set forth. The blood of the slain Jews reached to the nostrils of the Romans' horses and then, like a tidal wave, plunged a distance of one mile or four miles to the sea, carrying large boulders along with it, and staining the sea a distance of four miles out.

The Jewish school children of Bethar, according to the Talmudic literature, were of course not spared by the Romans, who are said to have wrapped each of them in his scroll and then burned all of them, the number of these school children having been either 64 million or at least 150,000 (the approximate present public school population of Washington, DC).

The Romans matched the Germans in efficiency, for the bodies of the slain Jews were used to build a fence around Hadrian's vineyard, which is said to have been eighteen miles square, and blood saved over from the tidal wave was used to fertilize Roman vineyards for seven years. Shades of soap, glue and fertilizer factories!

It is also claimed that Bar-Kokhba (usually referred to in the Talmudic literature as Bar-Koziba – it is still not clear what his real name was) was killed by rabbis for falsely claiming to be the Messiah.<sup>433</sup>

The Talmudic literature was not intended for general circulation so its authors could exercise more freedom than the inventors of the six million hoax, who had to assess the gullibility of a possibly skeptical gentile audience. However, the spirit of the Talmudic accounts in the above instances seems remarkably similar to the spirit of our century's hoax. In this connection, it may be noted that it is not

---

<sup>431</sup> *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 4, 735.

<sup>432</sup> McCown.

<sup>433</sup> Babylonian *Talmud*, *Sanhedrin* 93b or p. 627 in the translation edited by I. Epstein.

really anomalous that a Talmudic scholar such as Rabbi Weissmandel plays a possibly significant role in the hoax. Also, because Rabbi Wise translated a good deal of ancient and medieval Jewish literature and also founded a Jewish seminary, he may also have some claim to being a Talmudic scholar. One suspects that such scholars might have been exactly the type required to give birth to the hoax.

## Credentials

A remaining objection could raise the question of my credentials for writing such a book. This is a good point, for it is true that my formal training has been in engineering and applied mathematics and not history.

It is not unprecedented for investigators to make contributions in fields apparently remote from their specialties, but I will concede that the point should not be waved aside lightly. Normally, we expect developments in historical investigation to come from historians, just as developments in engineering come from engineers. Exceptions to this rule can be admitted, but some justification for the exception should be expected.

My justification is the obvious one: default on the part of regular professional historians. No such person has come forward with a critical study of the question or with any work actually arguing any particular side of the extermination question and presenting the evidence, which supports the thesis. The closest thing to such a work is the book by Reitlinger, who is at least willing to take explicit note of some of the anomalies that develop in presenting the story of the “holocaust,” but Reitlinger is not a historian but an artist and art collector. He has written several books, the most significant being his three volume study of the history of dealings in objects of art, *The Economics of Taste*. After Reitlinger, Hilberg manages a tiny bit of a critical attitude, but Hilberg is a professor of political science at the University of Vermont, and his doctorate is in public law and government.

The books by Reitlinger and Hilberg recognize, to a very inadequate but nevertheless perceptible degree, a responsibility to convince the skeptic. The other extermination mythologists do not make any effort whatever to show that the exterminations happened; they just assume we all know it happened and then they take it from there. This is the case with the remaining three of the five leading extermination mythologists – Nora Levin, Leon Poliakov, and Lucy S. Dawidowicz. Levin was a research librarian while writing her book and now teaches history at Gratz College, a small Jewish school in Philadelphia. Poliakov is research director of the *Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine* in Paris, and thus a professional Jewish propagandist. Dawidowicz is the only regular professional historian in the group and occupies the Leah Lewis Chair in Holocaust Studies at the Yeshiva University in New York. All five of the leading extermination mythologists are Jews.

In books and articles on subjects that are other than, but touch on, the “holocaust,” professional historians invariably give some sort of endorsement to the lie,

but the extent, to which contrary hints are found in their writings, is considerable. No professional historian had published a book arguing and presenting evidence either for or against the reality of the exterminations. The motivations are obvious. No established historian had been willing to damage his reputation by writing a scholarly-sounding work supporting the extermination allegations, solemnly referencing documents and testimonies produced at illegal trials held under hysterical conditions and seriously setting forth, without apology, obvious idiotic nonsense such as the alleged dual role of the Zyklon. At least, no inducement to produce such a work seems to have come along. On the other hand, the pressure of intellectual conformity (to put it mildly) in academia has evidently terrorized historians into silence in the opposite regard. This being the case, it is both justified and expected that works such as the present one be produced by engineers and whatever.<sup>434</sup>

## Other Matters

As promised early in this book, we have dealt here at depth with only one propaganda myth and have in no sense attempted to cover the general field of World War II revisionism. There is no point in repeating here what has been ably said by other authors who have contributed to demolishing lingering mythology relating to the war, but a few words, intended mainly to direct the reader to the appropriate literature, are in order.

The myth of Germany's solitary responsibility for the outbreak of war in 1939 has been demolished by the American historian David L. Hoggan in his book *The Forced War*. A. J. P. Taylor's *The Origins of the Second World War* is not as extensive, but it has achieved a much greater circulation and has been available in paperback for some time. Taylor's well deserved reputation as a Germanophobe have made his book a notable addition to the revisionist literature.

The myth of extraordinary Nazi brutality, as compared to the brutalities of the Western democracies, had been exploded by a number of books, of which the best is F. J. P. Veale's *Advance to Barbarism*, of which a new and expanded edition appeared in 1968. Other noteworthy books are *Unconditional Hatred* by Captain Russell Grenfell, RN, *America's Second Crusade* by William Henry Chamberlin, and Freda Utley's *The High Cost of Vengeance*. However, these authors ignore one of the greatest crimes of the western democracies, the forcible repatriation of Soviet citizens to the Soviet Union after the war ("Operation Keelhaul"). Most of what we know of this shameful episode is due to the efforts of Julius Epstein, a

---

<sup>434</sup> In the years after this book was first published in 1976, there was a great outburst of relevant scholarship of varying quality (see *e.g.* my Foreword to the 2003 edition). In 2003, I would not express myself on the historians in quite the way I have in these paragraphs. See for example my discussion of books by Martin Gilbert and Walter Laqueur in Supplement 2, written in 1982. Their books, while not brilliant, are competent and routine works of history. Their outstanding feature is that the authors fail to draw the obvious conclusions from their own research, as I explain in Supplement 2.

Jew who left Germany during the Thirties for the usual reasons, but started his crusades for truth during the war with his investigations into the Katyn Forest massacre and has spent the greater part of the postwar period investigating Operation Keelhaul. His book on the subject was published in 1973. Solzhenitsyn's *The Gulag Archipelago* offers a long discussion of Operation Keelhaul, which, because it is written from a Russian point of view, supplements Epstein's treatment notably. Nicholas Bethell's *The Last Secret* explores the political background of the forced repatriations.

For a reader interested in a more thoroughgoing discussion of the revisionist literature, the best seems to appear in the testimonial volume *Harry Elmer Barnes*, edited by Arthur Goddard. The pamphlet by Barnes, *Blasting the Historical Blackout*, is a more intensive analysis of the status of World War II revisionism and is still available.

None of the above named publications touch the gas chamber myth or deal in a serious way with whatever was supposed to have happened in the German concentration camps. Here we have treated the camps almost entirely from a single point of view and have not deeply investigated the factual basis of other allegations of brutalities of a more random and less systematic nature. However, the Ilse Koch case, which was discussed in Chapter 2 (pp. 60-62), should be sufficiently instructive in distinguishing between fact and fiction, and the methods used at Dachau by the U.S. authorities to produce "evidence" of extraordinary brutalities should be conclusive.

The scandal of the continued imprisonment of Rudolf Hess, who died in prison in 1987 at age 93, was treated by a number of books while he was alive, notably *Prisoner No. 7: Rudolf Hess*, by Eugene K. Bird, one of the U.S. commanders at Berlin's Spandau prison, who broke regulations by not only talking to Hess but also interviewing him in depth. Two other books are *Motive for a Mission* by James Douglas-Hamilton and *Hess: The Man and His Mission* by J. Bernard Hutton.

## Some Implications

In this book, we have necessarily restricted ourselves to the demolition of only one myth and have not attempted to treat the very broad subject of the general behavior of Nazi Germany as compared to the Allies, except by recommending the above publications. They will help support the major implication of this work: the media in the western democracies are exposed as constituting a lie machine of vaster extent than even many of the more independent minded have perceived.

A second implication of this work naturally relates to Palestine. The "justification" that Zionists invariably give for driving the Arabs out of Palestine always involves the six million legend to a great extent. Of course, there is more than one *non sequitur* involved; Palestine was not invaded by six million dead Jews or, indeed, by any dead Jews, and in any case, it is not just or reasonable to make the



Arabs pay for whatever the Germans are supposed to have done to Jews in Europe during the Second World War. Moreover, Israel is not a land that welcomes all persons who suffered in some way at the hands of the Nazis, but all Jews, regardless of whether they or their relatives had ever had any contact with the Nazis.

Today the United States supplies enough aid to Israel to assure that Israel is able to retain, by armed occupation, lands that the United States itself declares to be rightfully Arab (the territories seized in the 1967 war). Although it is hard to see why the six million legend should motivate such a policy, such a motivation or justification is very often advanced. When, in November 1975, an overwhelming majority at the United Nations, in a burst of intellectual clarity rare for that organization, endorsed a resolution declaring Zionism to be a form of racism (a truth as inescapable as  $2 + 2 = 4$ ) the U.S. representative Daniel Patrick Moynihan, an otherwise impressive intellect, was reduced in astonishingly short order to hysterical yapping about the six million. As was shown by the aftermath of the "Yom Kippur War" of 1973, this support of Israel is completely contrary to the interests of the West. The obvious fact that this support is immoral in terms of the moralizing that has become a pervasive feature of Western foreign policies makes it doubly mad.

Another country that has extended considerable material aid to Israel is West Germany. As of 1975, the Bonn government had paid Jews several billion worth of restitutions and indemnifications of various sorts (calculated mainly in terms of dollars of the late Fifties and early Sixties), and was still making commitments for new payments.<sup>435</sup>

The largest single such program was defined in the 1952 Luxembourg Treaty between the Federal Republic and Israel; Bonn committed itself to paying Israel \$750 million, primarily in the form of German industrial products and oil shipments from Britain. The program, referred to in Israel as the *Shilumin* program, was completed in 1966. The text of the Luxembourg Treaty opens with the words:<sup>436</sup>

"Whereas  
*unspeakable criminal acts were perpetrated against the Jewish people during the National Socialist regime of terror*  
and whereas  
*by a declaration of the Bundestag on 27 September 1951, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany made known their determination, within the limits of their capacity, to make good the material damage caused by these acts [...]."*

The Bonn government has undertaken additional programs of indemnification that have been similarly motivated. Because this work has shown that the "un-

---

<sup>435</sup> *New York Times* (Jan. 18, 1975), 6. Editor's note: By 1963, total German payments amounted to 20 billion marks (5 billion 1963 dollars), and by 1984 the total had risen to 70 billion marks (23 billion 1984 dollars; D. v. Westernhagen, *Die Zeit*, Oct. 5, 1984, p. 36); in 2002, the German government estimated total payments of 138 billion marks (some 78 billion 2003 dollars: Bundesministerium der Finanzen (ed.), *Entschädigung von NS-Unrecht*, Berlin 2002).

<sup>436</sup> Vogel, 56, 88-100.

speakable criminal acts,” in the sense in which that expression is used in the Luxembourg Treaty, are largely a hoax and, specifically, a Zionist hoax, it then develops that Israel owes Germany a lot of money, because the proposed justification for the reparations has been invalidated.



# Appendices

## Appendix A: The “Statement”

Document 1553-PS is a set of documents, typewritten in French (except for a short part in English), and said to have been authored by Kurt Gerstein. The English translation, as provided by the Nuremberg staff, is presented below with certain modifications that are explained. The original is reproduced by Roques.<sup>437</sup> The first document is the lengthiest of the set and is what would normally be considered to be the “Gerstein statement”.

*“Graduate engineer for Mine surveying (Bergassessor Diplomingenieur)*

*Kurt Gerstein*

*Rottweil, 26 April 1945*

*Personal particulars: Gerstein, Kurt, Mine Surveyor, expelled from State service in 1936 as an anti-Nazi; certified engineer. Born on 11 August 1905, at Muenster, Westphalia. Partner of the factory De Limon Fluhme & Company, automatic greasing of locomotives, brakes Westinghouse, Knorr, etc. Duessel-dorf, Industriestrasse 1 – 17.*

*Father: Ludwig Gerstein, President of the District Court (Landgerichts-praesident) at Hagen, Westphalia, retired.*

*Mother: Clara Gerstein, nee Schmemann, died 1931.*

*Married since 2 May 1937 to Elfriede nee Bensch at Tuebingen, Gartenstrasse 24, 3 children: Arnulf, 5 years old Adelheid 3-1/2 years old Olaf 2 years old. Life: 1905 to 1911 Muenster, 1911 to 1919 Sarrebruck, 1919 to 1921 Halberstadt, 1921 to 1925 Neuruppin near Berlin, graduated in 1925. – Studies 1925 to 1931, Marburg on the Lahn, Aachen, Berlin-Charlottenburg Universities and technical colleges, 1931, certified engineer’s examination. Since 1925, active member of the Protestant youth organization the Y.M.C.A., and above all, of the Higher Christian Youth, called the ‘Bible Circle’ (Bk, Bibelkreis). Political career: follower of Stresemann and Bruening, active on their behalf; since June 1933, persecuted by the Gestapo for Christian activities against the Nazi State. 2nd of May 1933, joined the NSDAP; 2 October 1936, expelled from the NSDAP because of activities against Party and State. 30 January 1935, public protest in the theater of the town of Hagen in Westphalia, against the anti-Christian drama ‘Wittekind’. Beaten and wounded by the Nazis. 27 November 1935, mining surveyor’s examination (Bergassessor). Then employed by the State at Sarrebruck. On 27 September 1936, imprisoned by the Gestapo for ‘activities against the State’ because of having sent 8,500 anti-Nazi pamphlets to high officials of the State. Imprisoned until the end of*

---

<sup>437</sup> Roques, 222-227.

October 1936, released, was expelled from civil service. From December 1936 till the beginning of the war, medical studies at the Institute for the Protestant Medical Mission in the tropics, at Tuebingen. One-third – approximately – of income, that is one-third of 18,000 Reichsmarks per year, I donated since 1931 for my ideal religious goals. At my own expense, I had printed and mailed about 230,000 religious anti-Nazi pamphlets.

14 July to 28 August 1938, second imprisonment, in the Welzheim concentration camp. Hearing of the massacres of idiots and insane people at Grafeneck, Hadamar, etc., shocked and deeply wounded, having such a case in my family, I had but one desire, to see, to gain an insight of this whole machine and then to shout about it to the whole world! With the help of two references written by the two Gestapo employees who had dealt with my case, it was not difficult for me to enter the *Waffen SS*. 10 March to 2 June 1941, elementary instruction as a soldier at Hamburg-Langenhorn, Arnhem and Oranienburg, together with forty doctors. Because of my twin studies – technology and medicine – I was ordered to enter the medical-technology branch of the *SS-Fuehrungshauptamt* (SS Operational Main Office) – Medical Branch of the *Waffen SS* – *Amtsgruppe D* (Division D), Hygiene Department. Within this branch, I chose for myself the job of immediately constructing disinfecting apparatus and filters for drinking water for the troops, the prison camps and the concentration camps. My close knowledge of the industry caused me to succeed quickly where my predecessors had failed. Thus, it was possible to decrease considerably the death toll of prisoners. On account of my successes, I very soon became a Lieutenant. In December 1941, the tribunal which had decreed my exclusion from the NSDAP obtained knowledge of my having entered the *Waffen SS*. Considerable efforts were made in order to remove and persecute me. But due to my successes, I was declared sincere and indispensable. In January 1942, I was appointed Chief of the Technical Branch of Disinfection, which also included the branch for strong poison gases for disinfection. On 8 June 1942, the *SS Sturmbannfuehrer* Guenther of the *ReichsSicherheits-Hauptamt* entered my office. He was in plain clothes and I did not know him. He ordered me to get a hundred kilograms of prussic acid and to accompany him to a place which was only known to the driver of the truck. We left for the potassium factory near Colling (Prague). Once the truck was loaded, we left for Lublin (Poland). We took with us Professor Pfannenstiel MD, Ordinary Professor for Hygiene at the University of Marburg on the Lahn. At Lublin, we were received by *SS Gruppenfuehrer* Globocnek. He told us: this is one of the most secret matters there are, even the most secret. Whoever talks of this shall be shot immediately. Yesterday, two talkative ones died. Then he explained to us: at the present moment – 17 August 1942 – there are three installations:

1. Belcec, on the Lublin-Lemberg road, in the sector of the Russian demarcation line. Maximum 15,000 persons a day. (Seen!)
2. Sobibor, I do not know exactly where it is located. Not seen. 20,000 persons per day.
3. Treblinka, 120 km NNE of Warsaw. 25,000 persons per day. Seen!

4. Maidanek, near Lublin. Seen in the state of preparation.

Globocnek then said: You will have to handle the sterilization of very huge quantities of clothes, 10 or 20 times the result of the clothes and textile collection (*Spinnstoffsammlung*) which is only arranged in order to conceal the source of these Jewish, Polish, Czech, and other clothes. Your other duties will be to change the method of our gas chambers (which are run at the present time with the exhaust gases of an old 'Diesel' engine), employing more poisonous material, having a quicker effect, prussic acid. But the Fuehrer and Himmler who were here on 15 August – the day before yesterday – ordered that I accompany personally all those who are to see the installations. Then Professor Pfannenstiel asked: 'What does the Fuehrer say?' Then Globocnek, now Chief of Police and SS for the Adriatic Riviera to Trieste, answered: 'Quicker, quicker, carry out the whole program!' he said. And then Dr. Herbert Lindner, director in the Ministry of the Interior said: 'But would it not be better to burn the bodies instead of burying them? A coming generation might think differently of these matters!' And then Globocnek replied: 'But, gentlemen, if ever, after us such a cowardly and rotten generation should arise that they do not understand our so good and necessary work, then, gentlemen, all National Socialism will have been for nothing. On the contrary, bronze plates should be buried with the inscription that it was we, who had the courage to achieve this gigantic task'. And Hitler said: 'Yes, my good Globocnek, that is the word, that is my opinion, too'.

The next day we left for Belcek. A small special station of two platforms leans against a hill of yellow sand, immediately to the north of the road and railways: Lublin-Lemberg. To the South, near the road, some service houses with a signboard: 'Belcec, service center of the Waffen SS'. Globocnek introduced me to SS Hauptsturmfuehrer Overmeyer from Pirmasens, who with great restraint showed me the installations. That day no dead were to be seen, but the smell of the whole region, even from the large road, was pestilential. Next to the small station there was a large barrack marked 'Cloakroom' and a door marked 'Valuables'. Next a chamber with a hundred 'barber' chairs. Then came a corridor, 150 meters long, in the open air and with barbed wire on both sides. There was a signboard: 'To the bath and inhalations'. Before us we saw a house like a bath house with concrete troughs to the right and left containing geraniums or other flowers. After climbing a small staircase, 3 garage-like rooms on each side, 4 x 5 meters large and 1.90 meters high. At the back, invisible wooden doors. On the roof a Star of David made out of copper. At the entrance to the building, the inscription: Heckenholt Foundation. That was all I noticed on that particular afternoon.

Next morning, a few minutes before 7, I was informed: In 10 minutes the first train will arrive. And instead, a few minutes later the first train came in from Lemberg. 45 cars, containing 6,700 persons, 1,450 of whom were already dead on their arrival. Behind the little barbed wire opening, children, yellow, scared half to death, women, men. The train arrives: 200 Ukrainians, forced to do this work, open the doors, and drive all of the people out of the

coaches with leather whips. Then, through a huge loudspeaker instructions are given: to undress completely, also to give up false teeth and glasses – some in the barracks, others right in the open air, to tie one's shoes together with a little piece of string handed everyone by a small Jewish boy of 4 years of age, hand in all valuables and money at the window marked 'Valuables', without bond, without receipt. Then the women and girls go to the hairdresser, who cut off their hair in one or two strokes, after which it vanishes into huge potato bags 'to be used for special submarine equipment, door mats, etc.', as the SS Unterscharführer on duty told me. Then the march begins: Right and left, barbed wire, behind, two dozen Ukrainians with guns. Led by a young girl of striking beauty they approach. With police Captain Wirth, I stand right before the death chambers. Completely naked they march by, men, women, girls, babies, even one-legged persons, all of them naked. In one corner a strong SS man tells the poor devils, in a strong deep voice: 'Nothing whatever will happen to you. All you have to do is to breathe deeply, it strengthens the lungs; this inhalation is a necessary measure against contagious diseases, it is a very good disinfectant!' Asked what was to become of them, he answered: 'Well, of course, the men will have to work, building streets and houses. But the women do not have to. If they wish to, they can help in house or kitchen'. Once more, a little bit of hope for some of these poor people, enough to make them march on without resistance to the death chambers. Most of them, though, know everything, the odor has given them a clear indication of their fate. And then they walk up the little staircase – and see the truth! Mothers, nurse-maids, with babies at their breasts, naked, lots of children of all ages, naked too; they hesitate, but they enter the gas chambers, most of them without a word, pushed by the others behind them, chased by the whips of the SS men. A Jewess of about 40 years of age, with eyes like torches, calls down the blood of her children on the heads of their murderers. Five lashes into her face, dealt by the whip of Police Captain Wirth himself, chase her into the gas chamber. Many of them say their prayers, others ask: 'Who will give us the water for our death?' (Jewish rite?). Within the chambers, the SS press the people closely together, Captain Wirth had ordered: 'Fill them up full'. Naked men stand on the feet of the others. 700-800 crushed together on 25 square meters, in 45 cubic meters! The doors are closed. Meanwhile the rest of the transport, all naked, wait. Somebody says to me: 'Naked also in winter! But they can die that way!' The answer was: 'Well, that's just what they are here for!' And at that moment I understood why it was called 'Heckenholt Foundation'. Heckenholt was the man in charge of the 'Diesel' engine, the exhaust gases of which were to kill these poor devils. SS Unterscharführer Heckenholt tries to set the Diesel engine moving. But it does not start! Captain Wirth comes along. It is plain that he is afraid because I am a witness to this breakdown. Yes, indeed, I see everything and wait. Everything is registered by my stopwatch. 50 minutes, 70 minutes – the Diesel engine does not start! The people wait in their gas chambers. In vain. One can hear them cry. 'Same as in a synagogue', says SS Sturmbannführer Professor Dr. Pfannenstiel, Professor for Public Health at the Univer-

sity of Marburg/Lahn, holding his ear close to the wooden door. Captain Wirth, furious, deals the Ukrainian who is helping Heckenholt 11 or 12 lashes in the face with his whip. After 2 hours and 49 minutes, as registered by my stopwatch, the Diesel engine starts. Up to that moment the people in the four already filled chambers were alive, 4 times 750 persons in 4 times 45 cubic meters. Another 25 minutes go by. Many of the people, it is true, are dead at that point. One can see this through the little window through which the electric lamp reveals, for a moment, the inside of the chamber. After 28 minutes only a few are living. After 32 minutes, finally, all are dead! From the other side, Jewish workers open the wooden doors. In return for their terrible job, they have been promised their freedom and a small percentage of the valuables and the money found. Like stone statues, the dead are still standing, there having been no room to fall or bend over. Though dead, the families can still be recognized, their hands still clasped. It is difficult to separate them in order to clear the chamber for the next load. The bodies are thrown out, blue, wet with sweat and urine, the legs covered with excrement and menstrual blood. Everywhere among the others, the bodies of babies and children. But there is not time! Two dozen workers are engaged in checking the mouths, opening them by means of iron hooks: 'Gold to the left, without gold to the right!' Others check anus and genitals to look for money, diamonds, gold, etc. Dentists with chisels tear out the gold teeth, bridges or caps. In the center of everything, Captain Wirth. He is on familiar ground here. He hands me a large tin full of teeth and says: 'Estimate for yourself the weight of gold. This is only from yesterday and the day before yesterday! And you would not believe what we find here every day! Dollars, diamonds, gold! But look for yourself!' Then he led me to a jeweler who was in charge of all these valuables. After that they took me to one of the managers of the big store of the west, Kaufhaus des Westens, Berlin, and to a little man whom they made play the violin, both chiefs of the Jewish worker commands. 'He is a captain of the royal and imperial (K.u.K.) Austrian Army, who held the German Iron Cross 1st Class', I was told by Hauptsturmfuehrer Obermeyer. The bodies were then thrown into large ditches of about 100 x 20 x 12 meters, located near the gas chambers. After a few days the bodies would swell up and the whole contents of the ditch would rise 2-3 meters high because of the gases that developed in the bodies. After a few more days swelling would stop and the bodies would collapse. The next day the ditches were filled again, and covered with 10 centimeters of sand. A little later, I heard, they constructed grills out of rails and burned the bodies on them with Diesel oil and gasoline in order to make them disappear. At Belcek and Treblinka nobody bothered to take anything approaching an exact count of the persons killed. The figures announced by the BBC are inaccurate. Actually, about 25,000,000 persons were killed; not only Jews, however, but especially Poles and Czechoslovakians, too, who were, in the opinion of the Nazis, of bad stock. Most of them died anonymously. Commissions of so-called doctors, actually nothing but young SS men in white coats, rode in limousines through the towns and villages of Poland and Cze-



choslovakia to select the old, tubercular and sick people and to cause them to disappear, shortly afterwards, in the gas chambers. They were the Poles and Czechs of [category] No. III, who did not deserve to live because they were unable to work. The Police Captain Wirth asked me not to propose any other kind of gas chamber in Berlin, to leave everything the way it was. I lied – as I did in each case all the time – that the prussic acid had already deteriorated in shipping and had become very dangerous, that I was therefore obliged to bury it. This was done right away.

The next day, Captain Wirth's car took us to Treblinka, about 120 km NNE of Warsaw. The installations of this death center differed scarcely from those at Belzec but they were still larger. There were 8 gas chambers and whole mountains of clothes and underwear about 35 – 40 meters high. Then, in our 'Honor' a banquet was given, attended by all of the employees of the institution. The Obersturmbannfuhrer Professor Pfannenstiel MD, Professor of Hygiene at the University of Marburg/Lahn, made a speech: 'Your task is a great duty, a duty so useful and so necessary'. To me alone he talked of this institution in terms of 'beauty of the task, humane cause', and to all of them: 'Looking at the bodies of these Jews one understands the greatness of your good work!' The dinner in itself was rather simple, but by order of Himmler the employees of this branch received as much as they wanted as far as butter, meat, alcohol, etc. were concerned. When we left we were offered several kilograms of butter and a large number of bottles of liqueur. I made the effort of lying, saying that I had enough of everything from our own farm, so Pfannenstiel took my portion, too.

We left for Warsaw by car. While I waited in vain for a vacant bed, I met Baron von Otter, Secretary of the Swedish Legation. As all the beds were occupied, we spent the night in the corridor of the sleeper. There, with the facts still fresh in my memory, I told him everything, asking him to report it to his government and to all the Allies. As he asked for a reference with regard to myself, I gave him, as such, the address of the Superintendent General, D. Otto Dibelius, Berlin-Lichterfelde West, Bruederweg 2, a friend of Martin Niemoeller and chief of the Protestant resistance against Nazism. Some weeks later I met Baron von Otter twice again. He told me that he had sent a report to the Swedish Government, a report which, according to him, had a strong influence on the relations between Sweden and Germany. I was not very successful in my attempt to report everything to the chief of the Vatican Legation. I was asked whether I was a soldier, and then was refused an interview. I then sent a detailed report to Dr. Winter, secretary of the Berlin Episcopate, in order to have him pass it on to the bishop of Berlin and through him to the Vatican Legation. When I came out of the Vatican Legation in the Rauchstrasse in Berlin, I had a very dangerous encounter with a police agent who followed me. However, after some very unpleasant moments I succeeded in giving him the slip.

I have to add, furthermore, that in the beginning of 1944, SS Sturmbannfuhrer Guenther of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt asked me for very large supplies of prussic acid for obscure use. The acid was to be delivered to his

business office in Berlin, Kurfuerstenstrasse. I succeeded in making him believe that this was impossible because there was too much danger involved. It was a question of several carloads of poisonous acid, enough to kill a large number of persons, actually millions! He had told me he was not sure whether, when, for what kind of persons, how and where this poison was needed. I do not know exactly what were the intentions of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt and the SD. But later on, I thought of the words of Goebbels of 'slamming the door behind them' should Nazism never succeed. Maybe they wanted to kill a large part of the German people, maybe the foreign workers, maybe the prisoners of war – I do not know! Anyhow, I caused the poison to disappear for disinfestation purposes, as soon as it came in. There was some danger for me in this, but if I had been asked where the poisonous acid was, I would have answered that it was already in a state of dangerous deterioration and that therefore I had to use it up as disinfestant! I am sure that Guenther, the son of the Guenther of the Racial Theory, had, according to his own words, orders to secure the acid for the – eventual – extermination of millions of human beings, perhaps also in concentration camps. I have here bills for 2,175 kgs, but, actually about 8,500 kgs are involved; enough to kill 8 million people. I had the bills sent to me in my name; I said this was for reasons of secrecy; however, I did this in order to be somewhat free in my decisions and to have a better possibility of making the poisonous acid disappear. I never paid for these shipments in order to avoid refunding, which would have reminded the SD of these stocks. The director of Degesch, who had made these shipments, told me that he had shipped prussic acid in ampoules for the purpose of killing human beings. On another occasion Guenther consulted me about the possibility of killing a large number of Jews in the open air in the fortification trenches of Maria-Theresienstadt. In order to prevent the execution of this diabolic proposal, I declared that this method was impracticable. Some time later I heard that the SD had secured, through other channels, the prussic acid to kill these unfortunate people at Theresienstadt. The most disgusting camps were not Oranienburg, Dachau, or Belsen, but Auschwitz (Oswice) and Mauthausen-Gusen near Linz/Danube. These are the places in which millions of people disappeared in gas chambers or gas chamber-like cars. The method of killing the children was to hold a tampon with prussic acid under their nose.

I myself witnessed experiments on living persons in concentration camps being continued until the victim died. Thus, in the concentration camp for women, Ravensbruck near Fuerstenberg-Mecklenburg, SS Hauptsturmführer Grundlach MD made such experiments. In my office, I read many reports of experiments made at Buchenwald, such as the administration of up to 100 tablets of Pervitine per day. Other experiments – every time on about 100-200 persons – were made with serums and lymph, etc., till the death of the person. Himmler personally had reserved for himself the granting of permission to conduct these experiments.

At Oranienburg, I saw how all the prisoners who were there for being perverts (homosexuals) disappeared in one single day.

*I avoided frequent visits to the concentration camps because it was customary, especially at Mauthausen-Gusen near Linz-Danube, to hang one or two prisoners in honor of the visitors. At Mauthausen it was customary to make Jewish workers work in a quarry at great altitude. After a while the SS on duty would say: 'Pay attention, in a couple of minutes there will be an accident'. And, indeed, one or two minutes later, some Jews were thrown from the cliff and fell dead at our feet. 'Work accident' was written in the files of the dead. Dr. Fritz Krantz, an anti-Nazi SS Hauptsturmfuehrer, often told me of such events. He condemned them severely and often published facts about them. The crimes discovered at Belsen, Oranienburg, etc., are not considerable in comparison with the others committed at Auschwitz and Mauthausen.*

*I plan to write a book about my adventures with the Nazis.*

*I am ready to swear to the absolute truth of all my statements.*

[signed by hand:] Kurt Gerstein”

It is difficult to believe that anybody intended that this “statement” be taken seriously. A few specific points are examined here, but on the whole, I leave the reader to marvel at it. The part printed in the NMT volumes starts at “Hearing of the massacres” and ends at “one understands the greatness of your good work!” However, the remark about the BBC and the 25 million gas chamber victims is deleted. The version used by Eichmann’s Jerusalem tribunal was far more drastically edited.<sup>438</sup>

The original version of this book presented a very faithful reproduction of the English translation provided by the Nuremberg staff, a shortcut that I came to regret. For example, where it says above “Naked also in winter!”, the French was “aussi en hiver nus!” However, in my original version it read “Naked in winter!”, because that is how the Nuremberg staff rendered it. This caused a misunderstanding on my part that I passed along to readers; the events were supposed to have happened in August, but the incorrect translation implied it was winter. Thus, I have attempted here to bring the English text into closer conformity with the French language original. I have also been able to use the subsequent work of Henri Roques, which was the basis for a 1985 Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Nantes.

In this book, it has been the practice not to give SS ranks since these would not be understood by most readers; an Oberscharführer sounds just as important as an Obergruppenführer. Approximate contemporaneous U.S. Army equivalents have been used instead (these correspondences are given in Appendix B). However, in presenting the Gerstein statement, this practice has not been adhered to on account of the document’s lack of both descriptive and orthographic consistency. For example, Pfannenstiel is identified as both an “Obersturmbannfuehrer” (Lieutenant Colonel) and as a “Sturmbannführer” (Major). In the translation of the Nuremberg staff he became a “Sturmfuehrer”. We see both the correct “Reichssicherheitshauptamt” and the incorrect “ReichsSicherheitsHauptamt” and, below, “Reichs-Sicherheitshauptamt”. Below we also see both “Niemöller” and “Niemoeller”. It

---

<sup>438</sup> Rassinier (1964), 93-106.

is difficult to believe that a German could have followed such practices in a statement written out voluntarily.

No two people could possibly agree on how such deranged material should be presented in English. Do not assume that an obvious error is mine. As for the very long paragraphs, that is the way the document came. For the sake of the reader, I even inserted a couple paragraph breaks that were not there.

It may seem impossible to squeeze 700 or 800 people into a chamber 20 or 25 meters square and 1.9 meters high, but it is possible if one uses a scrap press, but in that case the victims would be literally, just as the document asserts, "crushed," and gassing would be quite superfluous.

It is of passing interest that in the original document "Warsaw" is not referred to via the German or French names for the city, but via the Polish "Warsawa."

As Rassinier has put it: if it is not true that Hitler made the said visit to Lublin-Majdanek,<sup>439</sup> if it is not true that 700 to 800 people can be contained in a gas chamber of 25 square meters, if it is not true that the Germans gassed 25 million people, and since the document contains little else, then we should ask: what does it contain that is true?

The role of Baron von Otter, a young Swedish diplomat during the war, was scrutinized in the postwar period. No confirmation of the Gerstein-Otter meetings had come from any Swedish source during the war, *i.e.*, before the document we have examined was created. Moreover, everybody knows that there was no friction in Sweden's relationship with Germany over the allegations attributed to Gerstein or anything similar.

In the immediate postwar period, the Allies were eager to organize support for their atrocity charges. Having the Gerstein document in hand but no Gerstein, they approached Baron Lagerfelt, a Swedish diplomat in London, to ask him to press von Otter to confirm the Gerstein story. Von Otter was then stationed in Helsinki, and Lagerfelt was a personal friend. These communications took place in July 1945, but Lagerfelt's success was only partial. He was able to compose an *aide-mémoire* for the Swedish Foreign Office, dated August 7, 1945, confirming the substance of what the Gerstein statement says about the meetings with von Otter, but he did not identify von Otter. The *aide-mémoire* identifies only "a foreign diplomat of a neutral country", and the country is not even named.<sup>440</sup> In 1945, von Otter evidently refused to allow his name to be used to confirm the story in an official document. However, in submitting the document, Lagerfelt was covered by his private correspondence with von Otter.

Von Otter's wish for anonymity in a 1945 report to his own Foreign Office raises problems. First, there was a document, our 1553-PS, that named him, so the maneuver was futile. Perhaps at that early point von Otter did not grasp that a document naming him was to get into the public record. That view was understandable; the Nuremberg trials were months off, and 1553-PS had not yet become notorious.

The second problem in interpreting von Otter's wish for anonymity is that the

<sup>439</sup> *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (April 1953), 177-185, esp. note 39a.

<sup>440</sup> Roques, 312.

Gerstein statement presents him as having told Gerstein, at a subsequent meeting in 1942, that he had reported the allegations to the Swedish Foreign Office. Why then the wish for anonymity in 1945? A more basic question: why was a 1945 report to the Foreign Office needed at all, if von Otter had reported the matter in 1942? We shall see.

The Gerstein matter followed von Otter around in the postwar period. The Swedish Foreign Ministry wrote to the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine in Paris on Nov. 10, 1949, attaching a copy of the *aide-mémoire* of August 7, 1945, apparently to a letter naming von Otter. On Nov. 22, 1952, Dibelius, as Lutheran Bishop of Berlin, wrote to the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich, confirming that he not only heard the story of the gassings directly from Gerstein, but had also learned from von Otter, “a few days” after the August 1942 train ride from Warsaw, of the encounter with Gerstein and the contents of his story.<sup>441</sup>

Von Otter does not seem to have confirmed the Gerstein story in a public forum until 1966, during an interview with Pierre Joffroy, author of a book on Gerstein. Von Otter then confirmed the meetings with Gerstein and the associated story, but was very vague on details. He also said that he never transmitted the Gerstein story to Dibelius, as Gerstein had supposedly asked, although he encountered Dibelius by chance in Berlin in the autumn of 1942. (We see that at least one distinguished citizen lied! I think the liar on this point was Dibelius.) On May 29, 1981, von Otter testified in a French trial similarly. In March 1983, von Otter stated in a television interview that his alleged 1942 report of the Gerstein encounter to the Swedish Foreign Office was only oral, not written. Moreover, he never made a personal memorandum of the encounter.<sup>442</sup> That resolves the puzzle of the quest for anonymity in 1945, and the need for a report in 1945. There was no 1942 report to the Swedish Foreign Office. Add that to the 25 million etc., as a falsehood in the document.

As for Dibelius, although he had been a leading member of Hugenberg’s Nazi linked DNVP before 1933, he became associated with the Niemöller led church opposition to the Nazis after 1933. Niemöller was incarcerated in 1935, but Dibelius was allowed to go free, and then he vanished into the obscurity of a minor post in a church welfare organization, being made Bishop after the war ended in 1945. It is not correct to characterize Dibelius as an active member of the war-time resistance, as the Gerstein statements do, thereby inflating his significance well beyond what the facts warrant.<sup>443</sup>

In the relevant reports of Cesare Orsenigo, the Papal Nuncio in Berlin, that have been published by the Vatican, there is of course no reference to Gerstein. See Appendix E.

A German version of the “Gerstein statement”, of essentially the same content, was produced about a year after Gerstein’s disappearance. His wife said that Gerstein had, unknown to her at the time, deposited it among their belongings at the

<sup>441</sup> *Vierteljahrshäfte für Zeitgeschichte* (April 1953), 177-185, esp. p. 181 and note 10.

<sup>442</sup> Roques, 309-313. On the 1983 television interview Roques cites Alain Decaux, *L'Histoire en Question* – 2.

<sup>443</sup> Mosse, 245. *New York Times* (Feb. 1, 1967), 39.

Hotel Mohren in Rottweil. Frau Gerstein's discovery of such a document in the dark days of 1946 naturally buttressed her status as the wife of Saint Gerstein rather than the wife of ordinary SS officer Gerstein, an enviable position for a German at the time. The German version of the "Gerstein statement" is typewritten and unsigned and reproduced by Roques.<sup>444</sup>

What is presented above is what would normally be considered the "Gerstein statement," but the statements allegedly (according to document 1553-PS) deposited by Gerstein in various languages in the spring of 1945 actually continue:

*"Kurt Gerstein, additional statement.*

*In my flat in Berlin W 35, Buelowstrasse 47, second floor, left, I was surrounded by a circle of anti-Nazis. Here are some of their names:*

*Major Lutz Reis, now at Hamburg, Glasurit-Works.*

*Dr. Felix Buss, chief legal counsel to Telefunken, Berlin, SW 11, Hallesches Ufer 30.*

*Director Alex Menne, Hamburg, Glasurit-Works.*

*Pastor Buchholz, chaplain of the Pleetzensee prison, who accompanied the officers of July 20, 1944 to the scaffold. These officers as well as my good friend, Pastor Martin Niemöller, smoked the cigarettes and cigars I got into the prison for them.*

*Pastor Mochalski, who replaced Pastor Martin Niemöller at the Annon Church at Dahlem.*

*Dorothea Schulz, secretary of Pastor Niemöller.*

*Mrs. Arndt, secretary of Pastor Martin Niemoeller at Dachau.*

*Emil Nieuwenhuizen and his friend Hendrik, from Phillips-Eyndhoven, deportees whom I had met at Church and who, for a long time already were my guests twice or three times a week. They had meals at my place, and listened to the wireless.*

*Director Haueisen, Berlin NW 7, Mittelstrasse, Francke printing works.*

*Herbert Scharkowsky, editor, Scherl-Press.*

*Captain Nebelthau and his wife, now at Kirchentellinsfurt-Wurttemberg.*

*Dr. Hermann Ehlers, trustee of the Niemoeller anti-Nazi resistance Church.*

*Dr. Ebbe Elss, same as Dr. Ehlers.*

*Other references: General Superintendent D. Otto Dibelius, 'chief of the Church' resistance against Nazism.*

*Pastor Rehling, Hagen-Westphalia, active in the Westphalia Church anti-Nazi resistance movement.*

*Praeses Dr. Koch, Bad Oeynhausen, likewise.*

*Baron von Huene, anti-Nazi professor of the University of Tuebingen.*

*Bernhard J. Goedecker, Fabrikant, Munich, Tizianstrasse, anti-Nazi.*

*Director Franz Bäuerle, Munich, Siemensstrasse 17, anti-Nazi.*

*The Catholic Priest, Valpertz, Hagen-Westphalia.*

---

<sup>444</sup> Roques, 229-241.

*Pastor Otto Wehr, Sarrebruck.  
Pastors Schlaeger and Bittkau, Neuruppin near Berlin.  
August Franz and his entire family, great anti-Nazi, Sarrebruck, now at  
Talheim-Wurtemberg.  
Doctor Straub, Metzingen-Wurtemberg, and family.  
[unsigned]"*

With the exception of Niemöller and Dibelius, I recognize none of the names on the list of "anti-Nazis" in connection with any known wartime activities, anti-Nazi or otherwise. The only one I recognize in any connection is Dr. Hermann Ehlers, who became a leading CDU politician after the war and who died in 1954. It may be that the person identified as "Praeses Dr. Koch" is supposed to be Dr. Karl Koch, a Protestant theologian who was a member, along with Dibelius, of the DNVP in the Weimar days and who died in 1951.

The next part of document 1553-PS is a letter to Gerstein from DEGESCH regarding the preservability of the Zyklon and the possibilities for future shipments in the face of bombing attacks which had destroyed a plant. The letter would be worth reproducing here only if it, too, were in French (it is in German). The next part of the document is a short handwritten note:

*"According to the annexed notes, the prussic acid was requested by the Reichs-Sicherheitshauptamt, Berlin W 35, Kurfürstendamm, by order of SS Sturmbannführer Guenther. I was in charge of this particular job and I performed my duties very faithfully, so that once the acid had arrived at Oranienburg and Auschwitz, I could have the boxes disappear into the disinfection rooms. Thus it was possible to prevent a misuse of the acid. In order to avoid drawing the attention of the Reichssicherheitshauptamt to the presence – or, as I should say, to the absence – of these stocks, I never paid for these shipments, the bills for which went to the same address, that is, my own. In this manner, it was possible to have the acid disappear as soon as it had arrived. If the absence of the acid had been noticed I would have answered: It is a mistake made by the local disinfection office which did not know, and should not have known, either, the real destination; or I would have said: The acid had become putrefied and it was impossible to keep it any longer.*

*[signed:] Gerstein"*

The final part of the document is the note in English:

<i>"Bergassessor a.D. Kurt Gerstein Diplomingenieur</i>	<i>Domicil permanent: Tuebingen/Neckar, Gartenstr. 24 26 April 1945</i>
---	---

*My report is intressant for Secret Service. The Things, I have seen, no more than 4-5 others have seen, and these others were nazies. Many of responsables of Belsen, Buchenwald, Maidanek, Oswice, Mauthausen, Dachau, etc. were men of my service, daily I have seen them in my double position.*

*1) SS Fuehrungs-Hauptamt, D, Sanitary-service and*

*2) Reichsarzt SS and Polizei, Berlin*

*I am in a situation to say the names and crimes of in reality responsables of*

*this things, and I am ready to give the material for this accusation in World-Tribunal.*

*My-self, cordial friend of reverend Martin Niemöller and his family (now at Leoni/Starnberger See/Bavaria!) I was after two prisons and concentration-camp agent of 'confessional-church,' SS-Obersturmführer and compartment-chief in SS-Führungshauptamt and of Reichsarzt SS and Polizei, a dangerous position!*

*The things I have seen nobody has seen. 1942 August, I have made my reports for Svenska legation in Berlin. I am ready and in situation to say all my observations to your Secret-Service.*

*The secretary of Svenska legation Berlin, now at Stockholm Baron von Otter is ready to be wittnes of my relation of 1942 of all this crueltytys – I propose to demand me for this informations.*

*Reference: Msr. Niemoeller [reverend Martin Niemoeller's women]  
Leoni/Starnberger See/München Bavaria)*

*[signed:] Gerstein*

*Nota: Your army has not find*

*Mr. Niemoeller*

*Mr. Stalin junior*

*Mr. Schuschnigg  
at Dachau.*

*They are deported, nobody now, who they are. Please do not publish my report bevore exactement now: Niemoeller is liberated or dead.*

*Gerstein"*

The remainder of document 1553-PS is the collection of Zyklon invoices. I have made no corrections in the above note in "English". Clearly, it was composed by a person who knew something of the French language. "Mr. Stalin junior" is no doubt a reference to Stalin's son, who was a POW in Germany. Schuschnigg was the Austrian Chancellor at the time of the Anschluss; he and Niemöller had been detained at Dachau for some time. Rassinier has provided an interesting discussion of Niemöller.<sup>445</sup>

---

<sup>445</sup> Rassinier (1964), 35-39.





## Appendix B: SS Ranks

The SS ranks and their approximate U.S. Army equivalents are as follows:

**Table 12: SS ranks and their approximate  
U.S. Army equivalents**

U.S. ARMY	SS
Private	SS Mann
Private First Class	Sturmmann
Corporal	Rottenführer
Sergeant	Unterscharführer
Staff Sergeant	Scharführer
Technical Sergeant	Oberscharführer
Master Sergeant	Hauptscharführer
First Sergeant	Sturmscharführer
Second Lieutenant	Untersturmführer
First Lieutenant	Obersturmführer
Captain	Hauptsturmführer
Major	Sturmbannführer
Lieutenant Colonel	Obersturmbannführer
Colonel	Standartenführer
Colonel	Oberführer
Brigadier General	Brigadeführer
Lieutenant General	Gruppenführer
General	Obergruppenführer
General of the Army	Oberstgruppenführer

One can exercise a certain amount of choice on this subject. The three grades of *Gruppenführer* are sometimes equated with Major General, Lieutenant General and General, respectively. An *Oberführer* is sometimes described as a “Senior Colonel” or a Brigadier General; in the latter case a *Brigadeführer* is equated with a Major General.

These ranks had their origin in the early days when the SS was something of an offshoot of the SA, which had similar ranks.



## Appendix C: Deportation of Jews

The six booklets which are the Netherlands Red Cross report entitled *Auschwitz* are actually about the approximately 100 transports of Jews which left the Netherlands, the first leaving on July 15, 1942, and the last on September 13, 1944. Auschwitz was the immediate destination of about two-thirds of the deported Jews, although large numbers were also sent to Sobibor, and some were sent to Theresienstadt, Bergen-Belsen, and Ravensbrück. The Netherlands Red Cross (NRC) data is exhaustive in regard to all matters pertaining to the transports while they were in the Netherlands; the dates of departure, the destinations of the transports, and the numbers of people in each transport, with breakdowns of the numbers according to sex and age. The authors assume that all Jews whom they are unable to account for, after the Jews reached their immediate destination, were gassed or perished in some other manner. Thus, they conclude that a majority of the approximately 100,000 Jews deported from the Netherlands perished, since, obviously, their study is very short on data regarding what happened at the camps when these people reached them. There are, however, exceptions to those statements; there is data regarding the evacuation of Auschwitz in 1945 and there are other bits, *e.g.*, data from the Monowitz hospital. The most significant data, however, is what is said to be the registration and death record from the Birkenau men's camp for the period July 16 to August 19, 1942, which is presented in volume two of the report. Because the NRC also provides detailed data regarding the Jewish transports from Westerbork (transit camp in the Netherlands) during this period, a comparison can be made, and the comparison (as Reitlinger admits) contradicts the claim that a majority or even a significant number of the Jews were immediately gassed on arrival at Auschwitz. There were thirteen transports from Westerbork in July and August, 1942, and they were composed as follows:

**Table 13: Men transported from Westerbork in July and August, 1942**

DATE	TOTAL	BREAK-DOWN BY AGE						
		0-12	13-15	16-17	18-35	36-50	51-60	61+
15-Jul	663	41	9	85	356	157	11	4
16-Jul	640	32	7	41	285	193	62	20
21-Jul	511	62	14	54	317	61	2	1
24-Jul	573	51	6	83	340	75	11	7
27-Jul	542	60	17	90	315	55	4	1
31-Jul	540	47	13	93	326	56	5	
3-Aug	520	72	21	31	255	139	1	1
7-Aug	510	67	28	21	172	168	48	6
10-Aug	288	18	8	19	93	97	45	8
14-Aug	238	43	14	5	36	68	72	
17-Aug	364	36	8	11	247	60	2	

DATE	TOTAL	BREAK-DOWN BY AGE						
		0-12	13-15	16-17	18-35	36-50	51-60	61+
21-Aug	493	56	12	49	269	97	9	1
24-Aug	351	26	5	19	192	78	23	8
TOTAL	6233	611	162	601	3,203	1,304	295	57

**Table 14: Women transported from Westerbork in July and August, 1942**

DATE	TOTAL	BREAK-DOWN BY AGE						
		0-12	13-15	16-17	18-35	36-50	51-60	61+
15-Jul	472	36	3	38	318	74	3	
16-Jul	255	28	6	27	161	32		1
21-Jul	420	53	8	36	268	54	1	
24-Jul	427	52	3	42	273	51	6	
27-Jul	468	55	13	50	291	55	4	
31-Jul	467	65	10	51	296	44	1	
3-Aug	493	85	17	29	232	129	1	
7-Aug	477	74	21	26	167	175	13	1
10-Aug	271	19	8	12	99	109	23	1
14-Aug	267	53	19	3	43	100	49	
17-Aug	142	18	6	12	49	53	4	
21-Aug	515	58	16	36	253	132	19	1
24-Aug	168	26	8	6	63	39	18	8
Total	4,842	622	138	368	2,513	1,047	142	12

**Table 15: Total deportations from Westerbork, July – August 1942**

DATE	TOTAL	MEN	WOMEN	
			WITHOUT CHILDREN	WITH CHILDREN TO 15 YEARS
15-Jul	1,135	663	472	63
16-Jul	895	640	255	42
21-Jul	931	511	420	83
24-Jul	1,000	573	427	75
27-Jul	1,010	542	468	85
31-Jul	1,007	540	467	81
3-Aug	1,013	520	493	104
7-Aug	987	510	477	96
10-Aug	559	288	271	35
14-Aug	505	238	267	52
17-Aug	506	364	142	26
21-Aug	1,008	493	515	85
24-Aug	519	351	168	39
Total	11,075	6,233	4,842	866

The data said to be from the Birkenau men’s camp is now presented, in order to be compared with the preceding Westerbork data. Column 1, below, gives the

times (morning, M, and evening, E) of the roll-calls at Birkenau, column 2 gives the date of the roll call, column 3 gives the total number counted in the roll call, column 4 gives the number who died between roll calls, column 5 gives the number of new arrivals registered between roll calls, and column 6 gives the number lost between roll-calls on account of release or escape. In column 7 are comments on the origins of the various transports to the camps, and the transports from Westerbork are indicated. Pithiviers, Drancy, and Beaune la Rolande were assembly points in France for Jewish transports, and Mechelen had the same function in Belgium. The transports from Slovakia were probably Jewish transports, but the composition of those from Poland is rather problematical. Where “various nationalities” (var. nat.) are indicated, the transports were most probably composed predominantly of political prisoners and ordinary criminals. Column 8 gives registration numbers assigned to the people indicated in column 5.

**Table 16: Birkenau registration number assignments, July 1942**

	DATE	TOTAL	DIED	NEW	LOST	ORIGINS	NUMBERS
M	16-Jul	16246	40	22			
E		16277	100	131			
M	17-Jul	16848	30	601		Westerbork 15-Jul	47087-47687
E		16950	83	185		var. nat.	47688-47842
M	18-Jul	17902	25	977		Westerbork 16-Jul Slovakia	47843-48493 48494-48819
E		17846	101	46	1		
M	19-Jul	17852	18	24		var. nat.	48820-48901
E		17770	82				
M	20-Jul	18526	53	809		Pithiviers 17-Jul	48902-49670
E		18478	122	74			
M	21-Jul	18450	28			var. nat.	49671-49795
E		18361	110	21			
M	22-Jul	18963	18	620		Pithiviers 19-Jul	49796-50270
E		18847	125	9		var. nat.	50271-50405
M	23-Jul	19312	14	479		Westerbork	50406-50884
E		19319	127	134		Poland	50885-51002
M	24-Jul	19717	13	411		Drancy 20-Jul	51003-51413
E		19635	173	91		Poland etc.	51414-51503
M	25-Jul	20415	11	791		Drancy 22-Jul var. nat.	51504-52102 52103-52115
E		20278	208	73	2	Slovakia var. nat.	52116-52332 52333-52367
M	26-Jul	20767	26	515		Westerbork 24-Jul	52368-52882
E		20696	71				
M	27-Jul	21038	28	370		Pithiviers 24-Jul	52883-53252
E		20939	167	69	1	var. nat.	53253-53325
M	28-Jul	20914	24		1		

	DATE	TOTAL	DIED	NEW	LOST	ORIGINS	NUMBERS
E		20713	205	4			
M	29-Jul	21163	23	473		Westerbork 27-Jul	53326-53790
E		21094	100	31		var. nat.	53791-53829
M	30-Jul	21327	16	249		Pithiviers 27-Jul	53830-54078
E		21236	91				
M	31-Jul	21220	16				
E		21183	113	76		var. nat.	54079-54154

**Table 17: Birkenau registration number assignments, August 1942**

	DATE	TOTAL	DIED	NEW	LOST	ORIGINS	NUMBERS
M	1-Aug	21421	32	270		Pithiviers 29-Jul	54155-54424
E		21489	98	166		Slovakia	54425-54590
M	2-Aug	21953	31	495		Westerbork 31-Jul var. nat.	54591-55071 55072-55085
E		21882	71				
M	3-Aug	22534	41	693		Pithiviers 31-Jul	55086-55778
E		22478	107	51			
M	4-Aug	22443	35			var. nat.	55779-55840
E		22354	100	11			
M	5-Aug	22796	38	480		var. nat Westerbork 3-Aug	55841-55907 55908-56334
E		22781	82	67		var. nat	56335-56387
M	6-Aug	22759	44	22		var. nat	56388-56409
E		23127	78	446		Mechelen 4-Aug	56410-56855
M	7-Aug	23079	48				
E		23065	93	79		var. nat.	56856-56991
M	8-Aug	23383	55	373		Beaune la Rolande 5-Aug	56992-57308
E		23353	121	91		var. nat.?	57309-57399
M	9-Aug	23598	70	315		Westerbork 7-Aug	57400-57714
E		23500	98				
M	10-Aug	23483	80	63		var. nat.	57715-57777
E		23392	219	128		Pithiviers 7-Aug	57778-57905
M	11-Aug	23336	56				
E		23109	232	5		var. nat.	57906-57910
M	12-Aug	23204	69	164		Westerbork 10-Aug	57911-58074
E		23010	205	11		var. nat.	58075-58085
M	13-Aug	23106	44	140		Drancy 10-Aug?	58086-58225
E		23199	213	306		Mechelen 11-Aug?	58226-58531
M	14-Aug	23088	111				
E		22984	206	102		???	58532-58633
M	15-Aug	23073	63	152		Drancy 12-Aug	58634-58785

	DATE	TOTAL	DIED	NEW	LOST	ORIGINS	NUMBERS
E		23166	177	270		???	58786-59055
M	16-Aug	23222	109	165		Westerbork 14-Aug	59056-59220
E		23097	134	9		var. nat.	59221-59229
M	17-Aug	23085	127	115		Drancy 14-Aug	59230-59344
E		23183	157	255		Mechelen 15-Aug	59345-59599
M	18-Aug	23096	92	5		var. nat.	59600-59604
E		23112	390	87		var. nat.	59605-59691
M	19-Aug	23112		319		Westerbork 17-Aug	59692-60010
E		22925	220	33		var. nat.	60011-60043
TOTALS (JUL. & AUG.)			6507	13173	5		

To give an example of interpretation of these figures, we see that between the evening of July 16 and the morning of July 17, 1942, the Westerbork transport of July 15 arrived at Auschwitz, and that 601 men from this transport were registered in the Birkenau men's camp and assigned registration numbers 47087-47687. During this period, 30 men also died in the camp, so the net change in the roll-call figure is  $601 - 30 = 16848 - 16277 = 571$ . Note that the 601 men from the Westerbork transport of July 15 are approximately the total men that started out on that transport, if one subtracts boys through 15 years of age. Since the table of Westerbork deportations has a separate column for "Women with children to 15 years," it is most probable that such children went with the women.

We have taken the liberty of making two corrections of obvious errors in the Birkenau men's camp data. The NRC report specified that 43 died between the evening of August 5 and 6, but a figure of 44 deaths brings agreement with the roll-call figures and the total of column 4. Also, the NRC report specifies that the Mechelen transport of August 15 received registration numbers 59345-59699, an obvious error which has been corrected.

The increments in registration numbers in column 8 do not agree in all cases with the numbers reported in column 5. Indeed, this is the case with the majority of transports, which arrived between July 17 and July 24, and it is also true of the transports, which received registration numbers 56856-57308. However, in all other cases the registration numbers in column 8 agree with the figures in column 5.

When boys through 15 years of age are subtracted from the total of men in the various deportations from Westerbork, the resulting figures are in good general agreement with the numbers reported registered in the Birkenau men's camp, although for reasons that one can probably guess, the agreement is not perfect. There were probably small numbers who either joined the incoming transports and are not listed as such or numbers who were not accepted into Birkenau for various reasons and sent to another destination. The largest unaccounted differences are in connection with the Westerbork transports of August 7 and August 10, where about 100 men are missing in each case in the registration at Birkenau.

This data, plus the one volume of the Birkenau Death Book (which is also discussed in vol. 1 of the NRC reports, except that it is referred to as the Auschwitz



Death Book there), confirm the WRB report claim that there was a great epidemic at Auschwitz in the summer of 1942, forcing work there to stop. We know of no data covering a substantially later period, which reports comparably high death rates at Auschwitz, although, as explained in the text, the death rate there was always deplorably high from 1942 on.<sup>446</sup>

---

<sup>446</sup> The *Kalendarium*, published in 1964 in German, says that of 1500 people in a transport that arrived at Auschwitz on April 16, 1944, from the camp in Drancy, France, a certain number of the men were registered as inmates and the others gassed. Many years ago Robert Faurisson pointed out that, according to the deportation lists, "the others" included Simone Veil, who, as Faurisson wrote, was the first President of the European Parliament (see his articles "Le 'ghetto-boy' et Simone Veil: deux symboles de l'imposture du génocide?", Dec. 1979; "Response to a Paper Historian," *Journal of Historical Review* 7(1) (1986), pp. 21-72). Later, I noticed that the English translation of the *Kalendarium*, published in 1990 (D. Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945*), engages in a little bit of revisionism on this and now says some of the women were registered. A document from the International Tracing Service, Arolsen, Germany, is cited.

## Appendix D: The Belsen Trial

Josef Kramer's two statements, as they appear in Phillips, ed., *Trial of Josef Kramer*:

### ***“Statement Of Josef Kramer***

*I was born on 10th November, 1906, at Munich. I am married and have three children. I volunteered for the S.S. in 1932; I had no training whatsoever, and was detailed for duty in a concentration camp. I did not volunteer for this specific kind of duty. When war broke out the S.S. was taken over by the Army and I volunteered for active service, as I would have preferred a fighting job, but I was told that I would have to do the job for which I was detailed. My first rank was Unterscharführer and my promotion to Scharführer and Oberscharführer was in 1934 and 1935. I cannot remember the dates.*

*Dachau. In 1936 I was in the office of the concentration camp at Dachau. The Kommandant of that camp was Standartenführer Loritz. There were only German prisoners in the camp. I cannot be absolutely certain, but as far as I can remember, they were all German. The S.S. Unit was Wachtruppe, Ober-Bayern. There were only political prisoners, criminals and anti-socials in this camp. Anti-socials are people like beggars and gypsies and people who do not want to work. No death sentences were carried out in the camp. The only cases in which people were killed was when they were trying to escape, in which case the guard had orders to shoot. In the case of any shootings, whilst prisoners were trying to escape, investigations were made by the Police. I left this camp at the beginning of June 1937.*

*Sachsenhausen. From Dachau I went to Sachsenhausen Concentration Camp. I had been promoted to commissioned rank, outside the establishment, to Untersturmführer. When I went to Sachsenhausen I was on the establishment there. The prisoners at Sachsenhausen consisted of the same three types as at the previous camp. The Kommandant of the camp was Standartenführer Baranowsky. There were no death sentences carried out in this camp. I was in charge of the mail department and therefore did not know everything that was going on, but have heard occasionally that people have been shot while trying to escape.*

*Mauthausen. My next concentration camp was Mauthausen in Austria. This camp was just being built when I arrived. The Kommandant was Standartenführer Ziereis. Here I had the same rank as before. Whilst in this camp I was promoted to Obersturmführer. I think this was in January, 1939. I was a sort of adjutant in charge of the office and at the disposal of the Kommandant. The prisoners were all Germans and of the same three types as I have described before. The last type, i.e. rogues and vagabonds, were mainly Austrians, as there seemed to have been many when Austria was taken over by Germany. There were between 1500 and 2000 prisoners and they were all men. This in-*

cludes Jewish prisoners. There was sufficient room in the camp for all prisoners when I was there. None of the prisoners knew at the time they arrived when they were going to leave. There were only a few who had a sentence like three months or six months, and the biggest part of the prisoners were there for an undefined period. Solitary confinement and solitary confinement with bread and water, or extra work on Sundays, were the sentences awarded for breaches of discipline. The prisoners were never beaten, nor do I know of any case of shooting. There were prison-breaks, but I was never present when somebody tried to escape. I was in the office and the telephone would ring and one of the guards would report that one of the prisoners had tried to escape. It was my duty then to go out and see where the prisoner worked and how it was possible for him to escape. We then notified the police and gave particulars of the person who had escaped. The instructions were that no prisoners had to go beyond a certain border-line. If a prisoner did, the guard had to challenge him three times with the words, 'Halt, or I shoot,' then first fire a shot in the air and only the second shot to kill. It is difficult to say how many shootings of this kind took place whilst I was at the camp because it is such a long time ago. I think that 10 to 15 people were shot, but I cannot say exactly. Every case of shooting had to be reported to the authorities at Mauthausen and at Linz. The nearest big town carried out an investigation. If someone was shot at, or shot whilst escaping, the guard was immediately put under a sort of open arrest, but none was ever convicted of wrongful shooting. Most of the people who were shot in this manner were criminals or vagabonds, the reason being that the larger part of the inmates of the camp belonged to that category.

The deaths that occurred were mostly from natural causes. When somebody died his relatives and the authorities, who had sent them to the concentration camp, had to be notified. There was one very severe winter when the deaths rose, but otherwise there were very few deaths. The prisoners were kept in wooden huts with three-tier beds, 250 to 300 in a hut. Whilst I was at this camp, Obergruppenführer Eike, who was in charge of all concentration camps, visited the camp three or four times, but I cannot remember the dates. There were no war prisoners in this camp. A few more political prisoners came in, but there were no great increases. Their nationality was mostly Austrian. There was no member of the former Austrian Government or of Schusnigg's Party either in Dachau or Mauthausen. I was in charge of the office and I dealt with the incoming and the outgoing mail on behalf of the Kommandant. I would read the mail to him and he would give me his orders, which I would pass on to the various sub-commanders. The powers of the Kommandant, with regard to punishment of prisoners, were not exactly laid down, but I think he could give up to 21 days. He was the only one who had disciplinary powers. I do not know the number of prisoners when I left in 1940, but the camp was full. The strength was recorded every day, but I cannot remember now what the number was. Some of the prisoners were sent away to other camps. These transfers were made not according to the type of prisoners but according to the type of work we wanted done, and according to their trades.

*Whilst I was there, some people were released back to freedom. I cannot remember whether they were political prisoners or others, but I remember that on Hitler's birthday, 20th April, 1940, I saw 50 prisoners in the courtyard who were going to be released.*

*Auschwitz. I went to Auschwitz in May 1940. I lived outside the camp in a village with my family. I had an office in the camp where I worked during the day. The Kommandant of the camp was Obersturmführer Höss. I was adjutant. I do not know what the number of the staff was when I came. The biggest part of the prisoners at Auschwitz were political prisoners of Polish nationality. There was very little there when I arrived, as the camp had just been built. All that was there when I left, four months after my arrival, were stone buildings which had been built by the Poles. There had been men, women and cattle living in the wooden buildings. The stone buildings were empty. The former inhabitants of the wooden buildings were shifted. When I first started, the camp staff consisted of only myself and one clerk, and there was only one S.S. Company for guard there. I cannot remember the name of the company, but they were referred to as 'Guards Company Concentration Camp Auschwitz.' This company had no 'Feldposte' number. The highest ranking officer was the camp Kommandant, after him came the Kommandant of the Guards Company, Obersturmführer Plorin. There were no officers, apart from the company commander. The platoons were commanded by warrant officers. There were three platoons per company and between 30 and 40 men in a platoon. This varied as required. Beside the camp Kommandant, myself, the clerk and the S.S. Company, there was nobody there. A second clerk came later. There were 40 or 50 S.S. men who did not belong to the Guards Company, who had administrative duties in the camp, such as in charge of the kitchen and of the barracks, etc.*

*I do not know the number of prisoners in that camp. It may have been between 3000 and 4000, but I would not like to commit myself. Untersturmführer Meyer was in charge of administration. I cannot remember his Christian name as I always kept well away from the others. The reason for that was that I had my family there. There was a doctor there and I think his name was Potau. He came from Upper Silesia. He died later on, but I cannot recollect this very well. There was another Untersturmführer, by the name of Meier (or Meyer), who was in charge of the prisoners. I think his Christian name was Franz. The Kommandant issued orders to the S.S. officer in charge of the guard. His orders came from the next highest S.S. formation. This formation was S.S. Wirtschaftsverwaltungshauptamt, Berlin, Amtsgruppe D, Berlin, Oranienburg.*

*When prisoners arrived we were notified by the Gestapo in Katowice. There were cases when prisoners came in who were brought by ordinary policemen, and they also brought files relating to them. They came mostly in batches. They arrived by train at Auschwitz station and were collected by car from there. The prisoners were all men. There were no questionings by the Gestapo in the camp. All the questioning was done before the prisoners arrived. There was one official of the police on the camp staff who dealt with*

criminals against whom proceedings had been taken before. I cannot remember his name. He only stayed a short while and was then exchanged for another one. When the prisoners arrived, some were healthy and some were not, but none showed any sign of ill-treatment or malnutrition. I think that during the time I was there, there were no cells for solitary confinement, but, as I say, the camp was only in its initial stages. The same rules as to German political and German prisoners were applied to the Poles and, later, to the Russians. There was no difference. One of the stone buildings was reserved for a hospital. This stone building did not differ in any way from the other buildings. Beside the one doctor I have mentioned, there was another doctor supplied from the interned people, among whom there were many doctors and medical students. It was not within my power to give any orders to the medical staff as the doctors came immediately under the Kommandant. The rate of deaths was roughly one per cent, in the summer or possibly one and a half per cent, this was a weekly average. These were natural deaths and it depended upon what was wrong with them when they came in. Reports were made by the camp doctor and I, as adjutant, saw them. I received an average of 30 of these reports per week. The prisoners who had died were burnt. There were prisoners working in the crematorium under orders of guards. The ashes were sent to the relatives if they required them.

There were very few releases from this camp whilst I was there. These releases were authorized only by the Gestapo in Berlin, for political prisoners; or by the police authorities for ordinary criminals. The Gestapo organization who dealt with the camp was the Gestapo Departmental Headquarters at Katowice. Whether there was another Headquarters between Katowice and the Central H.Q. in Berlin, I do not know. The Gestapo men were either civilians in plain clothes, or uniforms, with no distinguishing marks. Some of them wore an S.D. badge. The S.D. and the Gestapo were two different things. I depended upon the S.S. for my orders. So did the Kommandant of the camp. The Gestapo, however, dealt with the political prisoners within the camp. All corporal punishment had to be authorized from Berlin. The camp authorities could not authorize any corporal punishments. In the beginning, corporal punishment was administered by the guards, but, later on, this was forbidden by Berlin, and the prisoners had to administer the punishment themselves. I do not know why this order came from Berlin. It was signed by Gruppenführer Glücks and came from Oranienburg, Berlin.

Dachau. Between 15th and 20th November, 1940, I went back to Dachau. So far I had always been employed in the office, first as clerk, then as adjutant, and now I should get to know the work immediately connected with the prisoners. I was to be trained to become a Lagerführer. My transfer was authorized by the Central S.S. organization in Berlin. When I arrived in Dachau the camp was in perfect running order and consisted of 30 or 32 wooden buildings, all told, for housing the prisoners, including the hospital, etc. The number of prisoners in one barrack varied between 300 and 450. The total number of prisoners was between 13,000 and 14,000. There were three companies of S.S. (120

to 150 men in each company) to guard them, and the administrative personnel consisted of about 100 or 120. The officers of the Guards Companies were not professional S.S. They were people who had been called up from trades or professions, put in the Army, and then detailed to S.S. They were then from the S.S. detailed to their particular duties, e.g. concentration camps; they did not volunteer for these particular duties. They received their orders from the Kommandant who, in turn, received his orders from Berlin, Oranienburg. The Kommandant's name was S.S. Obersturmführer Piorkowski. The next in rank after the Kommandant was the Lagerführer, Hauptsturmführer Eill. I do not remember his Christian name. There was one officer in charge of administration, Hauptsturmführer Wagner. Then there were three company commanders whose names I cannot remember.

The prisoners were all men and consisted of criminals and political prisoners as before, and a new type, namely Poles and Russians, who had been prisoners of war and who were detailed for certain work, e.g. farming jobs, and who had committed minor crimes such as trying to escape or refusing to work, and they were therefore sent to the concentration camp. These prisoners of war were interned because they had committed these crimes. At this time there were only prisoners from the Eastern front, namely Poles and Russians. It has been pointed out to me that the war in Russia only broke out in June, 1941, whereas I left again in April, 1941. If this is so I must have mixed it up with Auschwitz. I was only there as a sort of trainee and had very little to do with the organization of the place. I cannot remember any prison-breaks. The death rate I cannot remember because it had nothing to do with me, but I know it was a very good camp.

There was a furniture factory and prisoners worked as carpenters and joiners, also as tailors and cobblers. Prisoners were only allowed out outside the camp in exceptional cases, such as for gardening. There were about forty to fifty new intakes per week whilst I was there. There were few transfers and very few releases. The prisoners came from the Gestapo in Munich. If they were criminals they came from the Police, also in Munich. Parties, organized by the camp administration, who visited the camp and going round the camp, were a regular feature about two or three times a week. These parties were formed mostly of prominent guests from abroad, statesmen and politicians from countries allied to Germany. No high-ranking German officials ever visited the camp.

Natzweiler, April, 1941, to 10th or 15th May, 1944. My appointment at Natzweiler was Lagerführer and in October, 1942, I was appointed camp Kommandant. I had been promoted to the rank of Hauptsturmführer before I was appointed Kommandant. When I arrived at the camp the Kommandant was Sturmbannführer Huettig. The officer in charge of administration was Obersturmführer Faschingbauer. The doctor was Obersturmführer Eiserle. The O.C. Guards Company was Obersturmführer Peter. The administrative personnel consisted of 20 to begin with, and 70 to 75 in the end. The camp is a very small one. There were no prisoners when I arrived as the camp had just

been built. When I left in May 1944, there were 2500 to 3000 prisoners, comprising the three usual categories: political, anti-socials, criminals and, later, Polish and Russian prisoners of war who had committed minor crimes or tried to escape or refused to work. There were also a few hundred prisoners from Luxembourg. I cannot quite say for certain whether there were any French prisoners there or not. The prisoners arrived with papers and their nationality was on these papers, but I cannot remember any details because I did not go through the papers myself. None of these people came in the camp direct; they all came from other concentration camps. I can, therefore, not say what they were in for, but as far as I know they were of the same three types as I have described before.

I cannot remember that, at any rate, prisoners have been lent for experiments to a doctor in Strassburg. I cannot remember Professor Pickard of Strassburg. It is quite impossible that experiments of any kind on prisoners have been carried out without my knowledge, as in both my appointments as Lagerführer and later as Lager Kommandant, I would have known. Obergruppenführer Glücks from the Ministry in Berlin came to inspect the camp twice in the beginning, once in the summer of 1941 and once in the spring of 1942. The visit of Gruppenführer Pohl took place at the end of April or the beginning of May 1944. The only things that Glücks enquired into were how many political prisoners, how many anti-socials there were. Foreigners figured as political prisoners. He did not ask for their nationalities. I do not know of any British prisoners having been there. I have never seen a document which shows British as the nationality of any prisoners in the camp. There were 15 wooden barracks in the camp and up to 250 prisoners to each of these barracks. The camp was on top of the hill and my office was in the camp boundary. I lived in the village at the bottom of the hill with my family. The officers were all married and lived with their families in the village. One change in the personnel which I can remember was that Obersturmführer Peter, who commanded the company of guards, was transferred and replaced by an Obersturmführer called Meier. I do not know any of the Rottenführer who were there. There was a crematorium at the camp. The death rate depended upon the season. There were about 7 to 8 per week in the good season and about 15 to 18 in the bad season. They all died natural deaths. The same procedure of informing the relatives and the authority that had sent them to the camp was followed in this camp as in the others described before.

There was only one medical officer on the staff (Obersturmführer Eiserle), and four or five medical orderlies (German). There were doctors and medical students among the prisoners who assisted the M.O. [Medical Officer]. Many persons of over 50 years died of natural causes, such as heart diseases. Compared with other camps, the death rate in this camp was very low. I used to go into the doctor's surgery and he explained the various things, like medical supplies, he had there, but as it was in Latin I did not really know what it was all about. He never complained about lack of medical supplies. There were two barracks set aside for the hospital, one for the people who were only weak

and the other one as a real hospital. There were 60 to 75 beds in the real hospital. The surgeon had facilities for carrying out minor operations but not major operations. For these people were sent to Strassburg. A document was signed when a person went there and it was signed again when he returned, and the death rate was shown in the books of the camp.

There were 20 to 25 prison-breaks whilst I was there, and ten of the prisoners who tried to escape were shot. Eight or nine were recaptured and brought back and the others got away. The eight or nine who were recaptured got between 14 and 21 days' detention, according to their age and physical condition. In four or five cases out of twenty, they were either whipped or beaten. The culprit got 10 or 15 lashes in each case. This was supervised by the Lagerführer and the camp doctor. When I was Lagerführer I supervised this myself. Generally speaking, when corporal punishment was administered, the number of lashes given varied between 5 and 25. The number was laid down in the order coming from Berlin. Twenty-five was the maximum. The doctor had to be present when corporal punishment was administered. I cannot recollect where a prisoner was unable to stand his punishment and fainted. If such a case had arisen, it would have been the doctor's duty to interfere as that was why he was there. The punishment was administered with ordinary wooden sticks, 3 or 4 feet long and about as thick as my thumb. The sticks were made of solid wood, as you find them in the woods around the camp. The punishment was administered by another prisoner, who was chosen at random, and in the following manner: the prisoner was made to bend down over a table, and the lashes were given on his backside, without his clothes having been removed previously. I never had any difficulties with prisoners who had to administer this punishment. They were given the order and they complied with it. If they had refused to comply with the order I could not have punished them for this refusal. The orders from Berlin were that so many lashes had to be administered by another prisoner, but the order did not say what should be done if one of the prisoners refused to beat one of his comrades.

There were no set rules for what crimes corporal punishment could be administered. It was up to the Kommandant to apply to Berlin for authority for corporal punishment to be administered. The application to Berlin had to say what kind of offense the prisoner had committed and what punishment he had been given already for offenses committed previously. This letter had to be signed by the Kommandant. The sort of offenses for which I would have applied to Berlin for authority for corporal punishment to be given was: 'This prisoner has already three or four times stolen food from his fellow prisoners' or for untidiness or for disobedience or for attacking a guard. The first thing that happened when somebody broke out of the camp and was brought back, was that the Criminal Investigation Department made investigation to find out whether he had committed any crimes whilst at large, and then he was brought before the Kommandant without any trial and the Kommandant ordered punishment. Every man who tried to escape had to be reported to Berlin and likewise had to be reported when he was brought back. The Kommandant could



give him 21 days' detention without referring to higher authority, but could give corporal punishment only with authority from Berlin. Every member of the guard was armed with a rifle and there were machine-guns on the turrets. Whips and sticks were forbidden. The guards just carried rifles.

When the prisoners came in in a bunch they were all put in the same block. Eventually, they were sorted out into three groups, politicals, anti-socials and criminals, but never according to their nationalities. There were no strict rules as to that point, but it developed like this as we went along. The three above-mentioned categories were kept apart only in their living quarters. They worked together, fed together and could talk to each other. In the beginning the prisoners worked only in the camp itself. Later we opened a quarry nearby. Other work that was done was that airplane engines were taken to pieces and those parts were salvaged which could be used again. Fifteen to twenty prisoners were released while I was there. The order for releases came from Berlin. I do not know why the order came. They were all political prisoners and of German nationality.

The camp was surrounded by barbed wire – 3 meters high. There were towers at the corners of the camp with machine-guns. There was one row of barbed wire where the guards patrolled and then another row of barbed wire. The wire was not electrified in the beginning because there was no current, but later, when current was available, this was done, in the spring of 1943. I was Kommandant then. Two months before I left the camp eight or nine dogs arrived, who were used to assist the guard. They were controlled by the guards. I remember two incidents where prisoners tried to escape from the quarry, but I cannot remember that they were shot. During the whole of my three years I had only two shootings in the quarry. The other eight prisoners who tried to escape, whom I have already mentioned, tried to escape from the camp itself and not from the quarry.

The only hanging that took place was in the summer of 1943 and it was done on orders from Berlin. Two Gestapo agents brought a prisoner to the camp and showed me an order, signed by somebody in Berlin, saying that this man had to be delivered to my camp and had to be hanged. I cannot remember by whom this order was signed. I therefore detailed two prisoners to carry out the execution. A scaffold was built in the camp and the execution was carried out in my presence. The people present were: the camp doctor (Obersturmführer Eiserle), who certified that the cause of death was hanging, the two Gestapo agents who had brought the prisoner, the two prisoners who carried out the execution, and myself. I cannot remember the name of the prisoner; I think his nationality was Russian. I cannot remember his name because he never appeared in my books. He was only delivered to be hanged. It is quite impossible that any other executions took place whilst I was camp Kommandant. The other prisoners of the camp were not paraded for this execution. No authorized shootings or any other executions took place at the camp on orders from Berlin. I have never heard of any special, narrow cells where men were hanged by their arms. There were no special buildings for prisoners who were

*under arrest, and no solitary confinement cells. It is quite impossible that any execution by hanging prisoners by their arms was carried out without my knowledge. The only prison we had was a block which was separated by barbed wire from the rest and this one was used for people who had contravened camp discipline.*

*All the prisoners in this camp were men. I have never heard of a prisoner called Fritz Knoll at this camp. He was not a foreman, but he may have been one of the prisoners. I cannot remember his name. If someone had died on a working party it would have been reported to the office and the office would have reported to me, but I cannot remember such an incident having occurred. Every instance of a prisoner dying at work or through any other cause would be reported to the office, by the office to the Criminal Investigation official and by him to the Kommandant. My command and control over all happenings in the camp at Natzweiler was so complete, and my staff had such definite orders, that the execution of any prisoners without my knowledge during the time when I was Kommandant is an utter impossibility.*

*Only S.S. personnel were allowed to inspect the camps. Nobody else was allowed anywhere near it. This included army officers who were forbidden to enter any concentration camp. One could only go into a concentration camp with authority from the S.S. General Commanding in Berlin. S.D. personnel were not allowed in the camp either, without authority from Berlin. With the exception of Gruppenführer Glücks, who came from the Ministry in Berlin, and Obergruppenführer Pohl, nobody visited the camp for the two years I commanded it. Apart from these visits, I was answerable to no one, except on paper, to Berlin. I cannot remember any particulars of the visit of Obergruppenführer Pohl at the beginning of May 1944. He came to inspect the camp and just had a good look round.*

*During the time I was Lagerführer I received the Kriegsverdienstkreuz (2nd Class) in the spring of 1943. There was no particular reason for this decoration. It was mainly for being Lagerführer for two years in that camp. I was put forward for the decoration by the Kommandant. I have also got the Kriegsverdienstkreuz (1st Class), which I received in January 1945. During the whole of the time I was at Natzweiler I was responsible for the camp. When I left I handed over to my successor. He was Sturmbahnführer Hartjenstein. The handing-over proceedings took place in my office, and I handed over the whole camp to him. The books were not handed over formally to my successor, they were not mentioned.*

*Auschwitz, 10th to 15th May, 1944, till 29th November, 1944. Auschwitz was an enormous camp to which many smaller camps in the vicinity belonged. As the responsibility for the whole camp could not be taken by one man, it was split, and I was put in charge of one part of the camp. I was Kommandant of that part, but as I came under the supreme commander of the whole camp, who was my superior officer, my duties were those of a Lagerführer, though my appointment was called Kommandant. I had under me in my part of the camp the hospital and the agricultural camp, which was an enormous camp*

and contained many thousand acres. The number of prisoners under my immediate control varied between 15,000 and 16,000 and 35,000 and 40,000, comprising male and female.

There were between 350 and 500 deaths a week. The death rate was higher among the men, the reason being that the influx from the working camp consisted mainly of sick people. When I speak of the death rate in Auschwitz, I mean that all these people died of natural causes, that is to say either from illness or old age. The death rate was slightly above normal, due to the fact that I had a camp with sick people who came from other parts of the camp. The only reason I can see for the higher death rate, not only at Auschwitz but at all concentration camps in comparison with civil prisons, was that prisoners had to work, whereas in civil prisons they had not to work.

In Auschwitz the prisoners went out to work at 5 a.m. in the summer and returned at 8 p.m., sometimes even later. They worked seven days a week, but on Sundays they returned at 1, 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon. The work was of an agricultural nature and all the work there was done by prisoners. The whole camp contained about 90,000 to 100,000 prisoners, but this is only a rough estimate. My superior officer, and the Kommandant of the whole camp, was Obersturmbannführer Höss. There were men, women and children in the camp. The majority of prisoners under my immediate control were Easterners, i.e. Poles and Russians. I have no reason to believe that there were any prisoners of war among them, although there might have been without my knowing it. As far as I can remember there were no British internees. I think the British prisoners were in the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen and in another camp near Hamburg called Neuengamme. It is possible that there were some French people in my camp, but I cannot say for certain. There were more women than men prisoners.

I had three companies of S.S. under me to guard the camp. Some of the guards were men of the Waffen S.S., and there were women employed by the S.S. as wardresses. There were roughly 420 male S.S. guards and about 40 to 50 women guards. The men and women prisoners who were outside the camp in the agricultural part were invariably guarded by men. The women guards only guarded the prisoners within the compound. There were about 10 to 14 doctors for the whole camp, out of which two were detailed to my particular part of the camp. There was a hospital in each part of the camp, but the biggest was in my part. I cannot say exactly how many beds there were in the hospital; this depended on how close you could put the beds together.

Prisoners were housed in wooden buildings with three-tier beds. The men were separated from the women and the children were with their mothers. Married people were separated. There were 150 buildings all told, men and women camps together; about 80 or 90 were for men and about 60 for women; 25 or 30 buildings were set aside for the hospitals. The camp was only being started, and it was planned to enlarge it considerably.

All prisoners who died were cremated. There was no sort of service held when they died. They were just burnt. The cremations were carried out by

prisoners. All I had to do when a prisoner died was to inform Obersturmbannführer Höss and he would deal with it. I had no administration in Auschwitz. All the prisoners were known by numbers only. I had nothing to do with meting out punishment in Auschwitz; that was all done through Höss. When I came to Auschwitz there was no corporal punishment for women, but I have heard it mentioned, and it was talked about in the camp, that there had been corporal punishment for women before, and that it had been abolished. The only way in which I was informed corporal punishment for women was not allowed was that conversation in the camp to which I have referred. I cannot remember with whom this conversation took place. If a case would have arisen in which a woman would have committed one of the crimes for which a man would have been beaten, I would have pointed out to the women guards that corporal punishment could not be administered to women. The only authority on which I could have placed this was that conversation shortly after my arrival. Even if corporal punishment for women would have been allowed, I would never have put it into practice, as such a thing is inconceivable to me. The punishment administered to women, if they had committed any of the crimes for which men were beaten, was that they were transferred to another working party where they had a dirtier type of work or longer hours.

When a request for labor came from Berlin, the prisoners had to parade before the doctor. I was very often present at these parades, but not always. The examination took place by the prisoners filing by the doctor without undressing. Then the decision whether a man or a woman was fit enough to be sent to work was made. If, however, somebody had to be examined to ascertain whether he was fit to receive corporal punishment, a proper medical examination was carried out. The reason why no proper medical examination could be carried out in the case of detailing people for labor was that the requests ran into thousands and the doctor would have been busy for days. This method of choosing people for work was the normal method applied in all concentration camps. There was nothing unusual about it.

There were four or five cases of people trying to escape whilst I was there. These attempts were made separately. Some of these prisoners got away. No prisoners were flogged; there were no executions, shootings or hangings in my part. I went through the camp frequently on inspections. The doctor alone was responsible for certifying the cause of death if a prisoner died. The doctors changed continuously. One of these doctors was Hauptsturmführer Mengele. I carried out inspections of the bodies of people who had died through natural causes in my capacity as Kommandant when I was wandering round the camp. Whoever died during the day was put into a special building called the mortuary, and they were carried to the crematorium every evening by lorry. They were loaded on the lorry and off the lorry by prisoners. They were stripped by the prisoners of their clothes in the crematorium before being cremated. The clothes were cleaned and were re-issued where the people had not died of infectious diseases. During my inspections I never saw prisoners who had died through physical violence. When a prisoner died, a doctor had to certify the

*time of death, the cause and the details of the disease. A doctor signed a certificate and sent it to the Central Camp Office. These certificates did not go through my hands. The two doctors worked daily from 8 o'clock in the morning until 8 or 9 at night. All efforts were made by these doctors to keep the prisoners alive. Medical supplies and invigorating drugs were applied. Two different doctors took charge of my part of the camp every day. I remember one very well, because he had been the longest period in my particular part of the camp and he had also served under my predecessor, Hartjenstein. I do not know how long he had been there. His name was Hauptsturmführer Mengele, as mentioned before.*

*The camp wire was electrified and the dogs were only used outside the camp compound to guard prisoners who were working on agricultural jobs. It was never reported to me that prisoners had to be treated for dog bites. No interrogations were carried out in the camps, and I have never done any interrogating at all whilst I was Kommandant. I sometimes sent people away for interrogation to the Criminal Investigation Officer, in which case they went to the Central Camp Office and were brought back after the interrogation had been completed. I do not know who did the interrogating.*

*I have heard of the allegations of former prisoners in Auschwitz referring to a gas chamber there, the mass executions and whippings, the cruelty of the guards employed and that all this took place either in my presence or with my knowledge. All I can say to all this is that it is untrue from beginning to end.*

*Belsen, 1st December, 1944, till 15th April, 1945. On 29th November 1944, I went to Oranienburg, Berlin, to report to Gruppenführer Glücks. His appointment was Chef der Amtsgruppe D, which means that he was the officer in charge of the organization of all concentration camps within the Reich. He was responsible to Obergruppenführer Pohl, whose appointment was Chef der Wirtschaftsverwaltungshauptamtes der S.S. (head of the Administration Department of the S.S. at the Ministry): equivalent to a General in the Army. He said to me: 'Kramer, you are going to Belsen as Kommandant. At Belsen there are, at the moment, a lot of Jewish prisoners who will eventually be exchanged.' It was later, when I was in Belsen, that I learned that these Jewish prisoners were being exchanged against German nationals abroad. The first exchange took place between 5th and 15th December 1944, and was carried out under the personal supervision of an official who came from Berlin for that purpose. I cannot remember his name. His rank was 'Regierungs-Rat.' The first transport contained about 1300 to 1400 prisoners. Glücks said to me at the interview in Berlin: 'It is intended to turn Belsen into a camp for sick prisoners. This camp will take all sick prisoners and internees from all concentration camps in Northern and North-Western Germany, and also all sick persons among these prisoners who are working either in firms or with industrial firms.' He was referring to Arbeitseinsatzstellen, which means prisoners who have been allotted to peasants or industrial firms, coal mines, and the quarries for labor and for whom special camps have been erected on the premises. Responsibility for feeding and for accommodation is entirely the re-*

sponsibility of the firm. Responsibility for administration remained with the parent concentration camp. He said: 'There are considerable numbers of prisoners working with industrial firms who are sick or physically unfit to do the work they are detailed for. All these prisoners will be drafted into Belsen Camp. It puts an unnecessary burden upon the industrial firms concerned and therefore these prisoners must be transferred. Which prisoners and how many Belsen is eventually going to hold I cannot tell you at the moment, because that will have to be worked out as we go along. The general rule is to be that every prisoner who through illness is absent from his work for more than 10 or 14 days will be transferred to Belsen. If and when these prisoners recover in Belsen, they will either be formed into new detachments and sent out to new jobs or returned to their old work, whichever may be more expedient. You see that this is going to be a very big task for you. I suggest that you go to Belsen now to look at the camp and see how you get along. If you want any help you can either come back to Berlin or write.'

This is where the duty conversation came to an end. Glücks then asked me how my wife and children were, and I enquired into the well-being of his family. I also asked whether it would be possible when I took over Belsen Camp to move my family there. He told me that I would have to go to Belsen and have a look. If I could find a suitable house I should write to him and he would authorize the move of my household. This conversation took place between Gruppenführer Glücks and myself, there was nobody else present. These were the only instructions I received and I did not ask for any more. I did not think I would require any more instructions and was quite satisfied with my orders.

After the interview with Glücks I spoke to three officers whom I knew personally. They were: Standartenführer Maurer (he was in charge of the allocation of prisoners to camps and for labor); Hauptsturmführer Sommer (he worked in Maurer's department); and Sturmbannführer Burger (he was the man who supervised the administration in the various concentration camps). I did not have any conversation on duty matters with either of the three above-named people. They were friends of mine, and as I happened to be in the house, I went to their various offices to say 'Hello.' The leading doctor was a Standartenführer Dr. Lolling. He was the M.O. in charge of all concentration camps. I cannot remember any names of other people, but I can remember these four names because they either came to visit the camps or I saw their names on various letters coming from the Ministry.

I then travelled to Belsen, where I was received by Obersturmführer Schaaf. He was the officer in charge of administration. The next morning I went to the office and met Sturmbannführer Haas, the Kommandant, who knew that I was arriving from Berlin to take over complete charge of Belsen. I asked him how many prisoners the camp contained, and he said, 'Roughly 15,000.' He said that it was not much use to discuss matters in the office and suggested a tour through the camp. On that tour he pointed out changes and improvements which he still wanted to make. The camp was about 1½ kilometres long and between 300 and 350 metres wide. There were roughly 60 barracks, in-

cluding accommodation for guards and stores; 40 to 45 were for the accommodation of the prisoners. The prisoners were made up of men, women and children; families were allowed to live together; otherwise men were separated from women. Six buildings in the men's camp, three in the family camp, and two in the women's camp served as hospitals. There was a crematorium in the camp.

I do not know of what nationality the prisoners were when I arrived, because there were no files or papers of any kind in the camp. It was impossible for me to know what kind of prisoners there were as they had been sent to Belsen because they were ill, from all concentration camps over the country. Many of them had lost their identification marks, and as there were no records it was absolutely impossible to tell who was who. I started to keep my own records of the prisoners, but these records were all destroyed on orders which I received from Berlin about the end of March. I do not remember who signed these orders.

The personnel consisted of one Guard Company S.S. The O.C. of the company was Hauptscharführer Meyer. He came from somewhere near Hanover. He was of average height, about 1 m. 70; he wore spectacles, had hardly any hair and was about 50. Then there was Hauptsturmführer Vogler. He was the officer in charge of administration who took over from Schaaf, whom I mentioned before as officer in charge of administration on my arrival. The officer in charge of the Criminal Department was Untersturmführer Frericks. The Lagerführer (Obersturmführer Stresse) was transferred a few days after my arrival, and I was without a Lagerführer for over two months and had to do the job myself with only one N.C.O. as assistant, whose appointment was Rapportführer; he was Oberscharführer Reddhaser. The M.O. was Sturmbannführer Schnabel. A Hauptscharführer acted as dentist. He was later on promoted Untersturmführer. His name was Linsmeier. There were no other officers and I had no Adjutant. There were 60 to 70 N.C.O.s, 20 to 25 of whom were in the Guards S.S. Company and the others employed on administrative duties. One of the N.C.O.s employed was the N.C.O. who was Office Clerk to the Officer in charge of Administration. He was Unterscharführer Kuckertz. There was another senior N.C.O. in my office. His name was Unterscharführer Rang. He acted as Untersturmführer and Adjutant. Other N.C.O.s whom I remember are Oberscharführer Hilmer (N.C.O. Administration); Unterscharführer Lademacher (also N.C.O. Administration); Unterscharführer Wille (also N.C.O. Administration); and Unterscharführer Müller, who was in charge of the food stores. When I took over Belsen there were six officers, including myself. I had no senior N.C.O.s. When I took over there were three women on the staff. I cannot remember their names at the moment.

The death rate when I arrived was between 40 and 60 a week. When I entered the camp the Lagerführer had to report to me and had to say: 'There are so many in the camp; so many died yesterday; which leaves so many.' On my arrival a book was kept in which these figures were entered, but was later dispensed with. This book I had taken over from my predecessor. It was kept by

the acting Lagerführer in his office. There was also another book in which the strength was recorded. The acting Lagerführer held a parade every morning to count the prisoners. On this parade every Blockführer reported the strength of his unit and the number of deaths that had occurred the previous day, and the Rapportführer added up the strength of the various blocks on a sheet of paper, making a grand total. This report included the number of deaths that had occurred the previous day. There were approximately 40 Blockführer on parade every day.

In January I took over a new camp, adjoining the old camp, in which there were 40 to 50 new blocks. I did not get any more staff when I took this camp over. Only later, when camps in Silesia were evacuated, guards arrived with prisoners, thus putting up the strength of personnel. I was not always informed when transports of prisoners arrived; especially transports of prisoners evacuated from Silesia arrived without warning. There were transports with only 100 or 200 people, and others with 1500, 2000, 2500, etc. I had food reserves in the camp, and when a new batch of prisoners arrived I had to fall back on these reserves until I had reported the new strength and thus got additional food for the higher number of prisoners. There was no regular food transport; the railway should have brought the food whenever there was a train available. I am unable to say how many prisoners I had after this month because it was my orders that I had to sent out prisoners for work as fast as possible. The incoming prisoners were therefore balanced by those being sent out for work and the figures fluctuated every day. Every prisoner who was fit to work was sent out with working parties ('Arbeitseinsatz') to industrial firms. The other prisoners worked only inside the camp and for the maintenance of the camp.

On 1st December when I took over there were roughly 15,000 people in the camp; roughly 200 died in December; on 1st January there were roughly 17,000 people in the camp; 600 died in January; on 1st February there were 22,000 prisoners in the camp. From the 15th February onwards I am unable to say how many prisoners I had as no more books were kept, as this proved utterly impossible in view of the transports streaming in from camps in Silesia which were being evacuated and, as I have already said, the records which I had maintained I destroyed in March.

I do not know the number of deaths which occurred in this period at all, but the conditions in Belsen got worse from the middle of February till the middle of April 1945, when the Allies came. I inspected the camp daily during this period and was fully aware of the conditions and the great number of people who were dying. The death rate during the months of February, March and April gradually mounted until it reached 400 or 500 a day. This figure was due to the fact that if people were healthy I had to send them out on working parties and only retain the sick and dying. I was notified by the Stationmaster that a transport had arrived and I would have to collect the prisoners. The transports arriving were checked in by the guards only by numbers and not by names. About twice a week food was indented for from local depots and a return sent



to the Ministry in Berlin, which was based on the figures given by the guards, who checked the people on entering the camp.

All prisoners received three meals a day. I cannot tell what the daily ration was as this was laid down by the food depot and was standardized. I never checked up on the rations from the depots, but I made sure that each prisoner had one litre of vegetable stew for the main meal, and in the morning the prisoner had coffee and bread, if available, and for the evening meal coffee and bread, again if available, and cheese or sausage. If the prisoners had worked on this diet it would have been insufficient for them to survive, but as they did not work I think it was enough to keep them alive. I thought they could stand this diet for about six weeks, and after six weeks I was hoping to get some more food. The rations described above were the normal rations in any concentration camp at that time. The main point on which the food deteriorated was bread, as this was lacking entirely for two or three days running several times. It was absolutely impossible for me to procure enough bread to feed the number of prisoners I had. In the early days the bread had been supplied by local bakeries at Belsen. Later there were so many prisoners in the camp that the local bakeries could not supply the required quantity any longer, and I sent out lorries to Hanover and other places to fetch bread, but even then I was not able to get half the bread I required to feed prisoners on normal rations. Apart from bread, the rations were never cut down. Flour was supplied in lieu of bread and was employed in making meals. It turned out, however, that had we made bread of this flour the death rate would not have been so high. I went to the depot in Celle and then to the next higher authority in Hanover and put them in the picture as to what was going on in Belsen. I also pointed out to them that if a catastrophe was going to happen, I would not only disclose the facts but also make them responsible. I cannot remember whom I saw at either of these places. I have never applied to Berlin in these matters because they could not have helped me in any way. This was entirely a matter for the ration people in Celle and in Hanover. My visits to these depots resulted in extra rations of potatoes and turnips arriving some time later.

I remember one case of cannibalism quite well. It was reported to me that a prisoner had entered the mortuary and that parts of one body were missing. I put a guard on the dead bodies at night and that guard arrested a man the same night who had approached a dead body. This man was arrested, but before he could be interrogated next morning he hanged himself. Whether there were more cases of cannibalism I cannot tell, but I put a guard on the mortuary from that night onwards. That guard consisted of prisoners. I thought that the prisoners would guard the bodies against other prisoners. Whether they did or did not do so I cannot tell. The mortuary was not always in the same building, as the prisoners fluctuated to such a great extent. I had to shift the accommodation continuously and therefore the building detailed as a mortuary was not always the same. If changes took place, this building was cleaned by the prisoners and used for their accommodation the next day.

The camp doctor reported sick and was replaced by Dr. Klein at the middle

of February. Roughly, on 1st March another M.O. arrived. His name was Hauptsturmführer Horstmann. Two days before the Allies arrived Horstmann left with the troops and only Dr. Klein remained. Apart from those two (Klein and Horstmann), there were no S.S. doctors in the camp. At the end of January Dr. Lolling, from the Ministry in Berlin, arrived on an inspection tour. I pointed out to him that if, as I was told in Berlin, Belsen was going to be a camp for sick people, I needed more doctors. He said that there were none available at the moment, but that as soon as he had some he would send them. Dr. Lolling inspected the camp and was fully aware of the conditions prevailing there at the time when he inspected it. He spent a whole day walking through the camp with Dr. Schnabel and inspected it thoroughly. The measures taken were that Dr. Lolling took a list of requirements with him and said he would see to it that we got the necessary medical supplies. Even though I was Kommandant I did not know anything about the supply of medical equipment and medical stores. This I left entirely to the M.O. All medical supplies were asked for direct from Berlin (Dr. Lolling's department). This is all I know about this matter.

During my stay at Belsen there were 15 to 20 prison-breaks. Some of the prisoners trying to escape were shot whilst trying to escape. I do not know how many. Towards the end of December an order arrived from Berlin forbidding corporal punishment altogether. From that moment onwards no corporal punishment was meted out.

Between 20th and 28th February the M.O. notified me that spotted fever had broken out in the camp. This fact was certified by a Bacteriological Institute in Hanover. I therefore closed the camp and sent a report to Berlin. The answer from Berlin was that I had to keep the camp open to receive transports coming from the East, fever or no fever. The second time I wrote to Berlin was between 1st and 10th March, when I sent a complete report on the conditions prevailing in the camp. These two occasions were the only occasions on which I ever made any representations to higher authority. These two letters were addressed to the Verwaltungsgruppe B in Berlin. I did not go to Berlin myself as I was instructed at my interview in November, because that would have taken three of four days and there was nobody to carry on in my absence.

As far as I can remember, Gruppenführer Pohl inspected Belsen Camp about 20th March. He came with one other officer. I conducted Pohl right through the camp and pointed out conditions as they were. He did not come because of the letter I had written. He came on a routine inspection tour – 'Just to have a look at the camp.' Whether the letter I had written to the Central Office in Berlin was mentioned during our conversations I cannot tell. I pointed out conditions to him, and he said that something must be done. The first measure he suggested was to close the camp and put no more people into it. I suggested two measures to Pohl to cope with the situation: (a) no further transports to come in; and (b) the exchange of the Jews in the camp to take place immediately. The result of this was that he dictated a letter from my office, addressed to Berlin, saying that the exchange of Jewish prisoners had to

take place immediately. This exchange did eventually take place during the last days of March, I do not know again where these prisoners were to be exchanged, but they left Belsen going to Theresienstadt. Between 6000 and 7000 people were sent away to be exchanged (three trainloads). These 6000 or 7000 constituted the entire number of Jewish prisoners who were to be exchanged. They were transported in three train-loads, each train consisting of 45 to 50 trucks. I had orders to send off three consignments on three different days. Each time I detailed a few guards – I cannot remember how many – and there was an N.C.O. in charge of each train, probably a Scharführer, but I cannot remember. I do not know to whom these N.C.O.s had to report at the other end. All I knew was I had to send off three train-loads. I never saw these N.C.O.s whom I sent away, again.

I pointed out to Pohl that I wanted more beds and more blankets, and he agreed that in this matter, like as in the other matters, immediate help was required. The doctor and the officer in charge of administration also spoke to Pohl. The officer in charge of Administration pointed out his difficulties in obtaining food, whereas the doctor was satisfied with the position as he had just received a new consignment of medical stores. Pohl held his appointment in Berlin for roughly two years. Glücks was there much longer as he had been there already under Eike. Eike was later sent to the Western Front and afterwards to the Eastern Front, where he was killed.

I do not know what nationality any of the prisoners were of at Belsen as there were no papers sent with them and the only check was done by numbers. I therefore cannot tell whether there were any British subjects among the prisoners, but it is possible that there were. I have never heard of a prisoner called Keith Meyer, who was a British subject.

The female staff increased in number the same as the male staff, as women guards arrived with women transports from the east. All women in the camp were under my command, the same as the men. Twenty to 22 wardresses were still at Belsen when the Allies arrived, and approximately 26,000 women prisoners. Unless I received complaints from the prisoners themselves I had no means of ascertaining what treatment was meted out by the female guards, but I had complete confidence in those guards. The only criticism I had to make was that they were a bit too familiar with the female prisoners. I had the same confidence in the male guards. They were 100 per cent correct and I have never received any complaints from the prisoners. In February or March – I cannot remember the exact date – Oberaufseherin Volkenrath arrived and was put in charge of the women guards. I had complete confidence in her.

There was a crematorium in the camp and as long as coke was available all dead bodies were cremated. When there was no more coke available they were buried in mass graves. I have never seen a Red Cross official in any of the camps I had been to. I cannot tell why not. If a Red Cross official had called I would have rung up Berlin immediately to ask whether he was permitted to enter the camp, as nobody could enter the camp without permission from Berlin. What the answer would have been I cannot tell.

*There were no standing orders from Berlin for any of the concentration camps I have been to as to: (a) the space allotted to individual prisoners; (b) sanitation, or (c) working conditions. This was completely left to the discretion of the Kommandant. I can remember no standing orders or instructions from Berlin except with regard to visitors to the camp and to punishments. In all other matters the Kommandant had complete discretion. When Belsen Camp was eventually taken over by the Allies I was quite satisfied that I had done all I possibly could under the circumstances to remedy the conditions in the camp.*

**Further Statement of Josef Kramer**

1. *I relinquished command of Struthof-Natzweiler in May 1944, and handed over to Sturmbannführer Hartjenstein. At this time and for at least a year previously Buck was commanding Schirmeck, but there was no official connection between Schirmeck and Struthof. There was a Gestapo officer attached to me during my period at Struthof; his name was Wochner and he was sent by the Gestapo at Stuttgart. According to the district allocation Struthof should have been, in my opinion, in Strassburg Gestapo area, but I believe that in any case Strassburg Gestapo depended on Stuttgart.*

2. *With reference to the orders received to gas certain women and despatch them to Strassburg University, as sworn by me before Commandant Jadin of the French Army, I give the following details: The orders I received were in writing signed by order of Reichsführer Himmler by Gruppenführer Glücks. As nearly as I can remember they stated that a special transport would arrive from Auschwitz and that the people on this transport were to be killed and their bodies sent to Strassburg to Professor Hirt. It further said that I should communicate with Professor Hirt as to how the killing was to take place. This I did and was given by Hirt a container of gas crystals with instructions how to use them. There was no regular gas chamber in Struthof, but he described to me how an ordinary room might be used. I do not know any more of the professors concerned with Hirt, but I do know that there was in one of the departments a Professor Bickerbach.*

3. *The first time I saw a gas chamber proper was at Auschwitz. It was attached to the crematorium. The complete building containing the crematorium and gas chamber was situated in Camp No. 2 (Birkenau), of which I was in command. I visited the building on my first inspection of the camp after being there for three days, but for the first eight days I was there it was not working. After eight days the first transport, from which gas chamber victims were selected, arrived, and at the same time I received a written order from Höss, who commanded the whole of Auschwitz Camp, that although the gas chamber and crematorium were situated in my part of the camp, I had no jurisdiction over it whatever. Orders in regard to the gas chamber were, in fact, always given by Höss, and I am firmly convinced that he received such orders from Berlin. I believe that had I been in Höss' position and received such orders, I would have carried them out, because even if I had protested it would only have resulted in my being taken prisoner myself. My feelings about orders in regard*

to the gas chamber were to be slightly surprised, and wonder to myself whether such action was really right.

4. In regard to conditions at Belsen, I say once more that I did everything I could to remedy them. In regard to the food, the prisoners throughout March and April 1945, got their full entitlement, and in my opinion this entitlement was perfectly sufficient for the healthy prisoner, but from the middle of February onward sick people began to come in and I felt they should have more food. I sent my Messing N.C.O., Unterscharführer Müller, to the food depots in Celle and Hanover, but he was told that no further food could be issued because we were already getting our entitlement. I did, in fact, get some food from the food store in the Wehrmacht Camp at Belsen, but it would have been no use my asking for more from them because they were not my correct authorized depot.

5. In regard to accommodation, when I was ordered to take 30,000 more people in early April, when the camp was already more than full, I appealed to Lieutenant-General Beineburg in the Kommandantur in the Wehrmacht Camp at Belsen and it was he who arranged for 15,000 prisoners to be lodged in the barracks in that camp. He had to get special permission over the telephone to do this. I never appealed to the General for help on the food situation or any other difficulties because I knew that he would not have been able to help me, in that he had no jurisdiction. I do not consider that I should have appealed to him because I knew that he could not have helped. Furthermore, I do not believe that anybody in Germany could have altered the food entitlement for the prisoners in the camp because I do not believe that the food was available. It surprises me very much to hear that there were large and adequate stocks of food in the Wehrmacht Camp. Nevertheless, I still feel that an appeal to the General would have been useless.

6. I have been told that some of my S.S. staff were guilty of ill-treatment and brutality toward the prisoners. I find this very difficult to believe and I would trust them absolutely. To the best of my belief they never committed any offenses against the prisoners. I regard myself as responsible for their conduct and do not believe that any of them would have infringed my orders against ill-treatment or brutality.

7. The Hungarian troops took over guard duties around the perimeter of my camp during the first days before the British arrived. I agree that during this period more shootings took place than was customary when the Wehrmacht were doing guard. I remember the incident on 15th April 1945, in the late afternoon, when I went with British officers to the potato patch and was ordered to remove the dead body of a prisoner from that patch. I think it is wrong that this man should have been shot and have no doubt at all that it was either the Wehrmacht or the Hungarians who were responsible.

8. The rifle range which is visible at the north-west corner of my camp was used fairly regularly by the Wehrmacht two or three days a week."

## Appendix E: The Role of the Vatican

The implications of a lie on the scale of the Jewish extermination hoax cannot be constrained to bear on isolated subjects such as Israel or World War II revisionism. Before not many years, it was realized that, during and after the war, Pope Pius XII had never spoken out in condemnation of the supposed exterminations of Jews. This fact naturally raised some problems for the propaganda history of World War II. The specific event that ignited general controversy was Rolf Hochhuth's play *Der Stellvertreter* (*The Deputy*). Supposedly based on the "Gerstein statement," the play performs a completely unscrupulous job of character assassination on Pius XII by relating events inconsistent with the "statement," thereby piling invention on invention. However, the play was unquestionably the catalyst for the discussion of a fairly important fact, although the ensuing discussion, carried on among people who had been completely taken in by the hoax, never clarified anything and only amplified the confusion.

It is no more necessary, here, to explain why Pius XII did not speak up about exterminations of Jews than it is necessary to explain why he did not protest the extermination of Eskimos. However, the role of the Vatican is of some interest to our subject, so a few words are appropriate.

First a few background remarks. During the period 1920-1945, the Vatican considered Communism to be the principal menace loose in the world. This being the case, it was open to friendly relations with the Fascists after their assumption of power in Italy in 1922 and the Concordat of 1929, reversing the earlier pre-Fascist anti-clerical policies of Italian Governments. This was the basis for relations that remained generally good until Mussolini fell from power in 1943.

When Hitler came to power in 1933, the Vatican had similar hopes for an anti-Communist regime that would make domestic peace with the Church. At first, it appeared that events would unfold as in Italy, and the Concordat of 1933 with Hitler (still in force), guaranteeing the church a portion of tax revenues and further defining the proper spheres of Church and State, reinforced this expectation.

Things did not turn out so well, however. Although the Concordat had defined the Church's rights in the sphere of education and youth culture in general to the satisfaction of the Vatican, the Nazis found it difficult to live with such terms and found various ways of undercutting the Catholic position without formally repudiating the terms of the Concordat. For example, the Catholic Youth associations were forbidden to engage in sport on the shrewd calculation that such restrictions of such associations to the realm of the truly spiritual would guarantee that they would wither. There were also various means of intimidation employed against parents who insisted on sending their children to Catholic schools. Moreover, Nazi publications such as *Das Schwarze Korps* (the SS magazine) and *Der Stürmer* were openly anti-Christian and constantly heaped abuse on the Pope and the Catholic clergy in general, favorite charges being that the holy men were homo-

sexuals or were having amorous liaisons with Jewesses. Although the Nazis never reneged on the most important provision of the Concordat, the commitment on tax revenues, the mutual hostility became so great that many felt that there was always a good possibility for a second *Kulturkampf* (Bismarck's unsuccessful attempt of the 1870s to break the power of the Roman Church in Germany).

The Nazi-Vatican hostility led, in 1937, to the most unusual Papal encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*. Issued in German rather than the usual Latin, it was among the strongest attacks that the Vatican had ever made on a specific State. The Pope at the time was Pius XI, and Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli, who was to become Pope Pius XII in 1939, was the Vatican Secretary of State. Pacelli, a diplomat of worldwide experience, for ten years Papal Nuncio in Germany, and fluent in German, was already regarded as the obvious heir to Pius XI, and his pre-eminence in the area of international diplomacy was unquestioned. *Mit brennender Sorge* was written under his supervision.<sup>447</sup>

Despite the unquestioned hostility between the Church and the Nazis, it should be kept in mind that Communism, in the eyes of the Vatican, was still the prime enemy. With an antagonist such as the German Nazis, there was room for maneuver for the Church, but the Communists, up to that date, had shown themselves to be total and deadly enemies. Moreover, Germany was not the only European State, with which the Vatican was displeased. France and Czechoslovakia had strongly anti-clerical Governments. Thus, when war came, the Vatican (although, of course, officially neutral) could not be enthusiastic for either side. Because Communism was considered the prime enemy, it is probably correct that the Vatican rather preferred the Axis side, but in their eyes this was definitely a choice of lesser evils. Moreover, there was a considerable diversity of preferences within the Church. For example, the wartime Papal Nuncio in Berlin, Msgr. Cesare Orsenigo, was evidently satisfied with the German victory over France in 1940 and expressed to the German Foreign Office his hope that the Germans would march into Paris through Versailles. On the other hand, the Jesuit-controlled Vatican radio was so anti-German that the British considered it a virtual extension of their own propaganda service.<sup>448</sup>

So much for the political background of the Vatican's situation during the war. We return to consideration of the fact of Pope Pius' silence on exterminations of Jews. It would not be feasible to review here the views of all who have contributed to the controversy, so we shall restrict ourselves in this respect. First, there is the Vatican itself, which is represented mainly by the nine volumes of wartime documents that it published in the years 1967-1975, *Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale*. The principal editor of this series had been Robert A. Graham, an American Jesuit and former editor of the Jesuit magazine *America*. Graham, who accepts the extermination legend, has emerged as the principal spokesman for the Vatican in these matters. It is unfortunate that the only volumes of the nine that are devoted entirely to war victims are the last two, published in 1974-1975, which carry the subject no further than December 1943.

---

<sup>447</sup> Rhodes, 171-210.

<sup>448</sup> Rhodes, 246.

Among the numerous authors in the controversy, the various positions are well represented by two recent books: *The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators* by Anthony Rhodes (London, 1973), a defender of the Vatican, and *The Pope's Jews* by Sam Waagenaar (London, 1974), a critic of the Pope.

The official Vatican position, as set forth in the Introduction to the eighth volume of *Actes et documents*, is as follows:

*"During his brief visit to the Vatican on 26 September [1942], the personal representative of President Roosevelt, Myron Taylor, renewed an official request for information. They had received, from the Geneva office of the Jewish agency for Palestine, information on the desperate situation of the Polish Jews and the Jews deported to Poland. The report, dated 30 August, described the liquidation of the Warsaw ghetto, executions in a camp called Belick, in Lwow, and in Warsaw. The destination of the deportations was death: 'The Jews deported from Germany, Belgium, Holland, France, and Slovakia,' said the report, 'were sent to the slaughterhouse, while the aryan deportees to the East from Holland and France were actually used for labor.' The memorandum from Taylor to Cardinal Maglione [Vatican Secretary of State] said: 'I would be very grateful to Your Eminence if it were possible to tell me if the Vatican has any information which tends to confirm the report contained in this memorandum. If so, I would like to know if the Holy Father has some suggestions touching on some practical means of using the forces of public opinion of the civilized world in order to prevent the continuation of this barbarism.'*

*Cardinal Maglione had to reply, on 10 October, that he had on his part no particular information confirming the Geneva report. In effect, the most detailed information, received those days by the Vatican, was the same as that received by the United States. The sources were the Polish Ambassador to the Vatican and the Jewish organizations themselves. 'The reports on severe measures adopted against non-aryans have also come to the Holy See from other sources, but at present it has not been possible to verify their accuracy.' Under these conditions, the second question on practical means to put into operation did not call for a reply.*

*Very significant are the notes set down by Maglione after having received the Taylor document: 'I do not believe that we have any information which confers these grave tidings. Right?' For his part the 'minutante' [recorder or archivist] wrote: 'There is Mr. Malvezzi's.' The information of Malvezzi, official of an Italian firm, recently returned from Poland, was grave but general and did not harmonize with the Geneva report.*

*That which the Cardinal Secretary of State heard as 'severe measures' can be interpreted in the light of the documents of these two years. The information received in the Vatican consisted of second or third hand reports, taken seriously however, concerning the brutal treatment imposed on the Jews of Hungary, Croatia, Slovakia, France, and other countries. What was the ultimate destination of the deportees, what was the plan of the Nazis, then remained an enigma. When, for example, in the month of March, Msgr. Burzio, the Chargé d'affaires in Slovakia, spoke of the deportees as going to 'a certain death,' it is*



clear that he based this assertion on the inhuman conditions of the departures and the brutality of the guards. After such a beginning, it was easy to imagine that the old, the sick, and the children were not able to live long, even if typhus did not cut them down in the overpopulated and unsanitary camps. In the same sense was taken the remark of the Croatia police chief Eugene Kvaternik, according to whom the Germans had already caused two million Jews to die and that the same fate awaited the Croatian Jews. Afterwards, these words have been confirmed as only too exact. It is obvious, however, that the representative of the Holy See, Father Abbé Marcone, in reporting them to the Vatican, did not believe or was unable to believe that they should be taken literally. One took them at least as a grave intimation of the tragedy which appeared only in general outline.

The end of the year 1942 saw several public declarations on the deportations. On 17 December, the United Nations published in London a declaration on the rights of man, in which it denounced, in strong but general terms, the treatment inflicted on the Jews. On 24 December, Pope Pius XII made, in his Christmas Eve message, a very clear allusion to the deportations, concerning which the world, at that time, was able only with difficulty to form an idea.”

This Vatican explanation is not acceptable. It is of course true that only occasional scraps bearing on exterminations of Jews appear in their documents. Moreover, no reasonable person would deny that most of these scraps must be classified as inventive propaganda, for the claims of exterminations are either coupled in some sense with other claims that nobody would defend today, or are associated with other oddities demolishing their credibility. For example, a note of 2 January 1943 to the Vatican from Wladislas Raczkwicz, the President of the Polish exile government in London, claimed that the Germans had embarked on a general extermination of the Polish population in addition to its Jewish minority (in agreement with our analysis of Chapter 3, the note mentions the Auschwitz concentration camp with an implication that it is not one of the sites of exterminations).<sup>449</sup> We have already noted, in Chapter 3 (p. 128), that Msgr. Burzio, the Papal Chargé d'affaires in Slovakia, sent some invented tales back to Rome. Additional scraps of this sort are reviewed below.

One must, of course, accept the Vatican claim that such information as they had during the war could not have been taken as decent evidence of exterminations; that has already been proved in this book. However, that is not the point. The Vatican spokesmen today assert not merely that their information did not reveal an extermination program, but that the exterminations happened, on a continental scale, without reliable information about them coming to the Vatican. It is this claim that is completely ridiculous and simply cannot be entertained for more than a few seconds.

It is not possible for an extermination program of the type claimed to have transpired without the Vatican learning of it. The slaughters are supposed to have taken place mainly in Catholic Poland, where the Church had its agents, Catholic

---

<sup>449</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 7, 179.

priests, in every village, situated in such a way (hearing gossip, confessionals, etc.) that no such thing as the exterminations could possibly have happened without the entire Polish Catholic clergy knowing about them. It is true that the Germans imposed a censorship on communications to or from Poland, so that the Polish clergy and the Vatican could not communicate with customary freedom, as explained in the Introduction to volume three of *Actes et documents*, but as also there explained, there were many ways of circumventing the censorship, notably through Italians, who had business of various sorts in Poland and points east, and through messages carried by private persons from Poland to the office of the Papal Nuncio in Berlin, who communicated with the Vatican through privileged diplomatic channels.

Rhodes realizes that the claim of ignorance of the exterminations is not tenable and concedes (because he assumes the exterminations happened) that Pius XII must have known about them. The explanation for the failure to speak up unambiguously seems to Rhodes to be a fear that any public and explicit condemnation would have made the situation of Catholics in Germany and the occupied territories worse. Rhodes then asserts that “in his *private* messages to Heads of States in connection with the persecution of the Jews, Pius XII certainly ‘spoke up’” (Rhodes’ italics), and then gives two examples of such private messages, bearing on Slovakia and on Hungary, which however contain nothing about exterminations, but speak only of deportations and persecutions of Jews in general terms.<sup>450</sup>

Rhodes’ picture of a timid Pius, afraid to speak up against the Nazis and their programs, does not hold up for many reasons. As shown by the documents Rhodes quotes, he must claim that the Pope was also too timid to speak up in confidential diplomatic communications. Moreover, the historical record does not support Rhodes’ picture of a Catholic Church terrorized into silence by the Nazis. While, in parallel with their counterparts in Allied countries, they never opposed the German war effort, they were quite vocal during the war in their opposition to the religion-related policies and values of the National Socialist regime and expressed their opposition in the Catholic press in Germany and in pulpits throughout Germany. In December 1942, the German Bishops, meeting in their annual conference in Fulda, sent a declaration to the German Government denouncing the persecution of Catholic Churches in occupied countries. In January 1943, Konrad Count von Preysing, Bishop of Berlin, made a public condemnation of Nazi racial theories and policies. In August 1943, the German Bishops publicly denounced the Nazi policies hostile to Catholic education, and this denunciation was read in public all over Germany.<sup>451</sup> The inescapable fact is that the Catholic Church was not terrorized into silence.

Timidity does not explain why Pope Pius failed to condemn the alleged exterminations after the Nazis had been defeated. The Pope’s speech to the College of Cardinals on June 2, 1945, was a long and blistering attack on the defeated Nazis, and yet the only thing in the speech that could possibly be interpreted as a reference to exterminations was a reference to “applications of national socialist teach-

<sup>450</sup> Rhodes, 347.

<sup>451</sup> *New York Times* (Jan. 22, 1943), 6; (May 13, 1943), 8; (Sep. 5, 1943), 7; (Sep. 6, 1943), 7.

ings, which even went so far as to use the most exquisite scientific methods to torture or eliminate people who were often innocent.” However, reading further in the speech it becomes clear that the Pope, like so many other people at the time, was thinking of the catastrophic scenes found in the German camps at the end of the war. The only specific victims mentioned are the Catholic priests interned at Dachau, a high percentage of whom perished there for reasons abundantly covered in this book. Although Pope Pius did mention that one Polish auxiliary bishop died of typhus, his remarks leave the impression that he believed that the deaths in the camps were intentional on the part of the Nazis, and the priests interned at Dachau are described by Pius as having “endured indescribable sufferings for their faith and for their vocation.” There is nothing in the address about exterminations of any racial, religious, or national group.<sup>452</sup>

While it is the case that the record does not indicate that the Roman Church was terrorized into silence during the war, the Vatican was nevertheless vulnerable to pressure to some degree, as is made evident by an examination of the circumstances behind the declaration of Pope Pius’ which came closest to sounding like a condemnation of exterminations, his Christmas Eve message of 1942.

In Chapter 3 (pp. 82f.) and above we saw that, in the autumn of 1942, the Allies inquired of the Vatican whether it had any information supporting the extermination claims that Rabbi Wise and some others had been making for several months and that the Vatican had no such information. While Pope Pius and the Secretary of State, Luigi Cardinal Maglione, no doubt smelled *Greuelpropaganda* immediately upon hearing such stories, the Vatican material reproduced above shows that they at least made some effort to inquire into the matter. Also, the Papal Nuncio in Italy, Msgr. Francesco Borgongini-Duca, met on November 10, 1942, with Guido Buffarini, Undersecretary in the Italian Ministry of the Interior, for the purpose of discussing the general military and political situation. The situation of the Jews was discussed and Borgongini-Duca reported to Maglione:<sup>453</sup>

*“He then spoke to me concerning the speech of Hitler [in Munich on 8 November] and, I having asked him if in allusions to retaliations, they might mean asphyxiating gas, he twice replied to me decidedly no.”*

Thus, the Vatican had essentially no information, in the autumn of 1942, tending to confirm the extermination claims, and it took this position in its exchanges with Allied representatives when the matter came up. In Chapter 3 (p. 84) we noted that there was one anonymous note supposedly from a Vatican source, produced in late November, which supported the extermination claims. However, since that was not the Vatican position, the note was no doubt a forgery in some sense. If it did come from a source inside the Vatican, it may have been authored by Virgilio Scattolini, an employee of the Vatican newspaper *l’Osservatore Romano*, who posed as a Vatican insider during the war in order to sell his fabricated “information”, suitably tailored for the buyer, to all comers, and who for a while was considered “our man in the Vatican” by the OSS.<sup>454</sup> A lesser possibility

<sup>452</sup> *New York Times* (Jun. 3, 1945), 22.

<sup>453</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 7, 82.

<sup>454</sup> *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. 59 (Jan. 1974), 719f.

is that the note came from the priest Pirro Scavizzi, who is discussed below.

The information that the Vatican had in December 1942 relative to Nazi persecutions of Jews is well represented by a message composed by Msgr. Giuseppe Di Meglio of the staff of Orsenigo, Papal Nuncio in Berlin, and delivered to the Vatican by Di Meglio on December 9, 1942. The message deals at length with the German policies toward the Jews, and it is a good assumption that such material was written in response to a request from the Vatican to Orsenigo for such information. The Berlin Nunciature was doubtless considered about the best source of such information within the church, because a good deal of the communication between Poland and the Vatican was through Orsenigo's Berlin office, as we noted above. The heart of the part of the message that dealt with the Jews was:<sup>455</sup>

*"Since many fled, before the arrival of the German troops, from the Polish territories occupied by the Russians and from territories properly Russian, one estimates that presently, in the Reich and the occupied territories, including the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia, there are more than four million Jews, i.e., one fourth of the entire world Jewish population.*

*Measures.*

*1. Institution of ghettos.*

*Internal quarters of some cities have been designated for the Jews as their official homes, with the right of administration, police forces, and appropriate means of communication.*

*Of the ghettos established up to now, the most important are those of Litzmannstadt (Lodz) and Warsaw. Some ghettos are also found in the Baltic countries and in the occupied Russian territories.*

*2. Concentration camps.*

*Since, as is evident, places cannot be found for all Jews in the city ghettos, immense concentration camps have been created where they lead a harsh life; little food is given them; they are assigned to extremely hard working conditions which quickly lead many to death.*

*It is said that such concentration camps are found up to now in Poland, that the eastern territories, particularly Poland, have been established in the plans of the German Government as the definitive place of residence for the Jewish population of Europe.*

*Generally, in order to not attract the attention of the population too much, they are forced to leave in the middle of the night; they are permitted to take little clothing with them and only a small sum of money.*

*3. The Star.*

*Since the month of September 1941, a mark of identification has been compulsory for all Jews: a yellow star, six pointed, to be worn on the breast, with the inscription in the center, Jude!*

*The sight of these wretches who, pale and emaciated (their food rations are much less than those of the Germans; some foodstuffs are denied to them entirely), walk the streets at predesignated hours of the day or, when travelling,*

---

<sup>455</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 8, 738-742.

*cluster together in corners, awakens a profound sense of horror and pity.*

*Inhuman treatment in the occupied territories and in the countries politically subject to Germany:*

*An Italian journalist, returned from Romania, gave me, some time ago, a long account concerning the brutal methods adopted in that country, mainly by German instigation, against the Jews.*

*He related to me that a train was completely filled with Jews; every opening was then closed, so that no air could enter. When the train arrived at its destination, there were only a few survivors, those, that is, who, finding themselves near some incompletely sealed opening, had been able to breathe a bit of air. [...]"*

Di Meglio closed this part of his message by noting the anti-Christian character of Alfred Rosenberg's *Institut für Erforschung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben* (Institute for Investigation of Jewish Influence in German Religious Life) and also by noting the unconcern of the German clergy with the tribulations of the Jews.

In several respects, Di Meglio's information was obviously erroneous. For example, we can gain a fair idea of the actual conditions of the deportations of Romanian Jews from the Report of the Red Cross, both from the excerpt reproduced in Chapter 5 here and from other sections<sup>456</sup> and also from the writings of Ginsburg. It is certain that the events in the story related by the anonymous Italian journalist were invention. Di Meglio seems willing to accept the worst.

Di Meglio's treatment of the role of the concentration camps admits some misinterpretations of the actual conditions. For one thing, he suggested that many Jews were sent to concentration camps because there was insufficient space for them in the ghettos; this is not correct. Jews, among others, were sent to the camps in Poland as labor needs required. Di Meglio also gave the impression that the camps were primarily for quartering Jews, which is also incorrect. He also probably exaggerated the poverty of the diet in the camps, but, as we saw in Chapter 4, he was at least correct on the matter of the high death rate in the camps at the time he wrote his account, although overwork was not the cause of the deaths.

In other words, Di Meglio's description of the situation was the general or approximate truth, with some inaccuracies, and colored by his willingness to believe the worst. It is clear that he had no information on the existence of an extermination program even remotely resembling the one that was then taking shape in Allied propaganda and was being related to the Vatican by various Allied diplomats and Jewish organizations.

The Pope's Christmas address made a passing remark, without specific reference to the Jews, on "the hundreds of thousands who, through no fault of their own and solely because of their nation or race, have been condemned to death or progressive extinction." Berlin had mixed reactions to the address; the RSHA considered it a direct assault on the Nazi regime, while the Foreign Office appears

---

<sup>456</sup> Red Cross (1948), vol. 3, 520ff.

to have considered it so much holy hot air. The Allies, we recall from our Chapter 3 (p. 100), had officially embraced the extermination claims on December 17 in a statement, in which “the number of victims” was “reckoned in many hundreds of thousands” of Jews, and they were not satisfied with the Pope’s statement and thought it was not explicit enough.<sup>457</sup> From our point of view, however, the Christmas remark seems at first puzzlingly strong in view of the picture of the situation that the Vatican had received from the Berlin Nunciature and also in consideration of the oddity that the Pope’s strongest remark of such a category should have been made so early in the war and then not repeated.

An explanation for the appearance of the “death or progressive extinction” remark in the Pope’s Christmas address is found in the Vatican’s wartime documents. In late 1942 and early 1943, one of the Vatican’s principal diplomatic objectives was to secure a pledge from the Allies not to bomb Rome. The British were particularly insistent on their right to bomb Rome, as compared to the Americans, who had a large Catholic minority that constituted a very important component of the political base of Roosevelt’s New Deal. The British took the position that Rome could not be given special consideration and would be bombed if and when military factors indicated such action. In pursuit of its objective, the Vatican dealt not only with the Allies, attempting to divert them from their apparent course, but also with the Germans and Italians, attempting to persuade them to remove any operations of a military nature from Rome (there was little or no war industry in the city, but there were military command headquarters and military barracks). In December 1942, the Italian Government agreed to relocate its military headquarters away from Rome. Feeling that some progress toward their objective had been made, Cardinal Maglione met on December 14 with the British Minister to the Vatican, Sir F. D’Arcy Osborne, in order to communicate this development to the British and to further discuss the bombing issue. Osborne, however, was unimpressed and pointed out that there remained Italian troops quartered in the city. Maglione’s notes on the meeting summarized the exchange thus:<sup>458</sup>

*“The Minister pointed out that one has the impression that the Holy See is particularly preoccupied with the Italian cities, when it speaks of bombings, because they are Italian.*

*I made him observe: (1) that for Rome there are special considerations. I recounted them to him (and I did not fail to repeat to him that if Rome is bombed, the Holy See will protest); (2) that the Holy See now intervenes against the bombing of the civilian population of the Italian cities because such bombings are in progress. The Minister must not forget that the Holy Father spoke against bombing of defenseless populations on other occasions: when the English cities were being bombed everybody knew that the bombings of the English cities did not escape really harsh words from the Holy Father.*

*The Minister recognized the justice of my observation and, then, ex-*

<sup>457</sup> Rhodes, 272ff; Waagenaar, 409, 435f.

<sup>458</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 7, 136ff. Waagenaar, 413, quotes from the Osborne-Maglione exchange, but he does not quote it in its proper context of the bombing threat to Rome.

*claimed: 'But why doesn't the Holy See intervene against the terrible slaughter of the Jews?'*

*I recalled for him that the Holy Father had already asserted, in his messages, the right to life, to a peaceful existence, and to a sufficient share in the goods of this world for all men, whatever their race or religion.*

*One must not ignore, I added, how much the Holy Father has done and is doing to alleviate the plight of the poor Jews. These people know it and frequently thank the Holy See for how much it is doing for them.*

*The Minister insisted on this point: it would be necessary that the Holy See intervene to stop the massacres of the Jews. [end of note]"*

Later the same day, Osborne ran into Msgr. Domenico Tardini, Secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastic Affairs (the Vatican Foreign Office), and regarding the departure of the Italian military command headquarters from Rome, Osborne assured Tardini that "It changes nothing!" Tardini summarized his conversation with Osborne in his notes and concluded:<sup>459</sup>

*"The removal of the military commands may help put better in evidence that whoever bombs Rome is barbaric (and thus it is well that the Holy See be an interested party), but it will not spare Rome from the bombs."*

We thus see the background of the Pope's Christmas Eve remark. To the Vatican, it appeared from the exchange between Osborne and Maglione that the English were in effect proposing a deal: the Pope condemns extermination of Jews and the Allies do not bomb Rome, a persuasive position that can convince even a Holy Father. Aside from any possible ethical considerations, it was obvious to the Vatican that it could not wreck its official neutrality by publicly accusing the Germans of completely fabricated offenses and, in any case, the Germans were still the dominant military power on the Continent at that time, so the remark appeared in the Christmas address without specific reference to Jews or Germany (along with other remarks that sounded more or less anti-German without being specific). However, the Allied bombing threat to Rome did not diminish after Christmas 1942. Thus, except for a brief similar remark ignored by the world press, which occurred in a long papal address of June 2, 1943, no more talk of this nature came from the Vatican. Pope Pius made a favorable reference to the Christmas remark in his letter of April 30, 1943, to his friend von Preysing, but even in that confidential communication his specific words were milder than those of the Christmas remark.<sup>460</sup>

Although the Vatican was entirely justified in interpreting Osborne's remarks as a specific proposition, it is most likely that this was a misinterpretation nevertheless and that Osborne did not imagine himself as offering a deal. It is possible, for example, that Osborne felt that Maglione had a relatively strong position and thus he grasped at something somewhat out of context in order to supplement his side of the verbal exchange. The official Allied declaration on extermination of Jews came three days later, and thus the matter was no doubt somewhat in the air in the diplomatic corps and came to Osborne rather naturally.

<sup>459</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 7, 138f.

<sup>460</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 2, 326; vol. 9, 40; Rhodes, 348f.

Rome was first bombed on July 19, 1943 (by the Americans), the targets being the rail center that German and Italian troops had started passing through after the Allied landings in Sicily on July 9th. In subsequent raids, bombs occasionally fell on the Vatican, but the damage to historical and religious monuments in the Vatican and elsewhere in Rome was slight.

The only other point of some interest in regard to the role of the Vatican is that its efforts in extending aid to Jews were fairly extensive, as discussed by Rhodes. However, Waagenaar should also be read in this connection, on account of Rhodes' failure to make some points. However, from the point of view of analyzing the extermination legend, the only significant inference to draw from such activities of the Vatican is that they offer further data showing that the exterminations could not possibly have happened without the Vatican knowing of them, because the Vatican was somewhat involved in Jewish affairs in Europe at the time.

While the significant points regarding the role of the Vatican are not many and have been covered, there are a few odd matters that we may as well set forth while we are on this subject.

A strange character appearing in the Vatican's wartime documents is Pirro Scavizzi, a very ordinary priest who rode Italian military hospital trains that shuttled back and forth between Italy and the eastern front. He was called an "almoner," and he administered to the wounded Italian soldiers, whatever incantations are delivered in such circumstances. Since he did so much traveling, however, he was frequently used as a courier, and his frequent near contact with, and regular delivery of messages to, high ranking prelates seems to have fired his imagination.

The first oddity we run into was in February-March 1942. Scavizzi produced a letter, allegedly from Adam Sapieha, Archbishop of Cracow, on the subject of the sufferings of Catholic priests under the brutal Germans. As related in *Actes et documents*, however, the circumstances were most peculiar:<sup>461</sup>

"[...] *the Archbishop [...] renounced all precaution and described [...] the rigor of the Nazi oppression and the tragedy of the concentration camps. But after having deposited this testimony with [...] Scavizzi, he grew fearful and sent Scavizzi a message asking him to burn the document 'for fear that it fall into the hands of the Germans, who would have shot all the Bishops and perhaps others.'* The Abbé Scavizzi destroyed the note in question, but not without first having made a copy in his own hand and having added at the same time his own testimony on the tragedy and the despair which constituted the daily course of existence of the Catholics of Poland."

Scavizzi's producing of a letter which he had burned, in honoring the request of the author of the letter, necessarily makes one a bit uneasy about him, but let us bear with him a bit. He next appears in connection with a letter he wrote to Pope Pius from Bologna on May 12, 1942:<sup>462</sup>

"*In regard to the present Nuncio [Orsenigo in Berlin], the Cardinal [Innitzer in Vienna] deplored the silence about it [the persecution of the Jews]*

<sup>461</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 3, 15f. Rhodes, 288.

<sup>462</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 8, 534.



and expressed the judgment that He [Orsenigo] is too timorous and not interested in such grave matters.

*The anti-Jewish campaign is implacable and constantly grows worse, with deportations and even mass executions.*

*The massacre of the Jews in the Ukraine is already complete. In Poland and Germany they also intend to carry it to completion, with a system of mass killings."*

Even if Innitzer had held such views, it is ludicrous in the extreme to imagine that he would have confided them to Scavizzi, even for Scavizzi's personal information, not to mention for transmission to the Pope via Scavizzi. One is now entitled to raise suspicions regarding Scavizzi's reliability.

Scavizzi next appears on October 7, 1942, when he wrote a "report on the situation in Poland" that managed to get into the Vatican files:<sup>463</sup>

*"The Jews: The elimination of the Jews, with mass killings, without regard for children or even for babies, is almost total. As for the remainder of them, who are all marked by white armbands, civilized life is impossible. They are not permitted to shop, enter business establishments, take streetcars or taxis, attend spectacles or frequent non-Jewish homes. Before being deported or killed, they are condemned to forced hard labor, even if they are of the cultivated class. The few remaining Jews appear serene, almost ostentatiously proud. It is said that more than two million Jews have been killed."*

At this point, one develops a second suspicion, namely that the Vatican took as knowledge what we have set forth as our first suspicion about Scavizzi: that little weight should be attached to Scavizzi's statements. They had such material from Scavizzi in their files but did not consider it as confirming the claims of the Zionist organizations, as is made clear above.

Possibly because the Vatican wartime documents are still in the process of editing for publication at the time this is being written, Scavizzi makes no more appearances in them. However, in 1964 (he died around 1967) he claimed in an Italian magazine that the Pope had *confided* to him, Pirro Scavizzi, during the war on the apparently negative implications of a proposed excommunication of Hitler (a nominal Catholic) for his exterminations of Jews!<sup>464</sup> That does it. Scavizzi was obviously a weaver of self-inflating tall tales designed to make him appear rather more important than his humble station in riding the hospital trains would have suggested. It therefore becomes clear that our second suspicion must be correct: Scavizzi was considered by the Vatican to be a harmless nut who could be trusted to administer last rites and even to deliver messages, but not to keep facts straight. It is mildly humorous that, judging from their editorial comments, the editors of *Actes et documents* seem to take Scavizzi seriously. However, because the interpretation of Scavizzi as a teller of tall tales fairly leaps out at the reader from the documents, it is possible that the editors have other thoughts on the subject of Scavizzi that they have not expressed.

There is, however, one point of not negligible importance in connection with

---

<sup>463</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 8, 669n.

<sup>464</sup> Rhodes, 345; Waagenaar, 431.

Scavizzi's reports, particularly the report of May 12, 1942 concerning the persecution of the Jews. It is not likely that Scavizzi independently invented the extermination legend, although it is remotely possible. If he did not invent the extermination claims appearing in his letter of May 12, 1942, he must have heard them somewhere, a fact of some interest, as his report is dated over a month before Zionist organizations in the West started talking this way (the first known such statement for the World Jewish Congress was on June 29, 1942, as we noted on page 98). This suggests that such propaganda was in circulation in Eastern Europe earlier than June 1942. This, indeed, is in agreement with the account of Dawidowicz, according to whom extermination claims for the Wartheland (the annexed part of Poland south of the Corridor), claiming killings via gasmobiles at Chelmo, first appeared in the four-page Jewish underground, the *Veker*, which printed these first extermination claims on pages three and four in issues published in February 1942. Claims of exterminations in the General Government of Poland (via gassing at Belzec) appeared in the underground publication *Mittellungen* in early April 1942.<sup>465</sup> The evidence, thus, suggests that the extermination legend owes its birth to obscure Polish Jewish propagandists, but the nurturing of the legend to the status of an international and historical hoax was the achievement of Zionist circles centered primarily in the West, particularly in and around New York.

Since it appears that extermination propaganda was in existence in Poland in the spring of 1942, and because much of the information that reached the Vatican from Poland came through the office of the Papal Nuncio in Berlin, such stories might have reached Orsenigo at the time. Indeed, a letter of Orsenigo's to Msgr. Giovanni Montini (the later Pope Paul VI, who often substituted for Maglione during the war), dated July 28, 1942, was devoted mainly to deploring the difficulty of ascertaining exactly what was happening in regard to the Jews. After commenting on the occasional practice of the Nazis of suddenly and without warning ordering selected Jews to pack up for deportation, he wrote:<sup>466</sup>

*"As is easy to understand, this lack of advance notice opens the door to the most macabre suppositions on the fate of the non-aryans. There are also in circulation rumors, difficult to verify, of disastrous journeys and even of massacres of Jews. Also every intervention in favor only of the non-aryan Catholics has thus far been rejected with the customary reply that baptismal water does not change Jewish blood and that the German Reich is defending itself from the non-aryan race, not from the religion of the baptized Jews.*

*Among such sinister rumors there is no lack of some less bleak: thus for example there is talk that in Holland, where deportations of the non-aryans have now commenced, an outspoken protest by the clergy, with which the Catholic Bishops associated themselves, succeeded in getting the baptized non-aryans excepted from the deportations. Likewise it was reported that in the notorious ghetto of Litzmannstadt, in the Wartheland, a Polish priest, who with a spirit of apostolical heroism had requested it, was granted permission*

<sup>465</sup> Dawidowicz, 295ff.

<sup>466</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 8, 607f.

*to enter and remain there for the care of the souls of the non-aryan Catholics.”*

An editorial footnote remarks that the story from Holland was false. We remark in passing that a considerable portion of the Vatican concern for aiding Jews, in this period, was specifically for the families of Jewish background that had converted to Catholicism and whose situation was particularly tragic, since it seemed that nobody wanted them; the Germans considered them Jews, and the Jews considered them renegades.

The preceding remarks of Orsenigo make it clear that he had heard certain horrid rumors, although it is not clear what he meant by “massacres” (*eccidi in massa*). There were, of course, as we noted in Chapters 5 and 7 (pp. 181, 272), occasional massacres of Jews during the war, and the reports he had received may have pertained to them or they might have had their origin in the extermination propaganda that had recently started coming from Jewish underground organizations in Poland. It is even possible that he was thinking of some report that Scavizzi had made at the Berlin Nunciature in connection with the “information” he transmitted in his letter of May 12, 1942. In any case, the Di Meglio letter of December 9, 1942, shows that the Nunciature, at that time, had accepted no extermination claims (except possibly for the story from Romania), if such claims reached it.

There are just a couple more points worth discussion in relation to the Vatican documents. During the war, the Vatican representative in Greece and Turkey was Msgr. Angelo Roncalli, the later Pope John XXIII. On July 8, 1943, he reported to the Vatican from Istanbul as follows:<sup>467</sup>

*“1. In accord with my rule of circumspection in my contacts with various people, even those entitled to special respect, I avoid meetings not strictly necessary or singularly useful. For example, I saw von Papen [German Ambassador to Turkey] only once in six months, and only hastily and in passing on the occasion of my Easter visit to Ankara. At the time there was much talk of the Katyn affair which, according to von Papen, should have made the Pole reflect on the advantage of their turning to the Germans. I replied with a sad smile that it was necessary first of all to make them overlook the millions of Jews sent to Poland and suppressed there, and that in any case this was a good occasion for the Reich to improve its treatment of the Poles.*

*Now that von Papen has returned, as has the entire diplomatic corps, from Ankara to Istanbul and the Bosphorus, occasions for meetings will not be lacking.*

*2. Now and then the fine Baron von Lersner comes to see me. [...]*”

Roncalli then proceeded to discuss matters not relevant to our subject. When this document was published by the Vatican, the press reported that Roncalli had remarked on “the millions of Jews sent to Poland and annihilated there,”<sup>468</sup> a fair enough translation, but a few words on the point of the translation are worthwhile. The Italian verb *sopprimere* (whose past participle appears in Roncalli’s note) is

<sup>467</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 7, 473f.

<sup>468</sup> *New York Times* (Apr. 5, 1973), 1, 5.

cognate to the English “to suppress” and the French *supprimer* (which is relevant because Roncalli and von Papen probably spoke to each other in French). The Italian and French words are equivalent in meaning, but they are not equivalent to the English word because, when applied to people, *sopprimere* and *supprimer* carry some implication of killing in large numbers. However, when applied to people, they are not entirely equivalent to “extermination” or “annihilation”; both French and Italian have words cognate to and equivalent to these two English words. To apply *sopprimere* to a large group of people carries an implication only of large numbers of killings, and may or may not mean “extermination,” depending on the context. Thus, one must allow the possibility that Roncalli was thinking of something other than the sorts of extermination claims that the Allies had made and which Roncalli had certainly heard by then. For example, he may have been thinking in terms of such things as the then recent and highly publicized German suppression of the Warsaw ghetto rebellion, in the course of which the Germans killed many Jews. However, I am inclined to reject such an interpretation; it seems more likely to me that Roncalli was indeed thinking in terms of extermination such as the Allies had claimed.

If, however, one reads the Roncalli account carefully against its proper diplomatic background, it becomes clear that it is not really very important what, very specifically, Roncalli was thinking about when he made this remark. He describes a chance meeting between two diplomats, one of whom, he, did not wish a meeting. In accord with his “rule of circumspection” his words would therefore have been chosen to “avoid meetings.” What Roncalli in effect said to von Papen was that, if the latter wished to prolong the meeting, Roncalli was going to be difficult. Roncalli communicated to von Papen, in diplomatic language, the attitude he sets forth in plain and direct language in the first sentence of his report. Roncalli’s remark was a diplomatic parry of a certain well known type, wherein it is not really important to determine, in better than vague terms, what the speaker was referring to, or to determine whether or not the speaker himself accepted the truth of the allegation in question. All that is relevant in the exchange is that Roncalli did not want to talk to von Papen, and that was all he communicated to von Papen. If, on the other hand, Roncalli wished to speak to von Papen, he certainly would not had *opened* his side of the exchange with such necessarily antagonistic remarks, either in reference to exterminations or in reference to bloody suppression of ghetto revolts, and quite independently of any of his own opinions on the subject of alleged German atrocities and brutalities.

Because the Vatican was an observer of and participant in the events of World War II, it was inevitable that the extermination stories, which the whole world heard, were heard also by the Vatican. The stories are thus naturally reflected in passages found in the Vatican documents, and when we encounter such passages there, they should be viewed in the context of the possible specific motivations of the person making the remark and also of the evolution of the propaganda as analyzed in this book, especially in Chapter 3. Roncalli, as his report clearly implies in its first sentence, was merely trying to get rid of von Papen at their July 8, 1943, encounter in Ankara, when he repeated the extermination claim which, as

he well knew, had not been specifically endorsed by the Vatican despite Allied pressures.

Another letter we encounter in the Vatican documents was written to Pope Pius in August 1942 by the Ukrainian Roman Catholic Archbishop André Szepcyczkyi. The letter dwells at great length on supposed German atrocities, and the reader will be very puzzled, especially in regard to motivation, until the last lines are read and Szepcyczkyi finally comes to the whole point of his letter. He remarks on his failures over a three year period to obtain from the Pope an Apostolic Benediction (*i.e.* a papal endorsement, most important in religious politics) and then points out that his sufferings and strivings under “evil” Germans should certainly be adequate grounds for granting one at last.<sup>469</sup>

That the few passages appearing in the Vatican documents and bearing on exterminations of Jews merely reflect the evolution of the propaganda, as analyzed in this book, is very clear. In Chapter 3 (p. 128) we noted that Burzio passed on to the Vatican, from Slovakia, tales about soap factories, when such tales were a feature of the propaganda. Another example is a set of notes made by Maglione on May 5, 1943, recording extermination stories. The occasion for composing the notes is not clear, *i.e.* the reader cannot tell from what has been published whether Maglione was recording his own impressions or merely allegations made by somebody else (other documents written by Maglione around that time do not suggest that he believed the extermination stories). In any case, gas chamber exterminations at Treblinka and near Brest-Litovsk are noted. The editors of *Actes et documents*, obviously puzzled, remark:<sup>470</sup>

*“The information, probably delivered by an Italian official, would seem quite old, since it mentions neither Birkenau nor Auschwitz, where the greater part of the exterminations were concentrated at the time.”*

Further on this theme, the editors remark that in 1943<sup>471</sup>

*“[...] the Allied propaganda, which dwelled abundantly on the German atrocities, was completely silent on Auschwitz, for reasons which have never been satisfactorily analyzed.”*

Just as it was inevitable that some of the propaganda would manifest itself in the Vatican’s documents, it was also inevitable that some of the truth, in regard to the matters we are concerned with here, would find its way into that part of the Vatican archives selected for publication. Thus, the documents suggest that the Vatican did after all have some access to Jews in Poland, not only Polish Jews but also Italian Jews who were deported after the German occupation of Rome on September 8, 1943.<sup>472</sup> Also, the editors of volume 9 of *Actes et documents* (on the subject of war victims in 1943) note that friends and relatives of deported Jews were known to have later received mail from them, that the members of the Dutch resistance who were “in constant contact with the Jews of their country [reported] simply that the deportees were enlisted for work in the camps, while the aged

<sup>469</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 3, 625-629.

<sup>470</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 9, 39, 274.

<sup>471</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 9, 42.

<sup>472</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 9, 493, 499, 632-636.

were sent to ghettos,” and that the Jewish leaders in Rome were unaware of any extermination program and feared deportations only in connection with such things as “the rigors of winter and the fragile health of many deportees,” as is confirmed by “many letters received then at the Vatican, and which today form a thick dossier in the archives. [...] no mention is made of their brutal extermination.” We also read that Father Marie-Benoît (a priest who was deeply involved in wartime aid to Jews) made a report in July 1943 on deportations of Jews from France and remarked that the Auschwitz and nearby camps were work camps where “the morale among the deportees is generally good and they are confident of the future.”<sup>473</sup>

Because Auschwitz extermination propaganda started in 1944, we will probably encounter Auschwitz extermination claims in the Vatican’s wartime documents when the Vatican publishes documents for 1944-1945, because bearing on exterminations, that is all there is in the documents of this critically situated source: propaganda.

## Addendum on Robert A. Graham

The obituary/tribute below first appeared, very slightly modified, in the *Journal of Historical Review*, March/April 1998, based on my manuscript of 31 July 1997. The Graham letter of 24 January 1983 was reproduced there from the original.

---

When I was writing *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, I encountered an extraordinary source, viz. the multi-volume collection of documents and commentary *Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale* (Acts and documents of the Holy See relative to the Second World War). The series, whose principal editor was Robert A. Graham, was still being published by the Vatican and more volumes were in the future.

Graham was a former editor of the Jesuit magazine *America*. The “extermination” claim was not challenged in the series, and it was generally understood that Graham’s main interest was in defending the wartime Pope Pius XII against charges of tacit consent to, and even collaboration with, Nazi policies of physical extermination of the Jews. Such charges crested with Rolf Hochhuth’s play *The Deputy*.

I believed that the Vatican documents constitute an important source. I devoted an entire appendix of my book to discussing them.

In studying the series of volumes, I was struck by some of the editorial remarks and believed that the editor, although not a revisionist in our sense, was implicitly raising fundamental questions of a revisionist bent. A good example was the quotation of some selected passages from some reports, from apparently

---

<sup>473</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 9, 38, 42f.

well informed sources, delivered to the Pope on 15 July 1943, which described Auschwitz as essentially a work camp and spoke of Jews who had been deported from France sending letters back to their families.<sup>474</sup>

These impressions were so strong that I believed it necessary to contact Graham directly. In early 1977, I wrote to him in Rome, thus starting a very satisfactory and years long correspondence, although the request for copies of documents that I made to him at the time could not be filled, for reasons beyond his control.<sup>475</sup>

In summer 1977, I was in Rome and visited him. Our conversation confirmed to me what I had read between the lines in *Actes et documents*: the editor was puzzled by the evidence he had examined, because much of it seemed impossible to reconcile with the “extermination” legend. He showed me a pamphlet I had not seen, published in 1943 by the “Polish Labor Group,” which was New York based but in touch with the Polish underground. Its title was appropriate: *Oswiecim – Camp of Death* (“Oświęcim” is Polish for “Auschwitz”). The pamphlet presented the truth with some embellishment, but what was important to Graham was that it did not speak of “exterminations” in any way reconcilable with the legend. He let me borrow the pamphlet to photocopy.

Vol. 10 of *Actes et documents* was long delayed, and I wrote to Graham several times in my eagerness to see it. Publication finally came in 1980, and Graham was thoughtful enough to alert me personally. I got a copy and found references to more interesting but unpublished documents. Again I wrote to Graham and happily, this time, my request was filled.<sup>476</sup>

At the IHR Convention in 1982, I compared the Holocaust legend to the Donation of Constantine and sent Graham a copy of the paper (see Supplement 2, p. 379). In the paper, I had noted that the Jewish historian Walter Laqueur understood as I did “that the far-flung nature of the operations of the Catholic Church guaranteed that the Vatican would have known what was happening to the Jews”.<sup>477</sup> Graham acknowledged receipt of the copy of my paper with a very kind, respectful and encouraging letter, referring to and not disputing the remark about the Vatican:

---

<sup>474</sup> *Actes et documents*, vol. 9, pp. 42, 393. The footnote on p. 42 should refer to “Nr. 264”, not 164. More examples are given toward the end of “Appendix E” of my book.

<sup>475</sup> I wanted copies of the documents about deportations of Jews from France that *Actes et documents* had quoted but not reproduced. Graham told me to send my “request through channels”, i.e. to Archbishop Agostino Casaroli, Secretary of the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church. I did so, but Casaroli replied that since the reports in question “were provided by Jewish authorities in France” then I should address myself to them. I wrote to the Centre de documentation juive contemporaine in Paris, but received no answer. I also visited the Centre in July 1977, but I could not find the documents.

<sup>476</sup> The most interesting document was a letter from Alexandru Safran, Grand Rabbi of Romania, to Msgr. Andrea Cassulo, Papal Nuncio in Bucharest, dated 30 June 1944. It expressed concern that the Jews of Hungary were “exposed to great privations and sufferings”, at a time when the legend would have us believe they were mostly dead. The Jews of Hungary and Romania remained in close contact throughout this period.

<sup>477</sup> The paper appears as a Supplement in recent printings of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. “IHR” means “Institute for Historical Review”, my publisher at the time.

*“VILLA MALTA*

*24 January 1983*

*Dear Mr. Butz,*

*Your airmailed copy of your September 1982 paper reached me today. I hasten to thank you for keeping me in mind when elaborating on your theme.*

*On a quick reading, I see I must reflect further on the validity of your approach. I never thought of this in analogy of the Donation of Constantine!*

*I note your quote from Laqueur on the Vatican. He was apparently peeved at us for telling him we published what we had, as of 1942. What makes him assume that there is on the contrary a lot more? This is begging the question.*

*I wish you a prosperous New Year and fresh discoveries and new insights on a great drama!*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Robert A. Graham”*

I always knew that there was an honest and honorable man editing the publication of the Vatican documents.

Rev. Robert A. Graham, S.J., died in a California retirement home, at age 84, on 11 February 1997.





# Supplements

## Supplement 1: The International Holocaust Controversy

*Presented orally at the 1979 conference of the Institute for Historical Review. This is a slightly edited version of the paper as published in the Journal of Historical Review, vol. 1, no. 1, Spring 1980, pp. 5-22.*

Some of you may be accustomed to hearing of me speak on the subject that I call “The Hoax of the Twentieth Century,” the legend of the physical extermination of millions of Jews, usually six million, by the government of National Socialist Germany during the Second World War. On several occasions, I have met with interested groups and given them what amounts to an oral synopsis of many of the arguments in my book.

Today I will cover different ground; I shall not concentrate on the hoax itself, but on the development of the international controversy surrounding the hoax. I have several reasons for this choice of subjects, and probably the most obvious is the fact that this is after all an advanced group of well-informed persons, many or most of whom are familiar with the relevant English language literature, and Dr. Faurisson is here to show you some things about the hoax you probably have not seen yet.<sup>478</sup> Another subject only partially known to most here is the development of the international controversy. Indeed, many “well informed” Americans are not aware that there has been a very loud international Holocaust controversy recently, because they are forced to get most of their information on world developments from the U.S. press, which sometimes gives readers the impression that Butz is the only author who has rejected or challenged central claims of the extermination legend.

There are important perspectives to be gained by viewing the controversy on an international scale. Permit me to say a few more words motivating the present focus on the controversy surrounding the hoax rather than the hoax itself.

### A Simple Subject

One of my dilemmas is that, by writing a whole book on the hoax, I may have suggested something that I did not wish to suggest, because there is an important point that I should perhaps have stressed. I wrote on page 24, but did not stress, the important point that

*“There are many considerations supporting this view, and some are so*

---

<sup>478</sup> Robert Faurisson, “Extensive Research on the ‘Gas Chambers’ at Auschwitz”, audio tape, 90 min., Newport Beach, CA: Institute for Historical Review. Published as: “The Mechanics of Gassing,” *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1980, p. 23-30.

*simple that they may surprise the reader even further. The simplest valid reason for being skeptical about the extermination claim is also the simplest conceivable reason: at the end of the war, they were still there.”*

The dilemma I am delineating is that, by generating much verbiage on this subject, I may give some the impression that it is a complex one. Therefore let me state emphatically that the great verbiage is required not because the subject is complicated but because public opinion has become distorted by the media’s generation of many times that verbiage, generated over several decades, with the consequence that unusual and elaborate therapy is required. However, it is very important that this select group not lose sight of the fact that the subject is quite simple and that only a cultural illness has made the great efforts of revisionists necessary.

The elements in an effective exposé of the hoax are not many. The principal points are as follows:

1. The Jews were singled out for special persecution by Nazi Germany. Many were deprived of their property, conscripted for labor, or deported east during the war. The German documents do not speak of exterminations. The term “Final Solution” (*Endlösung*) meant the expulsion of the Jews from Europe, and the deportations to the east were a step toward that objective.
2. Documents published by the International Red Cross and the Vatican do not harmonize with the extermination claims, and the very well informed wartime Pope, Pius XII, is often castigated for not speaking up against exterminations of Jews.
3. Partially on account of general wartime conditions and partially as a consequence of the German measures against the Jews (*e.g.* crowding into ghettos), a large number of Jews perished, but nothing near six million.
4. Published population statistics are quite meaningless, mainly because almost all of the Jews involved in the problem were East European (*e.g.* two or three million Polish Jews), but also because in the USA there has been no reliable count – the census does not treat this and the concept “Jew” was not admitted into the official records when a very large number entered the U.S. after the war. To the extent that a significant number of Jews might seem to be missing from some region they occupied before the war, they can to the best of our knowledge be accounted for in terms of the massive and well known postwar movements of Jews to the U.S., Palestine, and other lands, and also in terms of their simply remaining in the Soviet Union where the Germans had put them, according to the German documents.
5. The evidence for the extermination allegations depends crucially on trials, such as the Nuremberg trials, held before courts that were for political reasons constrained to accept the basic truth of such allegations. Thus, to many relevant defendants it seemed that the only possible defense strategy was to deny not the exterminations but only their personal responsibility for them (*e.g.* Ernst Kaltenbrunner or Adolf Eichmann).
6. The horrible scenes found in the German camps in 1945 were the result of the total collapse – in the context of the total collapse of German industry

and transport – of all German countermeasures against diseases, mainly typhus, that had plagued all German camps throughout the war. These German countermeasures had included periodic showers of all inmates and also extensive and periodic use of insecticides, such as Zyklon B, for disinfection purposes.

7. Concentration camp inmates were an important source of labor for the hard pressed wartime German economy, and the high death rate that prevailed in the camps throughout the war was considered “catastrophic” by the Germans (Chapter 4, p. 160). As a result of the high death rate, about 350,000 or perhaps 400,000 inmates died in the German camps during the war, some minority of that number being Jews.<sup>479</sup>
8. There were crematoria in all of the camps for the disposal of the bodies of people who died there.
9. The camps in Germany are not even claimed to have been “extermination camps,” except in occasional publications of a frankly sensationalistic nature. The so-called “extermination camps,” such as Auschwitz, were all in Poland and were captured by the Soviet troops after having been evacuated in an orderly fashion by the Germans. The Russians found no horrible scenes comparable to those we later found in Germany and no evidence of exterminations.
10. The “gas chambers” are fictitious, and the best the bearers of the legend can do to argue their existence is to advance the ludicrous claim that the Zyklon did double duty in exterminating Jews as well as lice or to misrepresent a shower or even an ordinary room as a “gas chamber.” Another tactic is to confuse the concept of a “gas oven.” All crematorium ovens are “gas ovens.”

That is the basic structure of the hoax.

## Why a “Hoax”?

At this point, it is convenient to remark on the title I chose for my book. In the controversy, one of the things that jolted some, even some who were otherwise favorably impressed by the book, was my use of the term “hoax” to describe the received legend. Some felt that, whatever the truth of the legend, the term was not adequate or appropriate to the situation. Such a trivializing concept, it was thought, should not be applied to a legend that lives on the vast scale of the Holocaust – it struck some as comparable to criticizing Handel’s *Messiah* as a “ditty.”

Let me assure you that the choice of “hoax” was calculated and that today I am

---

<sup>479</sup> The figure is for deaths of people who had been registered as camp inmates, in written records of which enough have survived to permit the estimate. The legend asserts that the “exterminated” millions were not entered in such records. See the report, “The Number of Victims of the National Socialist Persecution,” available from the International Tracing Service, D-3548 Arolsen, Germany. The remark should not be misinterpreted as a claim that the number of Jews who perished was some minority of 350,000. Many more died outside of the concentration camps, from diseases in ghettos, in occasional pogroms, and in other commonplace and uncommonplace ways. The number is not known.

even more convinced that it was a felicitous choice, for the reason that the thing really is trivial. The term “hoax” suggests something cheap and crude, and that is precisely what I wish to suggest. A term such as “myth,” although correct and sometimes used by me, does not convey this important description of the nature of the evidence supporting the extermination claim.

The uncomfortable reaction to the term “hoax” merely reflects the nature of the great popular delusion on this subject. At one time, some of the people who are addressing you here, such as Dr. Faurisson and myself, shared not only the popular belief in the truth of the legend but also the popular impression that its truth was beyond question – “as established as the Great Pyramid,” as I wrote. However, at some point we undertook an investigation and discovered, remarkably quickly, that beneath the legend’s face of granite there stood feet of clay.

It is this focus on the feet of clay, which revisionists have seen in the historical record, that creates a great psychological distance between the revisionists and even many intelligent people, and sometimes causes revisionists to appear to be crusaders of some sort. Those who have not seen the feet of clay cannot have the degree of certainty that seems to accompany revisionists. I believe that perhaps this contrast between the apparent dignity of the received legend and the reality of its crude and contemptible foundations is the key point that must be developed in the psychological reorientation of people whom you wish to inform. Once such a psychological reorientation is accomplished, the rest is routine. The jolt that the word “hoax” causes is a calculated initial step in this reorientation.

## A Societal Problem

Another reason for the wish to focus on the controversy here is that it represents a distinct problem. That is, there is an historical problem, treated in my book, and there is also the problem of the societal status of the legend, the subject of my talk today. The former, the historical problem, is relatively simple in comparison to the latter, or perhaps I should say that I do not feel that I understand the societal status of the hoax nearly as well as I understand the hoax itself. However, a couple of obvious features can be safely noted. For one thing, it is a case of media induced hysteria. For another, the political interests involved are not dead and gone, like those of World War I, but are as contemporary as tomorrow’s headlines, for Israel is always in trouble and will be in trouble as long as it exists as a Jewish state.

This has put historical scholarship into a dreadful situation, which can be seen more clearly, if we consider the manner, in which knowledge is almost always diffused in the “hard” sciences. There it is almost always the case that trained specialists, with appropriate credentials as professionals in the scientific area involved, make the initial revelations of new knowledge. These revelations are normally made first to colleagues and are formulated in the esoteric language of the specialty. Then, over some period of time, the new knowledge filters to general society, with the terms, in which it is described, undergoing in the process gradual simplification and popularization.

That is clearly not what has been happening in this “Holocaust” area. The non-specialist who has seen the feet of clay cannot get his most urgent and elementary questions answered by consulting the scholarly journals, for the simple reason that the societal and political conditions I have referred to have frightened the scholars away, and that is essentially the cultural illness I referred to earlier. It is not so much that the historians have had the wrong answers – they have not even confronted the questions, and the number of persons outside of the historical profession, to whom that fact is painfully obvious, is at least literal myriads today. Imagine such a situation holding in physics.

Now one can understand the curiosity that so disturbs many persons that this is “a field completely dominated by non-historians,” as I wrote in Chapter 7 (p. 263). Although the remark is no longer entirely true, it is still largely the case that the people who have drawn the obvious conclusions from the feet of clay and have publicized their conclusions do not have backgrounds as historians – mine is in engineering. I am the first to concede that this is a sorry situation, but the situation would be even more sorry, if nobody were asking questions about the so-called Holocaust. We can and should take considerable comfort from the fact that we have retained the cultural vitality to carry on here despite the default of the historians.

Another facet of this is the fact that, the normal channels for the flow of knowledge having been blocked, leadership in disseminating the revisionist view of the Final Solution has fallen to publications with special ideological orientations. For example *The Spotlight* in the U.S. and the *National Zeitung* in Germany are weekly newspapers that do not claim to be scholarly, but again we should take comfort from the fact that somebody has been beating the drum, for such widely read publications do nevertheless create pressures on the historians that make it more difficult for them to continue avoiding this subject.

They also serve to inform the general public, and here we should take note of the requirements of historical revisionism, because I may be misunderstood by some here and it may appear from my remarks that I am claiming that ideally such matters should be confined to scholarly journals and that the general public should not be bothered with them. I intend no such meaning, but it is true that there must be a distinction between the matters treated by scholars and those treated by the popular press.

The general public does not have the faculties or temperaments to treat knowledge in the ways of the specialists, so one must be prepared to accept something else for such purposes, and here it is useful to distinguish between an intolerable and a tolerable popular outlook. It would, for example, be intolerable if the populace believe the world to be flat. However, I suppose that for all practical purposes a belief that it is spherical would be tolerable and that a concern for the macro and micro deviations from sphericity can be left to the relevant specialists.

A comparable situation holds in this “Holocaust” area, and most of the publications that have been propagating the revisionist viewpoint on the “Six Million” have been doing a reasonably good job, both in terms of informing their readerships, given the noted constraints imposed by them, and in terms of generating pressures on the historians who might prefer to avoid the subject.

## Development of the Controversy

Before the early Seventies, there was only a relatively minor amount of publicly expressed questioning of the Holocaust legend. The most significant literature was the work of the former Buchenwald inmate and French Resistance member Paul Rassinier, who died in 1967. However, in reflection of the fact that there existed little interest in the subject, English translations of the Rassinier books were not published until very recently, *i.e.* in the past four years.

Around 1972 or 1973, there was an international development, by its nature not noticed at the time, that remains fundamentally mysterious. What I am referring to is the fact that a number of persons in several countries, virtually simultaneously and completely independently of each other (in fact each was not even aware of the existence of the others) resolved to question the received legend in the manner that was appropriate to his own situation and to publish his conclusions. Thies Christophersen's booklet *Die Auschwitz Lüge*, based on his recollections of his own stay near Auschwitz during the war and with an Introduction by Manfred Roeder, was published in Germany in 1973, and it was soon followed there by Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich's short article in the monthly *Nation Europa*, also based on his recollections of his wartime assignment near Auschwitz. The year 1973 also saw the appearance in the U.S. of Dr. Austin J. App's booklet *The Six Million Swindle*.

Richard Harwood's booklet *Did Six Million Really Die?* was published in Britain in the spring of 1974, and later in the same year there was the uproar at the Sorbonne over a letter by Dr. Robert Faurisson, so both were at work on this subject in 1973, if not earlier. My work commenced in 1972, and my book was published in Britain in the spring of 1976 and in German translation a year later.

In this review, I have not mentioned every relevant publication, and no value judgments should be made purely from the inclusion or exclusion of anything from the list. The purpose here is not to offer a bibliography or a critique but to discuss the development of the controversy.

These developments of the early and mid-Seventies initiated reactions and a controversy that still shows no sign of subsiding, as I think you are aware. In Germany, Roeder was successfully prosecuted for his Introduction to the Christophersen booklet,<sup>480</sup> and Stäglich was punished with a five year, twenty percent reduction of his pension as a retired judge.<sup>481</sup> These acts of officially enforced censorship did not daunt any of these persons. A new version of the Christophersen booklet was issued with an Introduction by Stäglich substituted for Roeder's. Stäglich has recently published his fine book *Der Auschwitz Mythos* through the Grabert-Verlag, and he has also co-published a shorter work with Udo Walendy. The so-called liberal establishment in Germany has been in a dither over this lone courageous man, and it has been openly asked in its press "is it really so difficult

---

<sup>480</sup> *Jewish Chronicle* (London), February 27, 1976, p. 3; *Patterns of Prejudice* (London), January-February 1977, p. 12.

<sup>481</sup> *Nation Europa* (Coburg), August 1975, p. 39.

to get this old and neo-Nazi?”<sup>482</sup>

Events unfolded differently in Britain, indeed in such a manner as to clearly suggest that questioning of the holy Six Million was not much longer to be restricted to an underground of any sort. In an astonishing development, the now famous Harwood booklet was favorably reviewed by the well known author Colin Wilson in the November 1974 issue of the influential monthly *Books and Bookman*. A furious controversy, which lasted about six months, ensued in the “Letters” section of this magazine. I have elsewhere criticized the Harwood booklet and pointed out some serious errors in it.<sup>483</sup> However, it also has its virtues and has been effective in stimulating questions, celebration, and discussion of its formerly taboo subject. It was banned in South Africa in 1976<sup>484</sup> and effectively banned in West Germany in its German translation in late 1978.

The Institute of Jewish Affairs in London published its quite vacuous article on my book in the November-December 1976 issue of its magazine *Patterns of Prejudice*. Around the same time, there began at Northwestern University an uproar over my book that soon resulted in national and even international publicity. There was a long story in the *New York Times*, but the story misreported the title of the book as *Fabrication of Hoax*.<sup>485</sup> I shall say a few more words about the fuss at Northwestern later.

In April 1977, I wrote to the magazine *Index on Censorship* (headquartered in London and affiliated with Amnesty International) to report to them the many acts of official censorship in this area, such as the events in Germany and South Africa. *Index* has assumed the responsibility of merely reporting instances of censorship, usually without further comment. They replied to me in May 1977 that they “will put the question of whether or not to take it up to our editorial board.” On my trip to Europe in the summer of 1977, I visited their headquarters and was told the editorial board had not yet deliberated on the matter. I have heard no further word from them, and I intend to write to them again soon to report new instances of censorship, which were not long in coming, for I was forbidden from speaking in Munich on September 3, 1977.<sup>486</sup>

Another development of 1977 was the commencement of the English language publishing operations of Ditlieb Felderer’s excellent group in Sweden.<sup>487</sup>

March 1978 brought the tragedy of the assassination of the French historian François Duprat, allegedly by an Auschwitz “remembrance commando,” for the offense of having denied the Six Million.<sup>488</sup>

Spring 1978 saw the U.S. airing of NBC’s eight hour *Holocaust* monstrosity with all the preliminary and post hoopla. The inanities and hysterics were repeated in Britain later in 1978 and in several European countries early in 1979. In Germany, the airing of *Holocaust* was perfectly timed to influence the Bundestag’s

<sup>482</sup> *Die Zeit*, May 25, 1979, p. 5.

<sup>483</sup> *Voice of German Americans* (New York), March 1978.

<sup>484</sup> *Patterns of Prejudice*, September-October 1977, p. 19.

<sup>485</sup> *New York Times*, January 28, 1977, p. A10.

<sup>486</sup> *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, September 2, 1977, p. 13; September 3-4, 1977, p. 13f.

<sup>487</sup> *Bible Researcher*, Marknadsvagen 289, 2 tr, S-183 Taby, Sweden.

<sup>488</sup> *Le Monde*, March 19-20, 1978, p. 24; March 23, 1978, p. 7.



decision not to permit a statute of limitations to go into effect for “war crimes.” I criticized *Holocaust* elsewhere, and I shall not waste words on it here.<sup>489</sup> I understand that it is to be shown again soon.

In the summer of 1978, the Noontide Press edition of some of Rassinier’s writings appeared.<sup>490</sup> A year later, Historical Review Press issued its English translation of Rassinier’s Eichmann book.<sup>491</sup>

Late 1978 brought a significant escalation of the controversy in all senses. In October 1978, the German publisher Propyläen issued Prof. Hellmut Diwald’s massive *Geschichte der Deutschen* (History of the Germans). Propyläen is an old firm, now owned by Axel Springer, which specializes in publishing books written by scholars but for an intelligent lay readership. On two pages, Diwald said some things very much in harmony with things revisionists of the “Final Solution” have said, and of course the clamor of the Establishment’s spokesmen was deafening. Golo Mann wrote that “these two pages [...] are the most monstrous that I have had to read in a German book since 1945,”<sup>492</sup> and the publisher responded to the clamor by stopping the sale of the first edition and substituting a new edition with the two offending pages hastily rewritten – in a style I am assured is not Diwald’s – in order to conform to the usual line. Axel Springer further promised publicly, in words I cannot imagine coming from a U.S. publisher under any circumstances, that this was only the beginning of the rewriting of the book and that by fall 1979 the book would be “not recognizable.”<sup>493</sup>

The original two pages that Diwald had published were not particularly significant in themselves; relatively little was said. There are, however, two points of major significance to note. First, Diwald does not lack credentials as an historian. He is a history professor at the Friedrich-Alexander University in Erlangen and has been well known in the historical profession since taking his doctorate under the German-Jewish historian Hans-Joachim Schoeps more than two decades ago. Second, the fact of the panic rewriting of the two pages, as a result of public pressure, definitively established points that should be made when people ask such questions as “why do even the Germans concede the reality of the six million murders?” or “why do the historians concede them?” The market in ideas in this area is not a free one. Throughout the world, there are at least informal and unofficial barriers to free expression and discussion.

In some countries, especially in Germany, there are also formal and legally enforced barriers. That fact has already been noted here, but late 1978 saw the initiation in Germany of a great new wave of repression. In that country there exists the concept of “youth-menacing media” (*jugendgefährdende Medien*). It is something like the “X rating” concept in the USA, except that its application is supervised by the government and not almost entirely restricted to pornography. In theory, the law is supposed to prevent only the availability of things to youth, but when non-

---

<sup>489</sup> *Spotlight* (Washington), May 8, 1978.

<sup>490</sup> Rassinier (1978).

<sup>491</sup> Rassinier (1979).

<sup>492</sup> *Der Spiegel*, December 4, 1978, p. 14f.

<sup>493</sup> *Der Spiegel*, April 9, 1979, p. 232ff; *National Zeitung* (Munich), February 16, 1979, p. 6.

pornographic matter goes on the list, the practical effect is to ban it, for the law specifies that listed literature may not be advertised or sold to private parties by mail. It can still be sold in bookstores, subject to certain restrictions, but with the exception of the Diwald book the literature that has been discussed here had never been stocked by regular bookstores in Germany anyway.

Late 1978 marked the beginning of an obviously systematic campaign in West Germany to put much of the literature I have told you about on the list of youth-menacing literature. The first was the German translation of the Harwood booklet, and the German translation of my book, entitled *Der Jahrhundertbetrug*, went onto the list in May 1979.<sup>494</sup> There is also a move against the Stäglich book that is too recent to discuss further here. Such developments in the official area in Germany, together with developments in the unofficial area, such as the Diwald affair, answer conclusively the question of why even Germans concede the reality of the “exterminations.” The system that we set up there after the Second World War gives them no other choice.

Almost simultaneously with these events in Germany, things were happening in France. In late October 1978, *l'Express*, a magazine comparable to *Newsweek*, published an interview with Louis Darquier de Pellepoix, who had been commissioner for Jewish affairs in the Vichy government during the German occupation and who has lived in Spain since the war. Darquier's generally unrepentant attitude – plus his claim that the only creatures gassed at Auschwitz had been lice – set off a French uproar virtually coincident with the one around Diwald on the other side of the Rhine. Most significantly for our interests, the spotlight then turned on Robert Faurisson, who was then teaching at the University of Lyon-2 and who had been almost forgotten since the relatively minor flap when he was at the Sorbonne in 1974. The disorders on the part of some of the students led to Faurisson's suspension from his teaching duties, a suspension that is still in effect, but another result of all their attention to Faurisson's supposedly outrageous views was that *Le Monde*, the French equivalent of the *New York Times*, saw itself obligated, much against its wishes, to give him space in which to express these views. It is true that *Le Monde* gave the other side much more space, but an important barrier had been broken, at least in France, and I am told that today there are a lot of questions being openly asked in that country whose expression would have been inconceivable only a year ago.<sup>495</sup>

As a consequence of the publicity in France, Faurisson was able to participate in a three hour debate on Italian-language Swiss television on April 17, 1979. I am told that the program generated enormous interest, that most impartial observers thought Faurisson had won the debate, and that the whole thing was rebroadcast on May 6. As a result of the television debate, a long interview with Faurisson was published in the August 1979 and following issues of the Italian magazine *Storia Illustrata*; this interview is by far the most instructive material on the

<sup>494</sup> *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, June 16, 1979, p. 23; *New York Times*, May 22, 1979, p. A13.

<sup>495</sup> *Le Monde*, November 22, 1978, p. 42; December 16, 1978, p. 12; December 29, 1978, p. 8; January 10, 1979, p. 11; January 16, 1979, p. 13; February 3, 1979, p. 10; February 21, 1979, p. 23; March 8, 1979, p. 31.

Holocaust subject to be published, to date, in an “Establishment” magazine or newspaper.<sup>496</sup>

At the height of the Diwald and Faurisson controversies in Europe, another one broke out in Australia. John Bennett, a Melbourne civil liberties lawyer, had sent copies of my book to several Melbourne academics, together with a memo by him summarizing what seemed to him to be some of the principal arguments in support of the thesis of the book, and inviting critical comment (I understand that to date, despite the publicity there, almost no such comment had been forthcoming). Neither the memo nor anything else Bennett had written on the subject had been intended for publication, but one weekly newspaper got a copy of the memo somehow and published it, igniting a controversy that lasted several months.<sup>497</sup>

In these controversies, the guardians of the legend have said very little of intellectual content. It has, with only rare exceptions, been all name-calling – “anti-Semitic,” “neo-Nazi,” etc. So here are a few people who have lived well up to or into middle age without it ever having occurred to anybody to call them such things and who are now so belatedly assaulted with these political cuss words just because they asked questions about the Six Million.

There was another important development early in 1979 and it came, oddly, from the CIA. Two photointerpreters released their study of some aerial reconnaissance photographs of Auschwitz that the U.S. made in 1944, when Auschwitz was of strategic interest as an oil target. Despite the publicity and even an historian’s claims that the photographs provided some sort of evidence of exterminations, there was no such evidence in the photographs.<sup>498</sup> What was to be found in the photographs was on crucial points exactly what was predicted in my book, where it was shown in Chapter 5 that such photographs must exist, although I had not seen them.<sup>499</sup>

## Negative Reactions in Academia

I have suggested that the negative reactions to revisionists of the Final Solution have been on the whole emotional, and I made no distinction between reactions of professional scholars and laymen. This was no oversight. I am sad to report that to an extent that stunned me the reactions of very many scholars have been what one might have expected from a hyperemotional Jewish grandmother. In the early stages of the public reactions to my book, one Prof. Wolfe of New York University made a fool of himself by writing to the *New York Times* that Northwestern University should bring me up on charges of “academic incompetence” and “moral turpitude” for authoring and publishing the book whose title, he

---

<sup>496</sup> English translation published as R. Faurisson, “The gas chambers: Truth or lie?”, *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1981, p. 319-373.

<sup>497</sup> *National Times*, February 10; February 24; *The Age*, February 15; February 16; March 3; March 15; March 17; March 22; March 23; March 24; March 28; April 6; April 14; May 8; *Nation Review*, May 24; May 31; June 28; *Weekend Australian*, May 26-27. All 1979.

<sup>498</sup> *Washington Post*, February 23, 1979, p. A1; *New York Times*, February 24, 1979, p. 2; March 6, 1979, p. A16.

<sup>499</sup> Brugioni and Poirier.

reported in his letter, was “*Fabrication of a Hoax*.” Clearly he had seen the *New York Times* story about the book, which reported an incorrect title, and he had not seen the book itself.<sup>500</sup>

That was an extreme case, but it is still true that scholars who should know better have made a lot of noises while saying almost nothing of substance. In all of the professorial criticism of my book at Northwestern, the only point of historical weight that was raised against it, and that reached me, was that the published population statistics are in conflict with my claims. That fact is mentioned and discussed in the first chapter of my book (p. 187).

The History Department at Northwestern supposedly undertook to sponsor a series of lectures entitled “Dimensions of the Holocaust,” but then the Chairman of the Department gave the show away in his introductory remarks by thanking the Hillel Foundation for rounding up the speakers for the affair. The University shortly later published the lectures in a booklet that is presumably still available.

There was another instructive development at Northwestern. There was published in the student newspaper a full page advertisement, sponsored by the Hillel Foundation and bearing a statement of “condemnation” signed by about half of the faculty.<sup>501</sup> There is no need to reproduce the text here. The statement mentioned “the murder of over eleven million people, among them six million Jews, by Nazi Germany,” and I think the most interesting feature of this is not the six million Jews but the five million or more others, who seem to have been added to the propaganda both rather recently and rather arbitrarily, although it is said that so-called “Nazi-hunter” Simon Wiesenthal has used the figure for some time.<sup>502</sup>

There is apparently some specific propaganda point served by the five million Gentiles. Wiesenthal claims that “one of the biggest mistakes made on the side of the Jews” has been to emphasize only the six million Jews and not the others, with the result that Jews “lost many friends.” I must confess that I do not see the point at all, but apparently it has been decided to toss the five million Gentiles into the propaganda on at least selected occasions.

To return to the statement of condemnation that was signed by so many faculty members at Northwestern, there is clearly something graver involved here than mere conformity to a doctrine or established myth, for it is a certainty that the vast majority of the signers had never heard of the five million *goyim* until they were confronted with the statement to sign. Their subscription was therefore not based on mere unquestioning acceptance of a familiar historical claim. It was based on considerations even more baleful to an academic environment. I will not explore the point further here, but it is easy to get the dismal impression that many would have signed almost anything related to the controversy, provided the Hillel Foundation wished it signed.

It is dismaying to report such behavior on the part of those to whom society has entrusted the custody of its affairs of the intellect. However, there are at least

<sup>500</sup> *New York Times*, February 4, 1977, p. A22.

<sup>501</sup> *Daily Northwestern*, March 30, 1977, p. 5.

<sup>502</sup> *Chicago Daily News*, November 12-13, 1977; *Los Angeles Times*, May 6, 1979, part 9, p. 4; *Los Angeles Times Calendar*, May 13, 1979, p. 2; *New York Times*, May 28, 1979, p. D7.

some indications that it is being realized that a more serious treatment of my book, if only to attempt to discredit it, is required. It has recently been said that "Butz might succeed in delivering ammunition to more 'revisionists' of the Final Solution. Here lies the danger. Butz should be unmasked, not ignored."<sup>503</sup>

## Conclusions

You can see the gist of the conclusions I am going to draw from this account of the development of the controversy. What I have described to you has been a process, whereby a thesis has emerged from the underground, to which it had been assigned both on account of political pressures and on account of its seeming implausibility (given the decades of propaganda), into the light of day where it is being discussed and argued in establishment publications throughout the world. It is still a minority thesis, but the trend in favor of revisionists is obvious to anybody who is not willfully blind.

Revisionists of the Final Solution, a handful of lone individuals of meager resources, have been successful far beyond their expectations – at least I did not expect things to unfold so rapidly – and this cannot be explained entirely in terms of the quality of their efforts. It can only be explained in terms of society's being receptive to such views at this point in history. The development that I have outlined here has now gone so far that I now believe it is almost irrelevant what I and my present revisionist colleagues do, or what happens to us.

To see the reason for this, one need only return to one of my earliest points: this is a simple subject. The almost universal delusions have existed not because of the complexities of the subject but because of political factors in Western society. A corollary of the simplicity of the hoax is that it only need be questioned and discussed, in a context free of intimidation and hysteria, for the psychological re-orientation spoken of earlier to be accomplished, the shattering of the delusions following in due course. That point has for all practical purposes been reached or soon will be reached.

I shall make an observation that may seem harsh. Revisionists of the Holocaust have been, to put it bluntly, victims of multifarious persecution. You know only a part of it – the part that appears in the newspapers, such as the book bannings in Germany or Faurisson's suspension at the University of Lyon-2. The other part, the more personal part, is at most only hinted at in the newspapers, is generally not known to you, and we shall not bother you with details of such painful things, but let me assure you they exist. I therefore am fully cognizant that it is harsh of me to make this observation: we should greet the fact of the persecutions, for they are symptomatic of success, and even the victims should be as elated over them as is psychologically possible in the grim personal circumstances they are in.

Sometimes it is said that the revisionist Holocaust thesis is comparable to claiming that the world is flat, but note that nobody bothers the flat earth people. It is not rough to go up against the whole world with no chance of winning, but it is very rough to go up against it with some chance of winning. That is what revi-

---

<sup>503</sup> *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, April 1979, p. 264.

sionists of the Final Solution did, and that is the reason for the persecutions, but the persecutions are too late and in vain, for as I just noted: it is almost irrelevant at this point what happens to today's Holocaust revisionists. The present inertia of the controversy has the weight to bring down the hoax even without their personal participation and deliver these mendacious and pernicious years into the trash can of shattered hoaxes.



## Supplement 2: Context and Perspective in the Holocaust Controversy

*Presented orally at the 1982 conference of the Institute for Historical Review. This is a slightly edited version of the paper as published in the Journal of Historical Review, vol. 3, no. 4, Winter 1982, pp. 371-405.*

When we criticize somebody in the discussion of some subject, because “he can’t see the forest for the trees,” we refer to a special sort of intellectual failing. We do not mean that the object of our criticism is incompetent or that his views on the subject of interest are erroneous or irrelevant. His views may, on the contrary, be buttressed by investigations of depth and power that would be a credit to any intellect. We mean that he is so focused on details that he fails to see the subject in proper and larger context, especially from the higher perspective, which, if adopted and pursued, would solve many of the problems that excited general curiosity in the subject in the first place.

When I first addressed an IHR conference three years ago, I explicitly made reference to this problem by pointing out that on p. 24 of this book I mentioned the consideration that, if appreciated adequately, would have made much of my study superfluous:

*“The simplest valid reason for being skeptical about the extermination claim is also the simplest conceivable reason: at the end of the war they were still there.”*

Through all of the controversy on the Holocaust, my thoughts have continually returned to this point. That so much controversy could have raged, with only rare occurrences of this observation, raises questions that are worth exploring.

On the one hand, my making of the above and similar general historical observations shows that I did not myopically see only the trees and not the forest. On the other hand, in some parts of the book my focus may seem to be on obscure details and to suggest myopia. This bifocalism is the topic of this paper. For one thing, I want to develop the “forest” side of the subject further, *i.e.* I want to place the “Holocaust” subject more firmly in the context of the higher history of the twentieth century. On the other hand, I want to consider the fact that so much of the investigation that has been conducted in recent years, certainly including my own, has presupposed and sought to satisfy myopic demands. I will argue, partly from historical analogy, that as a practical matter this great emphasis on detail seems justified and even necessary in the times we are in, but that it is important, in order to avoid getting tripped up on points of detail, that we keep the larger context in mind.



## Gitta Sereny

Gitta Sereny's article in the *New Statesman* of November 2, 1979, furnishes a useful illustration. She attempted to counter my arguments in only one respect. In the course of writing *Into That Darkness*, she had interviewed, in a German prison, Franz Stangl, former commandant of Treblinka (a facility in central Poland that served as a transit camp for deportations of Warsaw Jews). She wrote:

*"I talked with Stangl for weeks in prison; I talked to others who worked under him, and to their families. I talked to people who, otherwise uninvolved, witnessed these events in Poland. And I talked to a few of those very few who survived.*

*Butz claims in his Hoax that those [hundreds] who admitted taking part in extermination were doing so as plea-bargaining, in order to get lighter sentences. But those I talked to had been tried. Many had served their sentences, and none of them had anything to gain – except shame – by what they told me. Stangl himself wanted only to talk, and then to die. And Stangl is dead. But if [...] Butz [...] were really interested in the truth, Stangl's wife, and many other witnesses are still able to testify."*

Although the point is not of major importance, I note that Sereny had misleadingly reported Stangl's hopes during her interview. According to her *Into That Darkness*, Stangl was awaiting the decision on his appeal against a life sentence, so he presumably wanted to get out of jail before he died.

Anybody who has taken even a brief look at the details of the Treblinka legend (e.g. the claim that the exhausts of captured Russian tanks and trucks were used in the "gassings") would understand that history was not being served by Sereny's remarks on her interviews with Stangl. However, I am afraid that in the typical case such healthy skepticism might be accompanied by some myopia in offering an explanation for Sereny's account.

The most obvious myopic reaction would be to say or suggest that Sereny was lying, that Stangl never said anything like what she has attributed to him. Other possibilities might be to suggest that such remarks by Stangl were produced by bribery or torture. That such reactions quite miss the mark is easily seen by first considering the context, rather than the content, of Stangl's remarks. He was by then an old man. He had heard the tales of what was supposed to have happened at Treblinka for twenty-five years. Of course, he privately scoffed at them at first. Then he got accustomed to living in a culture, in which such tales were never publicly challenged. He may (as sometimes happens in such circumstances) have started to believe them himself, or perhaps he privately cultivated his knowledge that the tales were almost pure invention. It is most unlikely that we shall ever know, but we do know that in his confrontation with the journalist Sereny, the hapless old man could scarcely have reasoned that he could help himself by denying the legend as it applies to Treblinka. I am confident that Stangl told Sereny something like she reports. Of course Stangl sought to excuse himself personally, but what possible self-serving reason could he have found for telling Sereny that the "gassings" are a myth?

Accordingly, I wrote in my letter of reply to the *New Statesman*, which was not published there but was later published elsewhere:<sup>504</sup>

*“The key point is that the objective served by such statements should be presumed to be personal interest rather than historical truth. At a ‘trial’ some specific thing is to be tried, i.e. the court is supposed to start by treating that thing as an open question.*

*The ‘extermination’ allegation has never been at question in any practical sense in any of the relevant trials, and in some it has not been open to question in a formal legal sense. The question was always only personal responsibility in a context in which the extermination allegation was unquestionable. Thus the ‘confessions’ of Germans, which in all cases sought to deny or mitigate personal responsibility, were merely the only defenses they could present in their circumstances.*

*This is not exactly ‘plea-bargaining,’ where there is negotiation between prosecution and defense, but it is related. All it amounts to is presenting a story that it was possible for the court to accept. The logical dilemma is inescapable once the defendant resolves to take the ‘trial’ seriously. To deny the legend was not the way to stay out of jail.*

*Moreover it is not true, as Sereny implicitly asserts, that this logical dilemma no longer holds when the defendant is serving a life sentence. If he is seeking pardon or parole, he would not try to overturn what has already been decided in court; that is not the way pardon or parole works. For example, at the Frankfurt ‘Auschwitz trial’ of 1963-1965, so monstrous were the supposed deeds of Robert Mulka that many thought his sentence to 14 years at hard labor unduly light. Then, in a denouement that would amaze all who have not studied this subject closely, Mulka was quietly released less than four months later. However, if Mulka had claimed in any plea (as he could have truthfully), either at his trial or afterwards, that there were no exterminations at Auschwitz and that he was in a position to know, then he would have served a full life sentence in the former case and the full fourteen years in the latter, if he lived that long.*

*It is not widely known, but there have been many such instances – the subject is hard to investigate.<sup>505</sup> In no instance would it have made any sense, in terms of immediate self interest, to deny the exterminations. That was not the way to get out of jail.”*

If one accepts, as the terms of the debate, the purely defensive attitude of responding to the specific points made by the other side, then I still believe this to be the correct way to answer Sereny. I was satisfied as I wrote those lines, but in the course of so doing, the madness of the immediate context struck me. It was 1979, not 1942, and Sereny was trying to explain to readers of the *New Statesman*, via her account of a lone old man’s remarks, that they should believe the “extermination” tales. Continuing the letter, then, I wrote:

<sup>504</sup> *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 1 no. 2. Summer 1980, pp. 153ff. The “Dr.” before my signature was added by the editor. I never sign that way.

<sup>505</sup> *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, September 2, 1979, p. E2.

*“We do not need ‘confessions’ or ‘trials’ to determine that the bombings of Dresden and Hiroshima, or the reprisals at Lidice following Heydrich’s assassination, really took place. Now, the extermination legend does not claim a few instances of homicide, but alleges events continental in geographical scope, of three years in temporal scope, and of several million in scope of victims. How ludicrous, then, is the position of the bearers of the legend, who in the last analysis will attempt to ‘prove’ such events on the basis of ‘confessions’ delivered under the fabric of hysteria, censorship, intimidation, persecution and blatant illegality that has been shrouding this subject for 35 years.”*

To put it another way: In her 1979 article, Sereny was arguing the reality of the colossal events alleged by reporting what a tired old man recently told her in prison. One might as well argue that the gypsies burned down New York City in 1950, on the basis of confessions of gypsies who were living there at the time. Of course Sereny would argue that I am seizing on only one remark of hers and making it appear to be her whole argument. However, while I concede that she has a great deal more to say on this subject, the basic observation still stands. She was taking a great deal of space in a prominent journal in presenting arguments that in 1979 were wildly incommensurate with the allegation in question. If the Jews of Europe really had been exterminated, such arguments would not be offered.

When I saw Robert Faurisson in 1980, he congratulated me on this point, *i.e.* for pointing out that we do not need “trials” in order to believe in real historical events (Hiroshima, Lidice, etc.), and said he wished he had thought of it. I knew how he felt, for, at about the time of Sereny’s article, a man I had never heard of before telephoned me and raised a point I wished I had thought of, namely, why didn’t those Jewish bodies outside the Axis sphere, who had so much to say about “extermination” and “murder,” undertake to warn the Jews under Hitler what supposedly lay in store for them in the German resettlement programs? In all accounts we are told that the Jews packed up for the deportations and entered camps later without imagining that they were to be killed. This feature of the legend is of course necessary, for it is well known that violent resistance to the deportations was very rare (I implicitly touched this point in Chapter 4, p. 140-141, but nowhere nearly as strongly as I should have).

The general lesson suggested by these two incidents is the subject of this paper. We see that what was involved in both incidents was temporary myopia, not merely of the bearers of the received legend, but more importantly of the revisionists, who were so busy analyzing the trees that it took some fortuitous prodding to make them notice some important features of the forest. This is not a failing of individuals. It is a consequence of the historical circumstances, in which we find ourselves. I shall try to describe those circumstances and show how we should handle them today. This is done partly by presenting my approximation of posterity’s outlook on these matters and partly by offering several suggestions on the conduct of practical controversy.

## The Donation of Constantine

The “Donation of Constantine” is the most famous forgery in European history. It first appeared somewhere around the year 800. It is a document allegedly in the “hands” (*sic*) of Emperor Constantine I (288? – 337), which recounts the long-standing and false legend of Constantine’s conversion and baptism by Pope Sylvester I. Its principal feature is its grant to the Pope of temporal authority over “the city of Rome and all the provinces, places, and states of Italy, and the western regions.” It also decrees that the Pope “shall have the supremacy as well over the four principal (holy) sees, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople,” and makes various additional specific grants. To make it clear that the Donation is in earnest, the document then has Constantine declare his intention to transfer his own capital to “the practice of Byzantia (where) a city should be built in our name [...] for where the primate of priests and the head of the Christian religion is established by the Heavenly Emperor, it is not right that an earthly Emperor shall have authority there.”

What is of the greatest interest here is that the authenticity of this document was rarely questioned before the fifteenth century, despite the facts that (1) according to legends and histories widely available throughout the Middle Ages and to the document itself, the city that Constantine founded on the ancient site of Byzantium, and which was later called “Constantinople,” had not yet been founded, much less made the site of a principal holy see and (2) more conclusively, and in analogy with our “they were still there” observation on the Holocaust, according to records and histories available throughout the Middle Ages, imperial rule continued in Italy during the times of Constantine, Sylvester, and their immediate successors.

It was certainly not lack of interest or relevance that explains the long failure to see the Donation as a fraud. Much of the political life of the Middle Ages revolved around the controversy over the relative power of Pope and Holy Roman (*i.e.* German) Emperor, and able intellects participated in circumstances, in which the Donation was considered one of the arguments on the side of the Pope. Even Dante (1265-1321), an outspoken enemy of papal temporal power, touched on the Donation in his *Inferno* only to deplore Constantine’s granting of it:

*O Constantine, what great evil had as its mother  
Not your conversion, but that dowry  
Which the first rich father got from you!*

Thus, a wildly ahistoric forgery, approximately in the class of a letter bearing the alleged signature of George Washington, granting the Methodist Episcopal Church “authority to rule over Washington, DC and subject territories of North America,” went almost unchallenged throughout centuries of relevant controversy.

The first challenges were typically silly, off the mark, tendentious, or circumlocutory, and often, with Dante, challenged only the desirability of the Donation and not its historicity. In the middle of the twelfth century, the reform movement of Arnold of Brescia attacked the whole legend of Sylvester and the Donation by

arguing that Constantine was already a Christian when he met Sylvester. Among the anti-papal Ghibellines of Germany, there arose around 1200 the legend that, when Constantine made the Donation, the angels cried audibly “Alas, alas, this day has poison been dropped into the Church of God.” The partisans of the Pope retorted that, sure, the weeping was heard, but it was just the Devil in disguise, trying to deceive us. Others argued that the Donation was not valid because Constantine was tainted with Arian heresy, or because the consent of the people had not been obtained, or because the grant was supposed to apply only to Constantine’s reign. Others turned the donation into a back-handed blow at the papacy by arguing that it showed papal primacy to be derived not from God, but from the Emperor. Indeed, the last argument became, until the middle of the fifteenth century, a standard attitude toward the Donation on the part of anti-papal spokesmen. Around 1200, two writers had pointed to the fact of the continuity of imperial rule in Italy after the alleged Donation, but their presentations were circumlocutory and did not reveal their personal conclusions on the matter, and they had no evident influence on future controversy.

What should have been a conclusive critique of the Donation came in 1433, not from an anti-papal source, but from somebody we might characterize as a liberal reformer within the Church. Cusanus, Deacon of St. Florinus of Coblenz, presented for the use of the Council of Basle a critique of the Donation, which emphasized the overwhelming historical evidence against any transfer of sovereignty from Emperor to Pope in or just after the time of Sylvester and Constantine.

Cusanus’ *De concordantia catholica* had little direct impact, partly because of its dry and dispassionate tone and partly because it was eclipsed by the 1440 treatise of Lorenzo Valla, *De falso credita et ementita Constantini*. It is Valla’s name that is most closely associated with the overthrow of the hoax, partly because his own considerable talents were supplemented by Cusanus’ work, partly because of the oratorical and passionate nature of his treatise, and partly because the quickly succeeding developments of printing and the Reformation movement gave the treatise a massive distribution in various translations.

Valla’s basic approach was to subject the Donation to criticism from every perspective that was available to him. For example, he starts by trying to look at the matter from the perspective of Constantine, “a man who through thirst for dominion had waged war against nations, and attacking friends and relatives in civil strife had taken the government from them,” who then allegedly would “set about giving to another out of pure generosity the city of Rome, his fatherland, the head of the world, the queen of states, [...] betaking himself thence to an humble little town, Byzantium.” After reading only a few pages of Valla, the Donation seems incredible, but the treatise runs to about 80 pages in English translation and is a classic case of “overkill.” Valla supported Cusanus’ argument that the alleged transfer of sovereignty had not taken place with the evidence of the Roman coins of the period, which were issued in the names of Emperors, not Popes. Valla analyzed the language and vocabulary of the Donation document and showed they could not have represented the sort of Latin used by Constantine. Such methods were novel for the times.

Valla was not a disinterested scholar. At the time he wrote the treatise, he was employed as secretary to Alfonso of Aragon, who was contesting the rule of Naples with the Pope. Valla left his readers in no doubt of his view that temporal power of the Pope is bad and ought to be abolished. Nevertheless, Valla's treatise is a landmark in the rise of historical criticism, and I believe it can profitably be studied today by those engaged in "debunking the genocide myth."

Although somebody was burned at the stake in Strassburg in 1458 for denying the Donation, Valla's thesis was at first quite well received among educated people, although the treatise remained in manuscript. By 1500, it seemed the legend was finished; the relative quiescence of fundamental controversy on the character of the papacy was probably helpful. However, the development of the Reformation movement and the wide use of Valla's treatise as a weapon against the papacy had the ironic effect of reviving the defense of the legend. On the one hand, Martin Luther declared in 1537 that Valla's treatise had convinced him that the Pope was the embodiment of the Antichrist. On the other hand, Steuchus, librarian of the Vatican, produced in 1547 a rather able attack on Valla's treatise, which was put on the Index shortly later. The process of overthrowing the legend could only be considered completed around 1600, when the great Catholic historian Baronius declared that the falsity of the Donation had been proved.

This short sketch begs at least two fundamental questions. First, we have observed that the fraudulence of the Donation seems obvious, on the grounds that the alleged transfer of sovereignty did not in fact take place. Why then did it take so long to expose it?

I believe that the reason is fundamentally that it would have been impolitic, earlier than the Renaissance, to have drawn the obvious conclusions about the Donation. Important political and economic interests are difficult to oppose with mere observations, regardless of how factual and relevant. The two explanations that come most readily to mind, for the overthrowing of the legend at the time it was done, are, first, that the Renaissance introduced a new higher level of scholarship to Europe and, second, that the Reformation assisted anti-papal developments. I believe this interpretation is valid provided it is not thereby implied that the Middle Ages did not have the intellectual acumen to see through the fraud. The political developments of the post-medieval period were decisive in making it safe and even opportune to see the obvious.

We can elaborate on this basically political explanation by noting the old problem: we see the trees, not the forest, unless we make unusual efforts to do otherwise. To see the obvious, it must first be presented somehow. What people heard in the Donation controversy were the claims of Popes to temporal authority, references to the relevant document, and all sorts of arguments from quarters hostile to the Pope. Roman history, while known to a good extent, was not normally ably presented. For this perhaps amazing omission there are simple explanations. For one thing, the Popes represented the entrenched position and called the tune on what was to be discussed; they could hardly be expected to encourage examination on historical grounds. For another thing, spokesmen against the Donation, on account of their dissident position, had to address familiar subjects in order to ac-

compish the practical objective of being heard. Moreover, as they typically represented political or religious interests rather than historical studies, they often did not know the relevant history anyway. On the other hand, the professional scholars were largely dependent upon ecclesiastic authorities for their livelihoods. Thus, the field was suitable for a reign of politically founded stupidity.

To ask a second fundamental question, if the fraudulence of the Donation should have been obvious to the unintimidated and inquiring intellect and if political developments weakened and even removed the intimidation, then why was a lengthy treatise such as Valla's necessary to overthrow it?

The question as posed is loaded, mainly in the sense of presupposing cause and effect relationships. We cannot separate causes and effects in complex events which saw (a) the shattering of the power of the papacy in the Reformation and (b) the overthrowing of one of the impostures which supported that power and (c) the wide circulation of a book exposing that imposture.

At best we can ask what role Valla's treatise played in these events, and a good conjecture can be made on the basis of the contents of the treatise, which were far more extensive and far more detailed than what was required to prove the thesis. It contained intellectual material of such quantity and diversity that the spread of its influence was all but irresistible. Old coin buffs got something to talk about; the specialists in Latin grammar and language were invited into the controversy; the historians of Rome saw something for them, ditto the historians of the Church. In short, articulate tongues were set wagging against a background of colossal political development.

In my Convention paper three years ago, I stressed that extra-academic controversy should not be underrated as a means of nudging scholars along on controversial subjects (see Supplement 1). That is to say – and here I am speaking from direct experience as a member of academe – the typical attitude toward “hot subjects,” on the part of the basically honest but all-too-human scholar, is evasion. To be sure, there is a small minority, the hirelings of the profiteers of the reigning thesis, who consciously lie and obfuscate. Eventually there is a small minority that assaults the entrenched position, whose dissident utterances have the temporary effect of allying a larger minority with the conscious liars in denunciation of the heretics. However, the typical honest scholar, who tries to maintain self respect while paying his bills, evades the hot issue.

This evasion is made difficult or impossible if diverse members of the populace abound with challenging questions. If the popular expression goes far enough, it can transform itself from a factor making evasion impossible, into a factor making heresy relatively safe. Thus, do not underrate popularization of hot subjects as a means of nudging or even propelling those who ought to handle them.

The main points I want to make in this section are as follows. Simple and decisive arguments against the Donation of Constantine, which, it seems to us, should have been obvious to the Middle Ages, were smothered by the politics of the times. Valla's treatise, going into far more detail than seems necessary to our historical sense, played a crucial practical role in bringing down the legend of the

Donation, but this process was inseparably linked to political developments favorable to Valla's thesis and its unflinching consideration.

## The Analogies

The analogies to our own Holocaust legend may seem almost too obvious to belabor. The academics of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, who would not see the simple, stand in painful and embarrassing analogy to academics of today. However, it is worthwhile to expand on a few points.

We have seen that the legend of the Donation was overthrown in a period of political development highly unfavorable to the papacy, and this suggests another obvious analogy and expectation: that the Holocaust legend will be overthrown in a period of political development highly unfavorable to Zionism. This anticipated confluence is above all inevitable and inescapable, but it is useful to note its dangerous aspects. It will introduce dangerous pressures, political and intellectual, into the revisionist camp.

For example, as this is written, the Israeli invasion of Lebanon has made Menachem Begin the most unpopular man and Israel the most unpopular state in the world. It can plausibly be argued that the invasion has been brutally negligent of the welfare of innocent Lebanese civilians who have died in shocking numbers or suffered the privations attendant to the Israeli attempt to destroy the PLO forces. It can plausibly be argued that Americans have been dopes or dupes for giving Israel almost everything it wanted in the past. However, I have read, even in publications friendly to revisionism,<sup>506</sup> that the Israeli policy amounts to "genocide," which it does not, either in intent or (thus far) in effect, at least not in my understanding of the meaning of the word, which is somewhat close to "extermination." While such ill-conceived cussing may be the norm for the popular press, it is upsetting to see revisionist-oriented circles do it, for they, above all, should be able to make the distinctions among the various inhumanities that are necessary to keep the historical record straight.

A recognition of real danger comes with the understanding that such confusion of issues may have an explanation in terms of politics as well as in terms of normal human inexactitude. In the coming years, there will be strong pressures on many, including revisionists, to be "for" the Arabs as distinct from fair to them. The pressure will arise partly from the fact that it will be precisely the Middle East developments that will create opportunities for the revisionists to be heard. Thus, the revisionists will have to walk a tightrope, on the one hand resisting dangerous pressures, on the other hand exploiting such openings, as political developments may make, for the expression of legitimate historical observations. We should dearly love to consider the hoax in an ivory tower, but it is not going to happen that way.

As history never repeats itself, the Donation-Holocaust analogy does not hold on all salient points. However, there is another important point of similarity worth noting, namely the excessive attention to detail in both Valla's treatise and in con-

---

<sup>506</sup> E.g. *The Spotlight*, July 26, 1982, pp. 10f.



temporary revisionist investigations: overkill in both cases. The people of the Renaissance would not observe that the alleged transfer of sovereignty did not take place and let go at that, and we will not observe that the Jews were still there and let it go at that. Apparently we must pursue the subject into areas of detail that may seem fantastic to posterity. For example, we are not satisfied that the Zyklon, allegedly used in the “gassings,” was an insecticide; we need to exhaustively analyze the technical aspects of the claim.

This preoccupation with detail is both desirable and necessary. That it is desirable has been suggested in the discussion of the Donation. A preoccupation with detail entails a great diversity and quantity of thought on the legend, which, even if it might seem myopic to posterity, will, indeed has, set tongues wagging in the practical and urgent present to the extent that those formally charged with such concerns will no longer be able to avoid them. Indeed, that this point “has” been reached is essentially admitted by Raul Hilberg, author of *The Destruction of the European Jews*, in a recent interview in a French weekly:<sup>507</sup>

*“I will say that, in a certain manner, Faurisson and others, without having wished it, have done us a service. They have raised questions which have had as effect to engage the historians in new research. They have forced the gathering of more information, the re-examination of documents, and going further into the understanding of what happened.”*

That our preoccupation with detail is also necessary in the present circumstances follows from the propaganda strategy of the promoters and defenders of the established legend. One aspect of that strategy is to evade the real and simple question of whether or not the Jews of Europe were in fact physically exterminated by the Germans and to concentrate instead on the superficially similar and (provided enough confusion is generated) speciously equivalent question of whether or not “gas chambers” were operated by the Germans.

This is one basic trick of the hoaxers (there are others I shall mention), and too many of the revisionist camp or bent fall for it. To anticipate any misunderstanding on the point, let me give my assurance that I hold the answers to both questions to be “no”; there was no extermination program and there were no gas chambers. However, the former is the real bone of contention, and the latter is of only subsidiary importance to the Holocaust revisionist school, as I understand its implicit tenets. For example, if it turned out that, one day in 1942, ten adult male Jews were marched into Hitler’s headquarters in East Prussia, placed in Hitler’s shower (with suitable hasty mechanical modifications), and there gassed before the approving eyes of the Führer, I would have many reasons, historical and technical, for being astonished, but I would not be forced to change or withdraw any major conclusion on the “extermination” matter. The discovery would rock the revisionists for whom Hitler is of central interest, e.g. David Irving, but that is irrelevant.

By various tricks, e.g. focusing on certain types of testimonies or discussing “Zyklon” out of context, the defenders of the legend are often able to arrange the

---

<sup>507</sup> *Le Nouvel Observateur*, July 3-9, 1982, p. 70+.

quiet substitution, in public controversy, of the “gas chamber” question for the “extermination” question, not because they confuse the two, but because by so doing they are able to take advantage of certain routine reservations that apply to nearly every historical subject.

For example, until a short time ago, if I were asked if the Japanese had gassed prisoners during World War II, I would have answered that I was unaware of any such gassings. Now I have very recently read a credible report that they gassed 404 “human guinea pigs” in connection with “research on biological warfare.”<sup>508</sup> However, I continue to be certain that the Japanese did not “exterminate” any populations.

As another example, I am certain that during World War II the Allied powers did not exterminate any significant portion of the Eskimo population, and I am also confident that no individual communities of Eskimos were gassed by them, but not that I am “certain” in the former case and only “confident” in the latter. The difference arises from the fact that, while one can show that there was no extermination program for Eskimos (*e.g.* insignificant absences were noted after the war), one cannot show that no Eskimos were gassed. Of course, one can cite the lack of an evident motivation for gassing Eskimos, the lack of subsequent charges of Eskimo gassings, etc., and one can be “confident” no communities of Eskimos were gassed (of course, individual Eskimos might have been gassed for specific offenses in California). However, one must *e.g.* allow the possibility that some isolated Eskimo community, perhaps posing a security menace to some highly secret Allied military operation, was gassed in great secrecy. This is just routine historical reserve, applying to all phases of history, whose potential relevance to every historical subject is so taken for granted that it is rarely mentioned.

We can prove that the Eskimos were not exterminated, but we cannot prove that no communities of Eskimos were gassed. Likewise, and at the risk of giving the opposition words, which can be lifted out of context and used dishonestly, I can prove that there was no German program of physical extermination of the Jews, but I cannot prove that no Jews were gassed, although after living long with the evidence I am confident that no Jews were gassed.

If one examines closely the arguments that are offered when the tack is to argue that Jews were gassed, it is clear that the allegation is of the “isolated Eskimo community” sort. In place of geographical isolation, there is substituted the claim of administrative isolation, *i.e.* that no written records were kept of the design of the gas chambers or of their construction or of the gassings themselves, that in order to conceal the deeds the bodies were burned and not a trace was left, and that in order to keep the number of witnesses to a minimum Jewish work parties were used in the operations, these Jews later being killed also. Why such secrecy should have been considered necessary or relevant, given rallies in Madison Square Garden against the alleged slaughter, official Allied and Presidential declarations in condemnation, etc.,<sup>509</sup> is never explained, and few will ask such questions. The important thing is that the whole thing can then be “proved” via decla-

<sup>508</sup> *Chicago Tribune*, August 5, 1982, section 1, p. 5.

<sup>509</sup> See pp. 98-111 and 183-185.

rations of a few “witnesses,” upheld in court, and then used to support a preposterous allegation of a very different and even incommensurate sort, namely the physical extermination of the Jews of Europe.

It is a cheap trick. It relies on a massive dropping of context and shift of perspective, wherein the rubes are not expected to follow the simple shell game. Unfortunately, it has been successful, and this is why a preoccupation with detail, on the part of revisionists, is necessary as well as desirable. The bearers of the legend do not want to confront the “extermination” allegation directly, as easily available information makes it clear the Jews were not exterminated. However, no easily available information makes clear what happened at every location in eastern Europe during the war, especially in view of the political character of the postwar exploitation of documents, and this is where the hoaxers go to work. They offer to fill in such gaps, usually not via written records, but via alleged reconstruction on the basis of their “trials.” As they represent the entrenched position, they effectively call the tune on what is to be debated, and that is why revisionists, in the minority of instances, in which their opponents engage them in superficially scholarly debate, will find themselves confronted with details assembled for mendacious ends. The hoaxers dare not focus on the real question, as it is too simple.

## Context and Perspective

While the present interest in detail is desirable from the revisionist point of view, it is also necessary because the defenders of the legend have decided that, for the sake of their contrary purposes, a focus on detail can also be desirable, when there is to be anything like a debate. This odd harmony of the two camps is of course superficial.

That the focus on detail contains dangers for the revisionist is seen by noting that the defenders of the legend take this tack, because they have thereby substituted more malleable questions for the real one. Specifically, they trick their audiences into losing context and perspective. What Stangl said to Sereny in jail cannot be understood without the perspective gained by noting Stangl’s hapless position in the postwar world, particularly in postwar Germany, which has a political system imposed by the foreign conquerors who made possible the establishment of the legend in the first place. The claim that the lack of ordinary historical evidence for “exterminations” is explained by a German policy of utmost secrecy cannot be easily demolished except via some observation on the historical context of the alleged episode, such as made above. Therefore, while it is fine to focus on detail in these times, we risk losing battles, if not the war, if we forget the historical context and lose perspective.

Context and perspective constitute the theme of this paper, but it was necessary to discuss at length the nature of the need. Posterity will see this “Holocaust,” this curious imposture that enthralled us for two or three decades, as a transient phenomenon involving what will appear to be utterly audacious distortions of the historical record, which we should have seen more easily than we did, as the rele-

vant episodes will seem to have simpler interpretations than we see or at any rate emphasize. While we can, of course, not see things as posterity will, we can at least attempt to see the subject from a higher perspective. This will not only help our future reputation, but will also help us avoid getting tripped up on details in current controversy.

We can start by asking just what will draw posterity's attention as extraordinary. It will not be "exterminations" of Jews, as there were none. It will also not be the German program of expulsion of the Jews. There will of course be some interest in that program, just as today there is interest on the part of the historians in all sorts of past episodes. However, that German program was in its essentials far from unique, the Jews having been expelled from the Jerusalem area in the second century and from Spain in the fifteenth, to mention only the most famous two of many expulsions. The German program may seem deplorable, but it will not seem extraordinary.

What will seem unique is the establishment in Western society of the "Holocaust" legend, its exploitation past the point of sanity, its challenge from unconventional quarters of a few decades later, and its subsequent overthrow. One implication of this, perhaps for the revisionists at once instructive and deflating, is that revisionists will themselves be objects of historical scrutiny, *i.e.* we are part of the historical process that posterity will see, not merely its pioneering investigators.

I believe they will see us that way mainly because of our tendency, explanations for which have already been given, of getting entangled in details while bypassing or downplaying the observations that, it will seem, should have been both obvious and conclusive.

A specific illustration. In order for something to be "obvious," it ought to be figuratively before our very noses. Let us look at two of the recently published and widely discussed books in support of the extermination legend, namely *Auschwitz and the Allies* by Martin Gilbert (biographer of Winston Churchill) and *The Terrible Secret* by Walter Laqueur (Director of the Institute of Contemporary History, London, and editor of the *Journal of Contemporary History*). The two books look at the subject from similar perspectives and cover much of the same ground.

At the end of his long and copiously annotated study, Gilbert writes:<sup>510</sup>

*"Between May 1942 and June 1944, almost none of the messages reaching the west had referred to Auschwitz as the destination of Jewish deportees, or as a killing centre. Nor had the name of Auschwitz made any impression on those who were building up what they believed to be an increasingly comprehensive picture of the fate of the Jews."*

On the other hand, early in this shorter but also copiously annotated study, Laqueur explains that mass exterminations at Auschwitz could not have been concealed, noting that Auschwitz was "a veritable archipelago," that "Auschwitz inmates [...] were, in fact, dispersed all over Silesia, and [...] met with thousands of people," that "hundreds of civilian employees [...] worked at Auschwitz," and

---

<sup>510</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 340.

that “journalists travelled in the General Government and were bound to hear,” etc.<sup>511</sup>

I have no quarrel with such observations, as I made them myself, on the basis of essentially the same considerations.<sup>512</sup> Now the reader of Gilbert, Laqueur, and Butz can make a very simple determination. He is being told that (a) in the period May 1942 to June 1944, those interested in such matters had no information of mass exterminations at Auschwitz and (b) mass exterminations at Auschwitz could not have been concealed from the world for any significant length of time. Because he is hearing the same story from both sides then, by a process of inference necessary to those who want to form an opinion but do not have the time or means to become historians, he should assume both claims true. There was no information of mass exterminations at Auschwitz during the relevant period, and mass exterminations at Auschwitz would not have been kept secret. Therefore, there were no mass exterminations at Auschwitz.

The conclusion is inescapable and requires only elementary logic. It is comparable to the syllogism: “I see no elephant in my basement; an elephant could not be concealed from sight in my basement; therefore, there is no elephant in my basement.”

Logic tells us that this observation should be conclusive, and yet I know that in controversies to come it will often be lost sight of. It is a good example of a point on which we shall puzzle posterity for our myopia, because it will wonder why it was so seldom raised in a heated controversy. It is not the sole example of its type. The literature of the defenders of the legend is overflowing with concessions that will make posterity wonder how the legend ever could have been believed in the first place, and why a revisionist literature was necessary at all. Let us be specific.

The principal actors in the historical episode are the governments of the various powers at war, Jewish organizations operating in allied and neutral countries, Jewish organizations operating openly under the German occupation, clandestine resistance organizations in German-occupied Europe, Jewish or otherwise, the Catholic Church (on account of its twin attributes of ubiquity and centralization), and the International Red Cross.

Prominent among the Jewish organizations were the JDC (American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee), closely associated with the American Jewish Committee, the “political organization of the non-Zionist elite of American Jewry.”<sup>513</sup> The JDC was primary in extending material assistance to Jews. In Europe, an important representative was Joseph J. Schwartz in Lisbon.<sup>514</sup> More important from our point of view was Saly Mayer, the sometimes unofficial but always principal representative of the JDC in Switzerland. Mayer was in constant contact with the JDC in Lisbon and New York and also with Jews in occupied Europe, eastern and western.<sup>515</sup>

---

<sup>511</sup> Laqueur, pp. 22-25.

<sup>512</sup> See Chapter 3, pp. 113-115 and 121-123.

<sup>513</sup> Bauer, p. 21f.

<sup>514</sup> Bauer, Chapter 8.

<sup>515</sup> Bauer, Chapter 9, pp. 246, 264, 272, 274, 333, 366f, 371f.

Also prominent among the Jewish organizations were the JA (Jewish Agency), the unofficial Israeli government of the time, whose guiding light was Chaim Weizmann, and which was represented in Geneva by Richard Lichtheim and Abraham Silberschein. Zionism was also represented by the WJC (World Jewish Congress), whose guiding lights were Nahum Goldman and Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and whose principal representative in Switzerland was Gerhard Riegner. The Swiss representatives of these and other Jewish organizations were in constant contact with both Jews of occupied Europe and with Jewish and other representative in the Allied countries. For example, postal and telephone communications among Jews in occupied countries and those in neutral countries such as Switzerland and Turkey were easily established.<sup>516</sup>

As made abundantly clear by many books in addition to my own (*e.g.* Gilbert's book), it is from the WJC, supplemented by the JA, the Polish exile government in London, and occasionally more obscure groups, that the early extermination propaganda emanated.

Here are eight simple observations, all drawn from the literature of the defenders of the legend (sometimes via the intermediary of my book), which establish the non-historicity of the Holocaust or, more precisely, a program of mass physical extermination of Europe's Jews.

## Wartime and Postwar Claims

**The postwar claims had their origin in the wartime extermination claims. However, the differences between the two are such that it is implied that the wartime claims were not based on fact.**

There are two principal sorts of differences between the wartime and postwar claims. First, much of what was claimed during the war was dropped afterwards, only a fraction being retained. Second, the centerpiece of the postwar claims, Auschwitz, was not claimed at all until the very end of the relevant period.

Both observations were made in Chapter 3 of my book, the second was made above, and both are confirmed by more recent publications. The first is shown by listing specific examples, and those given in *Hoax* can be supplemented with some taken from the recent literature, particularly the Gilbert book, which gives numerous such examples.<sup>517</sup>

To discuss a specific example, it is well to focus on one Jan Karski, a non-Jewish member of the Polish resistance, who is said to have been sent from Poland by the underground, in November 1942, to report to the Polish exile government in London. His report described Polish Jews being sent to Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibor in railway cars packed with "lime and chlorine sprinkled with water." On the trip, half die from suffocation, poisonous fumes, and lack of food and water. These are burned. The remainder are put to death by firing squads, in "lethal gas chambers" and, at Belzec, in an "electrocuting station"; this remainder was

---

<sup>516</sup> Laqueur, pp. 4, 170f, 188.

<sup>517</sup> M. Gilbert, pp. 31, 39f, 44, 170.

buried. This report was widely publicized and circulated.<sup>518</sup>

Of course, the present story is that almost all the Jews were killed in gas chambers, their bodies later being burned. Also there is nothing about Auschwitz as an extermination camp in this report of the Polish underground, which, in this instance, cannot be accused of ignoring the plight of the Jews.

Karski published his story in 1944 as a silly book, *Story of a Secret State*, which sold well. At present, he is a Professor of Government at Georgetown University in Washington, DC. Although the wild disagreement between his wartime tall tales and the postwar tall tales is not novel to a student of this subject, I thought it useful to select Karski for mention because in recent years, in the deluge of Holocaust propaganda, he has been rediscovered and feted as something of a hero. He wrote a new and sanitized version of his story in 1979, no doubt for the benefit of those of his friends embarrassed by his book.<sup>519</sup> Then in 1981, he was a participant in a conference held at the State Department and sponsored by the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, whose chairman, author Elie Wiesel, "organized the event in part to build a bulwark against a rising tide of revisionist history." I have no evidence that anybody at the conference sought to get Karski to explain the discrepancies between his and today's received accounts of "exterminations."<sup>520</sup>

I am sometimes asked why I ignore Elie Wiesel, so here I shall give him one paragraph. I ignore him because, unlike authors I usually discuss, he is frankly a novelist and there is next to nothing in his declarations that could be considered historical argument. Even his allegedly autobiographical *Night* is too histrionic to be entertained as a purported primary source. This does not mean that there is absolutely nothing to be gained from noticing him. That a novelist was chosen to be Director of the President's Commission on the Holocaust, a plum for which there must have been a lot of behind-the-scenes jostling, is tremendously revealing of the forces at work today. As for a short judgment of Wiesel's various writings on the "Holocaust", I think it is fair to characterize them as reaching the heights that most of us can reach only with the help of magic potions containing gin and vermouth and comparable ingredients; Wiesel does not need such help.<sup>521</sup>

To return to the point, namely "that the wartime claims were not based on fact," the logic goes as follows: The defenders of the legend could explain the retention of a small fraction of the wartime reports only by claiming that wartime exigencies made corroboration of information impracticable and that as a consequence many inaccurate stories were passed along for public consumption. The result was a set of reports which, although originally inspired by fact, exaggerated the real situation. However, such an explanation cannot be reconciled with the fact of the absence of Auschwitz from the extermination claims. The Auschwitz

---

<sup>518</sup> M. Gilbert, pp. 93ff; Laqueur, p. 231.

<sup>519</sup> Laqueur, Appendix 5.

<sup>520</sup> *Washington Post*, October 28, 1981, p. A1; *Los Angeles Times*, October 29, 1981, pt. I, p. 20.

<sup>521</sup> See e.g. his contribution to the booklet *Dimensions of the Holocaust*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1977. This is the published version of a lecture Wiesel gave at Northwestern in the spring of 1977. An alternative is his article in the London *Jewish Chronicle*, November 4, 1977.

aspect would be consistent with the proffered explanation only, if some story exaggerated in relation to the postwar claims had been presented during the war, *e.g.* extermination of Jews by means in addition to gas chambers. The logic thus leads to the conclusion that the wartime claims were not inspired by fact.

## Wartime Records

**Both the wartime records and behavior of the Jews in occupied Europe show that they had no information of an extermination program.**

That resistance to deportation was rare and that Jews went to the various camps with no suspicion that they were to be killed, has been well known for many years, and recently published material has only reinforced this observations. However, its implications are usually not appreciated. Note that the observation holds for the Jewish leadership in the various occupied countries as well as for the general Jewish population.

To give some examples: Late in 1942, Slovakian Jewish leaders, negotiating with the Germans, took seriously the Germans' offers to cease deportations of Slovakian Jews from Auschwitz. In the French Jewish records, "we find a wealth of documentation that tends to deny" exterminations. French Jewish leaders saw "Auschwitz as a place of work" and in November 1944 (after the Germans had been driven out of France) were thinking, in regard to the deportees, mainly of reuniting families. We are told that "Jews in Holland never really knew what was going on in Poland" and that the records of the Amsterdam Jewish Council of January 22, 1943, show that the possibility of "extermination" was not even being entertained as an explanation for the breaking up of families. Jewish leaders in Rome were unaware of any extermination program and feared deportations only in connection with such things as "the rigors of winter and the fragile health of many deportees." Under such conditions, it is not at all surprising that there was only one derailment of an Auschwitz deportation train engineered by Jewish resistance activities (in Belgium).<sup>522</sup>

To focus on a man who should certainly have been well informed: Rabbi Leo Bäck, the "venerated head of German Jewry," showed via a letter he wrote in November 1942 that he had no suspicion that Jewish deportees were being killed, and by his own postwar admission, he told no other Jews of "exterminations" during his stay at Theresienstadt, from which there were many deportations.<sup>523</sup>

By the spring of 1944, right after the German occupation of Hungary, the Hungarian Jewish leaders had heard the extermination claims, including (finally) the Auschwitz claims. However, they "gave no publicity whatsoever" to such claims. "Not urgent warnings to their fellow Jews to resist deportation, but secret negotiations with the SS aimed at averting deportation altogether, had become the avenue of hope chosen by the Hungarian Zionist leaders."<sup>524</sup>

As for Poland, there was a famous rebellion of the Warsaw ghetto in April 1943.

---

<sup>522</sup> See Bauer, pp. 264, 271, 274, 371; M. Gilbert, p. 121; see also this book, p. 361.

<sup>523</sup> See p. 140; see also Bauer, pp. 56, 58.

<sup>524</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 204f.



However, this came only after almost all the Jews of Warsaw had been deported east. The claim is that “by March 1943 the destruction of Polish Jewry was almost complete.” During the period that they were supposedly being destroyed, there was no significant resistance to deportations.<sup>525</sup> Moreover, Jewish record-keeping in Poland was diligent and extensive, so that “many posthumous records have come down to us.” Yet there is an “absence of vital subjects from the records.”<sup>526</sup>

Thus, the Jews were not cognizant of an extermination program in the only senses that would be convincing, in the senses of resisting deportations or at least recording the Holocaust in their confidential records.

## World Jewry

**Jewish bodies outside occupied Europe, such as the JDC, the WJC, the JA, and others did not act as though they believed their own claims of “extermination.”**

There are quite a few senses in which this is the case, but the most important relates directly to the point discussed above. The Jews who, we are told, boarded deportation trains with no inkling that they were to be killed were, as was noted above, in close contact with Jewish bodies outside occupied Europe. Indeed, many of the records that show their ignorance of an extermination program are among their communications with these Jews outside Europe. Yet the Jews outside Europe did not undertake to impress on those inside what the deportations were allegedly all about, if one were to believe the remarks they were making for the consumption of others. Otherwise the alleged ignorance would not have existed.

This is enough to prove the point, but it is useful to give some good example of the real behavior of the Jewish bodies outside Europe during their supposed Holocaust.

Chaim Weizmann used the extermination claims when he thought them useful. However, in May 1943, Weizmann complained to Churchill’s secretariat that if “an Allied press release reporting the fact that Jewish scientists were among those involved in the Allied scientific war effort [...] were repeated, the Germans would carry out further anti-Jewish reprisals.”<sup>527</sup> Just what reprisals could be graver than physical extermination of all is not apparent.

It was noted above that the legend claims that by March 1943 almost all Polish Jews had been killed. However, throughout the alleged period of killing and even into 1944, Jewish relief organizations in the west sent food parcels to Jews in Poland, particularly though the JUS (*Jüdische Unterstützungsstelle* or Jewish Aid Office), with the permission and cooperation of the German authorities. Money was also sent to Jewish organizations in Poland through the London Polish exile government, again with the permission of the German authorities.<sup>528</sup>

By 1944 Poland had become a battlefield. Accordingly, on March 14, 1944,

---

<sup>525</sup> Bauer, p. 325ff; M. Gilbert, p. 121.

<sup>526</sup> Dawidowicz (1975), p. xvii; (1981), p. 125.

<sup>527</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 143.

<sup>528</sup> Bauer, pp. 329-334.

the WJC reminded the British, as Soviet forces were approaching Lvov, that there were “still a considerable number of Jews” in the Lvov area and that we should issue “a fresh and emphatic warning to the Germans” and also speed up the work of rescuing Jews from Nazi occupied territory (obviously to proceed to Palestine, as the WJC made clear by its wartime statements).<sup>529</sup> In the opinion of the WJC, the murdered Jews were still there.

Jewish newspapers in the west, while occasionally publishing massacre claims, clearly thought the claims exaggerated greatly and tended to contradict themselves in their statements. For example, the allegedly well-informed leftist Jewish “Bund,” in its publication *The Ghetto Speaks* for October 1943, spoke of the “struggle linking the Polish and Jewish masses.” In their opinion, too, the murdered Jews were still there. However, apart from such specific incidents, it is admitted that even after the Allied declaration of December 17, 1942, the first official claim of “extermination,” “there was no forceful, unequivocal response by American Jewry, including the JDC.” As a rule, “the Jews themselves did not really press very hard for rescue, and their propaganda for Palestine often seemed stronger than their concern for immediate steps to save their brethren.”<sup>530</sup>

The historical record thus shows that, apart from their occasional public claims of “extermination,” the Jewish bodies outside occupied Europe conducted themselves as if there were no exterminations, as is most clearly shown by their failure to undertake to warn the European Jews and by the nature of their real efforts (*e.g.* in connection with Palestine).

## The Allies

**Allied governments and their officials did not act as though they believed the extermination claims, and their intelligence services never produced any information corroborative of the claims.**

In connection with the actions of Allied governments and their officials we can say that (a) the declarations of the governments in relation to “extermination” were inconsistent, equivocal, and unconvincingly timed, (b) no concrete measures were taken to interfere with deportations of Jews or with whatever was happening in the camps, and (c) incidents involving leading officials show that they did not believe the claims.

Among relevant declarations of governments, perhaps the best known is the Allied declaration of December 17, 1942; this was unequivocally worded, although very much lacking in specific details. However, it seems unconvincingly timed. According to the legend, exterminations outside Russia are supposed to have been in progress for almost a year. Moreover, this date also marked the first unequivocal Soviet charge of “extermination,” although such a program was allegedly in operation there since June 1941. This makes the belated Soviet statement particularly incredible, as “there is every reason to assume that the Soviet authorities were from the beginning well informed about all important events in

---

<sup>529</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 181.

<sup>530</sup> Laqueur, pp. 183-186; Bauer, pp. 188-193, 403.

the occupied (Soviet) territories.”<sup>531</sup>

On the other hand, the Allied “War Crimes Declaration” of November 1, 1943, condemning German atrocities, failed to mention Jews. During the drafting of the declaration, the British Foreign Office had deleted references to “gas chambers because the evidence was untrustworthy.”<sup>532</sup>

In connection with Auschwitz, there was on October 10, 1944, a broadcast from London and Washington charging the Germans with “plans [for the] mass execution of the people in the concentration camps” Auschwitz and Birkenau (my emphasis). The German Telegraph Service replied immediately that “these reports are false from beginning to end.”<sup>533</sup> The first high level Auschwitz claim by the Allies that resembled the legend of today came in late November 1944, after the claimed termination of the “exterminations,” in the form of the publication of the document I have called the “WRB report” (as it was published by the War Refugee Board).<sup>534</sup> The Russians captured Auschwitz on January 27, 1945, and did not open it for inspection even after curiosity was expressed and even after the sensational publicity given to the captures of Belsen and Buchenwald gave the Soviets a motive to chime in. Instead, the Russians merely declared in late April 1945 that 4,000,000 had been killed at Auschwitz and issued a more detailed “report” on May 7, 1945.<sup>535</sup>

That the Allies undertook no concrete measures to warn the Jews in Europe or to interfere with the deportation or whatever was happening in the German camps is well known. This is most strikingly illustrated by the brief and mostly confidential controversy over bombing Auschwitz for the purpose of stopping exterminations there. Chaim Weizmann had proposed such measures in the summer of 1944 (somewhat half-heartedly, it appears). The strong impression gained is that the British and Americans, while pretending to consider Weizmann’s proposal seriously, were just engaged in verbal games. For example on July 7, 1944, Anthony Eden asked the Air Ministry to respond on the feasibility of the proposal. A response to Weizmann took a while; on September 1, 1944, Richard Law of the Foreign Office wrote Weizmann “that in view of the very great technical difficulties involved, we have no option but to refrain from pursuing the proposal in present circumstances.” This was despite the fact that at the time Weizmann’s proposals were allegedly being considered, the air forces were planning the bombing of Auschwitz as one of many oil targets and bombed Auschwitz on August 20, 1944, and several times thereafter on those grounds. The obvious suggestion is that the Auschwitz claims were not taken seriously, and the suggestion is confirmed by the fact that the supposedly crucial “information” of what became the “WRB report” was received in London and Washington in July 1944 but simply filed away by both governments “until resurrected three and a half months later.”<sup>536</sup>

---

<sup>531</sup> See p. 100 and pp. 246-247; see also Laqueur, pp. 68-72.

<sup>532</sup> Laqueur, p. 121.

<sup>533</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 325.

<sup>534</sup> See p. 116.

<sup>535</sup> M. Gilbert, pp. 337f.

<sup>536</sup> M. Gilbert, pp. 267-273, 290, 299-311, 341.

Incidents involving leading officials, which show that they did not believe the claims, are numerous. The “close association between the Jewish community and the Roosevelt Administration” is well known. In September 1943 this<sup>537</sup>

*“Administration was reluctant to accept the reports of murder centers and discounted the idea of an organized attempt to liquidate the Jews. Roosevelt explained the deportations to Frankfurter; the deported Jews were simply being employed on the Soviet frontier to build fortifications.”*

It should be assumed that Roosevelt based his remarks to Justice Frankfurter on information provided by his intelligence services. Frankfurter must have been convinced, for when Jan Karski (above) later reached Washington to tell his tales, Frankfurter told Karski “that he could not believe him.”<sup>538</sup>

When the Auschwitz claims reached Washington, involved officials at the State Department privately commented that “Stuff like this has been coming from Bern ever since 1942. [...] Don’t forget, this is a Jew telling about the Jews. [...] This is just a campaign by that Jew Morgenthau and his Jewish assistants.”<sup>539</sup>

In Britain we find a comparable situation. In September 1942, Churchill spoke in Commons condemning “the mass deportation of Jews from France, with the pitiful horrors attendant upon the calculated and final scattering of families.” He said nothing about “extermination.” In the Foreign Office, the extermination claims were generally not believed, and in the Colonial Office one official called them “Jewish Agency sob-stuff.”<sup>540</sup>

In November 1942, Edward Benes, exiled President of Czechoslovakia in London who was well informed on events in his homeland, wrote to the WJC that the claims coming from Riegner in Switzerland were false and that the Germans had no plans to exterminate the Jews.<sup>541</sup> The Swiss Government considered the Allied Declaration of December 17, 1942, “foreign rumor propaganda of the worst type.”<sup>542</sup>

Of great importance to our subject is what Allied intelligence had to say on these matters. After quite a few years of living with the literature of this subject, I have not encountered an instance of corroboration of “extermination” by any wartime intelligence source. What we have from intelligence sources militates strongly against the legend. For example, on August 27, 1943, “William Cavendish-Bentinck, Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee (Britain), whose task it was to evaluate the truth or falsehood of all such reports from Nazi Europe,” declared confidentially that the stories being circulated “tend to exaggerate German atrocities in order to stoke us up.”<sup>543</sup>

A U.S. counterpart, John Beaty, one of the two editors of the daily secret “G-2 Report,” which was issued each noon to give persons in high places the world picture as it existed four hours earlier, ridiculed the six million legend in a book pub-

<sup>537</sup> Feingold, pp. 9, 170; Laqueur, p. 94.

<sup>538</sup> Laqueur, p. 3.

<sup>539</sup> See p. 89; see also DuBois, pp. 184, 188.

<sup>540</sup> M. Gilbert, pp. 68, 95f, 99.

<sup>541</sup> Laqueur, pp. 162ff.

<sup>542</sup> Bauer, p. 229.

<sup>543</sup> Laqueur, pp. 83, 86; M. Gilbert, p. 150.

lished in the Fifties.<sup>544</sup>

The only really important data that we have from an intelligence source are the Auschwitz aerial reconnaissance photographs that were published by two CIA photo interpreters in 1979. Many of the photographs examined were taken in the spring of 1944 when, according to the legend, about 10,000 Hungarian Jews entered the camp every day to be killed. Because it must be conceded that the crematories at Auschwitz did not have such a massive capacity, the legend claims that “corpses were burned day and night” out-of-doors.<sup>545</sup> No evidence of this is to be found in the photographs, and the photo interpreters remark that even the crematory chimneys appear inactive.<sup>546</sup>

Thus, the Allies also did not take the extermination claims seriously enough to give them more than occasional lip service.

## The Vatican

### **The Vatican did not believe the extermination claims.**

It is agreed that the far-flung nature of the operations of the Catholic Church guaranteed that the Vatican would have known what was happening to the Jews.<sup>547</sup> Nevertheless, no unequivocal condemnation of exterminations of Jews ever came from the Vatican even after the Germans had been driven out of Rome or even after Germany's defeat. This is despite strong pressures put on the Vatican by the Allies to issue such a declaration.

There was an equivocal statement in the Pope's Christmas message of 1942, but it was issued only after the British had strongly suggested that the issuance of such a statement might help to dissuade the Allies from bombing Rome. However, the Pope made it clear to the Allies, even as his declaration was issued, that he did not believe the stories: “he felt that there had been some exaggeration for the purposes of propaganda.”<sup>548</sup> That Vatican spokesmen of today support the legend in their public statements is irrelevant to the historical point.

## The International Red Cross (IRC)

### **The actions and reports of the International Red Cross do not harmonize with the extermination claims.**

As with the Vatican, the statements of IRC spokesmen of today do support the legend, but that is irrelevant to the historical point. Also, general editorial remarks in books of documents published by the IRC right after the war do harmonize with the legend. However, all the historians should be interested in are the actual content of the reports and activities of the IRC during the war.

That the actions and reports of the IRC do not harmonize with the legend was

---

<sup>544</sup> Beatty, pp. 134-135.

<sup>545</sup> See p. 186; M. Gilbert, p. 231f.

<sup>546</sup> Brugioni and Poirier.

<sup>547</sup> Laqueur, pp. 55-58.

<sup>548</sup> See p. 400 (Appendix E); see also M. Gilbert, pp. 104f.

discussed at length earlier and it seems pointless to repeat the material here.<sup>549</sup> A couple more points I noticed recently are worth mentioning.

On April 14, 1943, the IRC made it clear that it considered Auschwitz a labor camp for deportees, to whom parcels could be sent.<sup>550</sup>

There were two highly publicized visits of the IRC to Theresienstadt, the Jewish settlement in Czechoslovakia. The IRC reports were relatively favorable in both cases. What is seldom noted is that the IRC delegate in the second visit in the spring of 1945 was George Dunant, who described Theresienstadt “as an experiment by certain leaders of the Reich, who were apparently less hostile to the Jews than those responsible for the racial policy of the German Government.” Because Dunant was guided around Theresienstadt by Adolf Eichmann, he must have known that Theresienstadt was an operation of Himmler’s SS. Dunant, moreover, was evidently in close contact with Jewish representatives. For example early in 1945, he went to Bratislava, partly at the urging of Saly Mayer, in order to supply hiding Jews with funds.<sup>551</sup>

## German Documents

**The German documents speak not of extermination, but basically of a program of expulsion and resettlement in the east. There is nothing about “gas chambers” in the concentration camp or other German records.**

That the German documents do not speak of extermination is well known. For example, there exists no written order of Hitler to kill the Jews.<sup>552</sup> The documents speak of the “Final Solution” as the ultimate expulsion of all Jews from Europe and of a wartime process of resettling Jews in the occupied east.<sup>553</sup>

The defenders of the legend of course claim that the Germans merely exercised commonplace circumspection and evasion regarding what they committed to writing. This excuse fails on the grounds that such attempts at concealment would make sense only in regard to something it was possible to conceal. It would have been obvious that the physical extermination of Europe’s Jews, whatever the outcome of the war, would not have remained secret. Indeed, for reasons discussed above, it would have become widely known while it was happening. Even if we hypothesize incredible stupidity of the Germans on this point, we surely must grant that they were aware of the atrocity claims being made in the Allied countries and would have seen that documentary masquerade was of no avail.

There is also nothing about “gas chambers,” in the sense of the legend, in the German documents. What the legend does at this point is produce the insecticide Zyklon B or other fumigation means, show us pictures of quite ordinary looking showers (alleging extraordinary concealed features), make references to the use of exhausts of diesel engines (apparently unconscious that the exhaust of a diesel is

---

<sup>549</sup> See p. 99 and pp. 167-183.

<sup>550</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 129.

<sup>551</sup> Bauer, pp. 430f.

<sup>552</sup> Laqueur, p. 152.

<sup>553</sup> *E.g.* see Chapter 7, pp. 251-261.

mainly carbon dioxide, not carbon monoxide),<sup>554</sup> or play games with the concept of a “gas oven” (crematory ovens, like most kitchen ovens, are “gas ovens,” and the crematories in the German camps were no exception).

All of this is so idiotic as to be torturing to discuss further. There is also no record of the design or construction of gas chambers. On the basis of my engineering experiences, it seems quite out of the question to suppress all normal historical records of engineering projects of the scope that could have produced the great “gas chambers.” Documents must not only be produced, but also distributed to the great number of individuals charged with specific details; there is no other way to achieve coordination. Even if major documents are closely controlled (as is supposed to happen with “classified” material in the U.S.), the various individuals would later be able, one way or another, to supply details that, taken together, would cohere credibly. We do not have such coherence with the Holocaust. Indeed, we have incoherence at not one but two levels. On one level, we have the mutual incoherence, in relation to “gas chambers,” of the authentic records dealing with crematories and disinfection measures. On another level, this attempt on the part of the hoaxers to supply specific technical details does not cohere with the feature of the legend according to which the “gas chambers” were improvised in a slapdash fashion by local non-technical German personnel.<sup>555</sup>

It is of interest that two of Heinrich Himmler’s closest aides, SS Generals Gottlob Berger and Karl Wolff, both testified that they had known nothing of an extermination program during the war. It is a greater interest that toward the end of the war Himmler told a representative of the WJC:<sup>556</sup>

*“In order to put a stop to the epidemics, we were forced to burn the bodies of incalculable numbers of people who had been destroyed by disease. We were therefore forced to build crematories, and on this account they are knotting a noose for us.”*

Are we to believe that the essential agreement between this attempt at self exculpation on the part of Himmler, on the one hand, and on the other hand the picture formed by the documents that Himmler’s enemies assembled in the three year period after his death was either accidental or arranged by Himmler through superhuman diligence and prescience? Are we to believe likewise of the essential agreement between the German documents on Jewish policy and the real wartime behavior of Germany’s enemies?

## German Resistance to Hitler

**The German resistance to Hitler, including the substantial part that was lodged in German military intelligence, was not cognizant in any way of a program of exterminating Jews.**

Part of the German resistance was of course opposed to the Hitler regime for

<sup>554</sup> Editor’s note: about the absurdities involved with Diesel gas chambers, see F.P. Berg, “Diesel Gas Chambers – Ideal for Torture, Absurd for Murder”, in G. Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, pp. 435-469.

<sup>555</sup> See the statement of Rudolf Höss, Chapter 4, pp. 130-139.

<sup>556</sup> For Berger, see p. 239; for Himmler’s remark, see p. 287; see also Laqueur, p. 18.

reasons related to its anti-Jewish stance. Moreover, the *Abwehr*, German military intelligence, was headed until 1944 by Admiral Wilhelm Canaris, a conscious traitor. Next in command in the *Abwehr* was Hans Oster, who handled financial and administrative matters and kept the central list of agents. Both Oster and one of his subordinates, Hans von Dohnanyi, an “Aryanized” part Jew, made it their “business to deal with all kinds of operations unconnected with their immediate tasks.” Among these operations were involvement in the anti-Hitler opposition and illegal assistance to various Jews. Both were executed for participation in the abortive coup of July 20, 1944.<sup>557</sup>

In the various accounts of the activities of the anti-Hitler resistance in Germany, for example *The German Opposition to Hitler* by Hans Rothfels, there is no evidence that this opposition was in any way cognizant of a program of exterminating the Jews or passed any such information on to the Allies. If there had been knowledge of such a program, it is a certainty that the information would have been passed on, because the anti-Hitler opposition was in contact with the Allies and attempted, without success, to get promises of some sort of Allied support in the event they succeeded in removing Hitler.<sup>558</sup>

Even if we grant the possibility that some Germans involved in the anti-Hitler opposition could have been ignorant of a program of physical extermination of the Jews, even if one had existed, are we to believe this possible of high officials of the *Abwehr*?

This concludes the discussion of the “eight simple observations [...] which establish the non-historicity of [...] a program of mass physical extermination of Europe’s Jews.” The allegation fails every relevant historical test and entails a level of audacity or “chutzpah” that would have staggered the imagination before the war. It is *demanded* that we believe that these “events continental in geographical scope, of three years in temporal scope, and of several million in scope of victims,” all transpired without one relevant party being cognizant of them. It is like telling me that, while I saw no elephant when I looked in my basement, he was there anyway. Also while I was sitting in my living room I did not notice that the elephant managed to come upstairs and romp about awhile, relevant stairways, door openings, and floors having suddenly miraculously become compatible with such activities. Then the elephant dashed outside into a busy mid-day shopping district, and then walked several miles back to the zoo, but nobody noticed.

Rassinier said somewhere, in connection with the extermination claim, “this is

---

<sup>557</sup> Laqueur, Appendix 1. The cases of the politician-journalist Lemmer and the economist Sommer, who are said to have passed information about exterminations to Swiss contacts, are of dubious import. Lemmer was not associated with the *Abwehr* and, as Laqueur notes, there is nothing in his autobiography about passing on information about extermination. Sommer was an army liaison officer between the General Staff and the *Abwehr*, and also travelled to Switzerland in connection with trade relations. One can infer from M. Gilbert, pp. 56ff, that Sommer’s association with a summer 1942 report that “camps are being prepared where all the Jews of Europe and a great part of the Russian prisoners-of-war will be exterminated by gas” has been claimed not by Sommer, who died in 1965, but by two Jewish intermediaries. It is also worth noting that neither Lemmer nor Sommer appear to have been seriously involved with the anti-Hitler opposition; both survived the war.

<sup>558</sup> Rothfels, pp. 125-151.



not serious.” I am not in accord with that evaluation. This is mad. However, that is not the point of this discussion. The point is that these observations can be considered to lie “figuratively before our very noses” because most have been made in books published recently, not by revisionists, but by the defenders of the legend, and the minority that were not made can be readily inferred from those books anyway. On account of the “Holocaustomania” of the past several years, their existence and general contents have been widely publicized. Perhaps these books have not served up the observations as succinctly and forthrightly as I have, but they have served them up. It would therefore be a case of myopia, of a sort posterity will find it hard to understand if, while pursuing “Holocaust” controversy, we allow ourselves to get so wrapped up with the little details that the defenders of the legend will raise that we allow ourselves to be diverted from taking into account the extraordinarily simple historical observations, which really settle beyond doubt any question of the existence of a program of physical extermination of the Jews of Europe.

## Concluding Remarks

In controversies to come, the partisans of the received legend will try mightily to confuse and complicate the subject with all the tricks that we can anticipate and perhaps then some. We have the precedent of the Donation controversy showing that simple observations that establish the wildly ahistorical nature of a reigning legend can get smothered. Thus, my most important advice to those who enter the controversy is that they not lose sight of the fact that the real bone of contention, the extermination allegation, has been laid to rest beyond peradventure by ordinary historical analysis.

It follows that the basic tactic of the defenders of the legend, in controversies to come, will be to attempt to make claims that cannot be tested by the normal method of placing them as hypotheses in appropriate historical context and seeing if they cohere. That this process is under way can be seen from the remarkable *New Statesman* article of Gitta Sereny that is discussed above. She makes it clear that she would rather discuss places such as Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka than Auschwitz.

There are good reasons for this. Sereny puts it this way:

*“Auschwitz [...] combined enormous labour installations and nearby facilities for extermination. Auschwitz, because so many people survived it, has added most to our knowledge, but also most of our confusion as between the two types of camps.”*

There is a valid distinction here. Auschwitz was a huge, multi-faceted operation, while the other alleged extermination camps were obscure facilities that functioned only for short times for the virtually exclusive purpose of serving as transit camps for Jews. Thus, we have a great deal of information about Auschwitz but much less about the others. For example, there probably do not exist relevant aerial reconnaissance photographs of the others,<sup>559</sup> nor were there any

---

<sup>559</sup> Editor’s note: For aerial photographs of Treblinka, see J. C. Ball, *Air Photo Evidence* ([www.air-](http://www.air-)

western prisoners of war at the others, nor were hundreds of ordinary civilians employed at the others, nor did inmates at the others come into contact with diverse people over a large territory, nor was there apparently any IRC cognizance of the others, nor were there nearly as many transports of west European Jews to the others (there were transports of Dutch Jews to Sobibor).

The consequence is that it is much easier to disprove the legend as it applies to Auschwitz than as it applies to the others, when we for the sake of discussion forego the general historical arguments against “extermination.” That is really why the defenders of the legend would rather discuss Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka. There is much less directly contradicting their supposed “evidence,” which consists mainly of postwar testimony. That postwar testimony was mostly given before German courts and under the present legal and political conditions in Germany, revisionists cannot examine it anyway.<sup>560</sup> That is neat.

However, the defenders of the legend are in an impossible position here. They cannot concede Auschwitz without conceding the whole issue, for the reason that there is no sort of evidence they offer for the others that is not also offered for Auschwitz. If the “confession” of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss is fanciful,<sup>561</sup> then who will believe the “confession” of Treblinka commandant Franz Stangl? If the Auschwitz accounts of Rudolf Vrba and Miklos Nyiszli are not credible and their books sick jokes, then who will believe the equally sick Treblinka accounts of Jankiel Wiernik and other obscure people?<sup>562</sup> If the Nuremberg and postwar German trials have not established the truth about Auschwitz, then who will believe that they have established the truth about Treblinka? If the large numbers of Jews admittedly sent to Auschwitz were not killed there, then who will believe that the large number of Jews sent to Treblinka were killed at that camp? Much advice, then, to those who would engage in controversy is to not permit the defenders of the legend to get away with ignoring Auschwitz. The fact is that it is very easy to bring down the legend as it applies to Auschwitz and Auschwitz in turn, on account of the nature of the evidence involved, brings down the rest of the legend with it.

There is another type of argument resorted to by the defenders of the legend. It was very recently offered by Hilberg in the remarkable interview referred to above, which I recommend to those who want to get a good idea of the contemporary line:

“[...] *the critics [i.e. the revisionists] do not account for a quite simple fact:*

---

photo.com); also C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*.

<sup>560</sup> Under German law the records of a trial are not open to the public. Exceptions are granted to those who are somehow involved personally in the case or to those considered to have a scholarly interest in aspects of the trial. Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich, retired German judge and author of *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, was denied permission to consult trials testimonies. See his pp. 371ff. Dr. Robert Faurisson interprets remarks, made in a letter by Justice Ministry official Dr. Hans de With to *Die Realschule* (October 1981), as suggesting that if Faurisson sets foot in Germany he will be arrested and sent back to France.

<sup>561</sup> See Chapter 4. For the final solution of the Höss confession question, see Faurisson’s discussions in *The Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 1, no. 2 (Summer 1980), pp. 103+; vol. 2, no. 4 (Winter 1981), pp. 311+, 319+.

<sup>562</sup> A. Donat.

*what then became of the people who were deported? The deportation was not a secret event. It was announced. Several million people were displaced to definite places. Where are those people? They are not hidden in China!"*

It may seem incredible, at a time when scarcely a day goes by that the press does not discover some hitherto obscure Jew who was deported from his home but survived, at a time when events in the Middle East cannot fail to remind people of the great Jewish exodus from Europe after the war (and even during it), and at a time when the revisionist literature is recalling the various ways Jews were moved around during and after the war,<sup>563</sup> that Hilberg would say such a thing. There seems to be no difficulty in accounting for the Jews. A reader's first impulse might be to assume that Hilberg had been misquoted.

However, while he does not elaborate on the point, I can think of two interpretations of Hilberg's remarks. He had an argument here, but as usual its plausibility is only illusory and depends on myopia and a loss of context and perspective.

What Hilberg probably has in mind is the fact that, while there is a great deal of documentation available that proves that Jews were deported to the camps in Poland, such as Auschwitz, Treblinka, etc., there is not available comparable documentation that proves that they proceeded on through those camps to points further east. At least, I have not seen such German records. I would be astonished to see them today. Admitted that the legend was thrown together in a sloppy fashion, mainly because some continuity with wartime propaganda was desired, it is nevertheless the case that the people who came into control of the German documents after the war and who put selections of them into evidence at the Nuremberg trials, were not operating under such handicaps. They could suppress very effectively.

One must certainly note who "the people who came into control of the German documents" were. There are many ways to make it clear by historical-political argument or by specific example. My favorite among the latter is that the David Marcus who was prominent in making the U.S. occupation policy in Germany during and immediately after the war and who headed the War Crimes Branch in Washington in 1946-1947, was the same David Marcus who commanded the Jewish forces in Palestine in the first (1948) war with the Arabs. One could go on.<sup>564</sup>

Hilberg's point would have some weight, if we were talking about virgin historical records, but what he is in effect saying (if I interpret him correctly) is that we should trust the architects of the Nuremberg trials, which presupposes more than he is trying to prove (I presume he would want to argue only that these architects were right in this instance). The attempt to drop context at this point stands logic on its head. All that is being noted is that the hoaxers have not handed over the materials that directly expose their hoax.

Hilberg might argue that such wholesale suppression is not possible and that traces of deportation of Jews further east would be left. That is true; moreover, there are such traces and scraps. If this is indeed Hilberg's point, then he ought to answer the following question: Where are the German records that deal with the

---

<sup>563</sup> See Chapter 7.

<sup>564</sup> See Chapter 1, pp. 46-49.

deportations to and administration of the settlement (not concentration camp) near Riga that is described in Jeanette Wolff's article in Boehm's book? I do not know. I am not saying that they will never turn up, but I know that they were not available to those who looked for such things at the Nuremberg trials.<sup>565</sup>

There is a second possible interpretation of Hilberg's remark. While little weight can be given to postwar Jewish population figures claimed for eastern Europe, it must be conceded that the number of Jews in postwar Poland is only some fraction of the very large number (perhaps 3 million) that lived in prewar Poland (not quite the same territory). This is not because we must believe population figures that are offered. It is because Poland, unlike the Soviet Union, is not a large country and such large communities of Jews would certainly have been noticed if they were still there.

Thus, if one drops all historical context the argument seems simple. They are not in this territory we today call Poland; therefore they were killed. To those familiar with fairly commonplace history the conclusion is as much a *non sequitur* as would be the observation that because there were many millions of Germans and ethnic Germans living east of the Oder-Neisse before the war, and today almost none, then they were all killed. In fact, the period was one of massive population movements, and the Jews were no exception. The Soviets deported many into the interior of the Soviet Union, and in the period after the war, the Polish Jews pouring into west Germany to proceed on to the U.S., Palestine, and other destinations became a widely publicized problem.<sup>566</sup>

I have little more advice at this time on prosecuting "Holocaust" controversy, and I cannot anticipate every trick. I cannot even promise that the Sereny and Hilberg expositions discussed here will be representative of what the reader might encounter as argument in support of the legend. Even today one runs into the argument that the American and British troops who captured Belsen, Buchenwald, and Dachau "saw it with their own eyes." They saw dead bodies, and it has been relatively easily available knowledge since 1945 that the deaths were due to the privations entailed in Germany's collapse, but the reigning confusion is so great that we still hear the argument anyway. All I can add is that one should keep current with the revisionist literature and the more important pieces of literature in support of the legend and, in controversy, be mindful above all of preserving historical context and perspective and not getting trapped with myopic historical vision.

---

<sup>565</sup> See Chapter 7, pp. 267-269.

<sup>566</sup> See Chapters 1 and 7.



## Supplement 3: A Response to a Major Critique of Holocaust Revisionism

*Presented orally at the 1992 conference of the Institute for Historical Review. This is a slightly edited version of the paper as published in the Journal of Historical Review, vol. 13, no. 3, May-June 1993, pp. 23-37.*

### Why Another Critique of Jean-Claude Pressac?

Jean-Claude Pressac's 1989 book, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, has been examined at length in *The Journal of Historical Review*<sup>567</sup> and elsewhere. Pressac's principal, almost sole target is Robert Faurisson, and I expect that Faurisson's critique will become the definitive one. Accordingly, this presentation is not meant to be a thorough critique of Pressac's book.

I do, however, wish to supplement what has already been written and said with some reactions of my own. What will be illustrated is something that I observed long ago and for which Pressac's book is a wonderful example. The Holocaust is such a gigantic fraud that it is a cornucopia of absurdities. One has only to contemplate it from a slightly different perspective to see new absurdities tumble out. Alternatively, one can view it from the same perspective after some time has elapsed (or one can ask another person to observe it), with the same results.

Also, Pressac has commented on my work and I think it appropriate to reply.

### What Pressac Has Done

It is generally agreed that Pressac did history a service in gathering and publishing documents that were previously unknown or at least not easily available. He then interpreted these documents in the outlandish ways analyzed in the earlier critiques.

He also accepted the chemical analyses reported by Fred Leuchter in 1988 (and since confirmed by accredited chemist Germar Rudolf),<sup>568</sup> and the implication that the alleged mass gassings with the pesticide Zyklon did not leave cyanide traces as were left in the delousing gas chambers (although he is not entirely consistent about this).<sup>569</sup> Thus, he invented a gassing procedure that, he claimed without offering evidence, would leave no such trace, declared it to be the one fol-

---

<sup>567</sup> Reviews and analysis of Pressac's 1989 book that have appeared in *The Journal of Historical Review*: M. Weber in Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 231-237; C. Mattogno in Vol. 10, No. 4 (Winter 1990-91), pp. 461-485; R. Faurisson in Vol. 11, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 25-66, and in Vol. 11, No. 2 (Summer 1991), pp. 133-175.

<sup>568</sup> G. Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*. This report also discusses various other contributions in this matter, e.g. by the Cracow Institute for Forensic Research. Editor's note.

<sup>569</sup> Pressac, p. 133.

lowed at Auschwitz, and found that he was consequently obliged to reject important details in the accounts of two star “witnesses”: Commandant Rudolf Höss, who was supposedly in charge of the whole operation, and Dr. Nyiszli.<sup>570</sup> In the course of his exposition, he notes additional problems with the standard testimonies. I am reminded of one of those old cartoons showing a man sawing off the tree branch he’s sitting on. As we shall see, even on the basis of the concerns he raised in his book, Pressac should have come down much harder on the alleged eyewitnesses.

In summary, what Pressac offers is (a) an admission that the gassings at Auschwitz cannot be proven by forensic means, (b) admissions that the usual alleged witnesses to exterminations are at least unreliable, and (c) a collection of German documents, ambiguous when taken out of context, that provide what he calls “criminal traces” of exterminations. These three points have been the foci of the earlier critiques of Pressac’s book.

Pressac’s book is entirely dedicated to supporting his claim that the wartime German authorities at Auschwitz constructed and operated homicidal gas chambers there. He cannot, and does not even try, to connect such operations to any policy emanating from Berlin. Nor does he try to show that there existed a three-year program employing trains continuously crossing Europe and carrying Jews to their deaths, unobserved by Allied intelligence agencies, by German military intelligence, by the Red Cross, by the Vatican, by the Jews facing transport under German policies, or even by the Jewish leaders outside occupied Europe who were publicly wailing about “extermination.”<sup>571</sup> Such major historical bounds having long been established, an opus such as Pressac’s, with its strict focus on local questions, is the only kind of anti-revisionist essay possible.

Such an author is in the position of a man who would prove that there was a recent war between Illinois and Indiana by scouring the countryside for spent firearms casings. It is not necessary to play his game of dropping all historical context in order to focus on a purely local matter, but a review of his book can do naught else. Nevertheless, I shall show that the objection that Pressac has dropped context holds even if we agree to play his game. That is, given the restriction of his view to Auschwitz, Pressac still focuses on local matters out of context, this time of the concentration camp in its full dimensions.

## The Crematories

In my view, page 184 of Pressac’s book is crucial. Here we are told:<sup>572</sup>

1. Mass gassings of Jews in “Bunker 1” (located near the newly built Birkenau section of the Auschwitz camp), commenced in 1942, possibly in January but certainly by mid-May.
2. On February 27, 1942 it was decided that the new 15-muffle Crematory II would be built at Birkenau rather than at the *Stammlager* (main or original

---

<sup>570</sup> Pressac, pp. 16, 53.

<sup>571</sup> See Supplement 2 here.

<sup>572</sup> Pressac, p. 132.

camp).

3. On some unknown date in May or June 1942, it was decided that an “industrial” extermination of the Jews would be undertaken. The new crematories were accordingly modified for this purpose, this being indicated by the first “criminal element” to appear on an engineering drawing: the separation of the drainage of the alleged gas chamber from the drainage of the rest of Crematory II. (Pressac has a very low threshold in detecting a “criminal element.”)
4. In the summer 1942, it was decided that four new crematories, rather than one, would be built at Birkenau for extermination purposes: Crematory III, a mirror image of Crematory II with 15 muffles, and the mirror image Crematories IV and V, each with eight muffles, for a total of 46 muffles (not counting Crematory I). Construction of these Birkenau crematoria was completed in spring 1943, and Crematory I in the *Stammlager*, with its six muffles, was shut down permanently in July 1943.

Pressac expects the reader to assume, as he does, that such great cremation capacity could only be to support an extermination program. Accordingly, he goes on to invite us “to imagine a village of 4,000 inhabitants with [...] a crematorium equipped with three 3-muffle furnaces. [...] We need not dwell on this picture.”

This point is repeated and emphasized elsewhere in the book. Regarding the crematories, Pressac writes: “THEIR CAPACITY WAS EXCESSIVE IN RELATION TO THE REAL NEEDS OF THE CAMP” (Pressac’s emphasis).<sup>573</sup> He argues that the cremation capacity was excessive for a normal community of this many residents. However, nobody maintains Birkenau was a normal community. Indeed, on page 165 I conceded that it could properly be called a “death camp.”

In making his argument, Pressac tries to ignore the catastrophic typhus epidemics at Auschwitz – an impossible task because the documents emphasize the importance of this matter. The first catastrophic epidemic – during the summer of 1942 – is not mentioned at all by Pressac on page 184 of his book, which is devoted to arguing (or at least asserting) that a decision was made in spring-summer of 1942 to launch an industrial extermination of the Jews and to expand accordingly the capacity of the cremation facilities then under construction.

Consider how horrible and devastating the summer 1942 typhus epidemic at Auschwitz was. The number of recorded male deaths in the period July 1 through August 19, 1942, was 8,236. The records for female deaths in the period are not available, but judging from the registration numbers, the female camp population was about 25 percent of the male. Therefore, the combined male/female recorded deaths for the period July 1 through August 19, 1942, was about 10,000.<sup>574</sup> The Höss order of July 23 quarantining the camp<sup>575</sup> was a necessary response to an extraordinary situation. These are the events that Pressac ignores, as he considers, on

---

<sup>573</sup> Pressac, pp. 200, 206.

<sup>574</sup> D. Czech, “Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau,” *Hefte von Auschwitz*, No. 3, 1960, pp. 68-76. Also D. Czech, “Die Rolle des Häftlingskrankenbaulagers im KL Auschwitz II,” *Hefte von Auschwitz*, No. 15, 1975, pp. 27ff.

<sup>575</sup> D. Czech in *Hefte von Auschwitz*, No. 3, 1960 (cited above), p. 73.



page 184 of his book, the changes in crematory construction plans that were made in summer 1942. He invites us “to imagine” an ordinary village in considering these crematories. Why should one try? What Pressac would have us ignore at this point is the virtual hellhole of catastrophic epidemic at Auschwitz. Dishonesty on this scale is rare; only a spinner of the “Holocaust” yarn could hope to get away with it.<sup>576</sup>

At first I considered this a most shocking instance of intellectual dishonesty. Continuing to read, I noted that on page 187 he does mention the typhus epidemic, and then, on page 188, I found the prize of the whole book. On that page Pressac finally offers a relation of the measures being taken at Auschwitz against typhus to the alleged extermination of the Jews. He wrote there:

*“The SS used the extermination of the Jews, about which their superiors had a general knowledge, without being informed of the practical details, to hide the terrible hygienic conditions in the camp, and to cover up their enormous consumption of gas for disinfection purposes.”* (Pressac’s emphases.)

The SS therefore must have hidden the catastrophe from Himmler during his visit to the camp on July 17-18, 1942. (My guess is that Himmler suggested, or at least informally approved, the quarantine order that was issued on July 23.)

Since the typhus epidemics cannot be ignored, Pressac mentions them on subsequent pages. On one he notes: “it was necessary at all costs to stop the epidemic,” while on another he ludicrously writes that in mid-September, almost two months after the quarantine order, “the deaths caused by the typhus epidemic were becoming a real problem” – the great understatement of the book.<sup>577</sup> That, which every minimally discerning reader will see, a presumptive link between the epidemics and crematory construction, is evaded. Here Pressac argues an extraordinary role for the crematories by maintaining that final approval for construction rested with the RSHA (the security/police branch of the SS), rather than the WVHA (the camp administration agency). If true, all that is indicated is some procedural point, or perhaps the generally acknowledged inequality of the two departments.<sup>578</sup> Pressac makes no effort to convey the full horror of the typhus epidemic of 1942. These reluctant admissions of a typhus catastrophe amount to evasions performed in order to strengthen, in the reader’s mind, the “industrial extermination” interpretation of the crematories. Pressac in fact thus engages in whitewashing the true horrors of Auschwitz.

Pressac’s reluctant and dispersed acknowledgment of the typhus epidemics could be viewed as yet another instance of a feature that has bothered every reviewer of the book: its poor organization. Many times I have come back to the book to reread some point I remember having read somewhere, only to find that the point is not at all where, logically, it ought to be, but rather in some unex-

---

<sup>576</sup> Pressac, pp. 217-218, repeats this amazing evasion. On p. 384 he hurriedly suggests a very weak relation between crematory construction activity and the epidemics.

<sup>577</sup> Pressac, pp. 188, 202.

<sup>578</sup> Nobody believes Oswald Pohl was equal in influence to Reinhard Heydrich while the latter was alive. It was RSHA head Ernst Kaltenbrunner who, toward the end of the war, issued the order opening the camps to the International Red Cross. See p. 63.

pected place. Normally such a lack of organization would be due to sloppy craftsmanship and would be rightly regarded as a nuisance that does not carry argumentative weight against the author's analysis. Further on, I will offer another interpretation of the poor organization that does carry such weight.

I wonder if Pressac's evasions should be viewed as "dishonesty." If I were to put on an odd-looking hat like the one that Napoleon wore and then go around claiming to be the French emperor, would that be "dishonesty"? That is, when the disguise is easily seen through by anybody not eager to self deceive, should that be regarded as a disguise at all? Pressac may be king of the clowns; he is not king of the hoaxers.

Pressac does not bother to consider the notion that the camp's large cremation capacity was appropriate for the epidemic conditions. In Chapter 4 (pp. 151-163) I made the following point, but in view of Pressac's book it seems necessary to belabor it. In considering cremation capacity, it is difficult to reach conclusions on a purely technical basis because of the distinction that must unavoidably be made between what is physically possible and what is practically attainable. For example, although I am told that my car can move at about 100 miles per hour, I know I cannot drive the 20 miles that separates my home in Evanston from the University of Chicago in twelve minutes; too many obstacles intervene. The technical data provides two numbers from which only an irrelevant conclusion can be drawn, whose only value is that the arithmetic is correct.

Pressac cites some documents on cremation capacity that he admits could not relate to practical conditions.<sup>579</sup> In the case of the crematoria in the concentration camps, the two main obstacles to such apparently simple calculations are (1) that the cremation equipment was not – and could not have been – used continuously,

---

<sup>579</sup> Pressac, on p. 108, cites a letter from Topf (reproduced in R. Schnabel, *Macht ohne Moral*, Frankfurt/ Main, 1957, p. 346). This letter asserts that one of the firm's double muffle ovens can reduce "in about 10 hours 10-35 corpses" (that is, the average time claimed to reduce one corpse in a muffle ranged from 34 minutes to two hours), and can be operated day and night, an assertion not borne out by later experience at Auschwitz, as Pressac notes (pp. 227-247, esp. p. 244). I believe this document is authentic, and the exaggerations are the usual ones of people trying to sell something. I note that it clearly specifies that corpses are supplied to the oven serially ("*hintereinander*"), in contradiction to the usual "witness" who claims that three or even more were fed into a muffle together. Witnesses also assert that the crematories belched flames from the chimneys, certainly not the operational mode of modern crematories. Pressac accepts such tall tales without protest (pp. 251, 253). I have far more trouble with the document reproduced by Pressac on p. 247, ostensibly a letter of June 28, 1943, from the Auschwitz construction department claiming that the 52 muffles at Auschwitz could reduce 4,756 corpses in 24 hours of operation. That works out to an average of 16 minutes per corpse. The date of the document was when the breakdowns of the crematories and consequent attempts at emergency repairs gave the SS no reason to exaggerate the efficacy of Topf's products (for example, Pressac, pp. 100, 227, 236). Moreover according to another document reproduced by Pressac (on p. 224), the crematories operated only 12 hours per day. On p. 91, Pressac gives the provenance of the June 28, 1943, document as the "Committee of Anti-Fascist Resistants of the German Democratic Republic." I am in the position of a man staring at an authentic-looking German document that states that a Volkswagen broke the sound barrier. If it is not a forgery, then it must have been some sort of joke. In one of his neo-Pythagorean exegeses that Faurisson has noted (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, Summer 1991, pp. 145-149), Pressac says (pp. 110, 244) that such figures should be divided "by a factor of 2 to 5."

and that (2), as I noted on p. 60 (Chapter 2), the camp inmates who routinely operated the crematories were normally “working with a lethargy taught them by the Russians.”

Although the term “extraordinary” is applicable when referring to numbers, I shall henceforth term as “ordinary” those camp deaths from non-homicidal causes, mainly disease but including execution for specific offenses, virtually all of which were at some point recorded in German documents and which are admitted by all sides. (Some of the “ordinary” deaths that occurred in 1945, during the chaos of the final months of the war, were not recorded).

An “extermination camp” is then a hypothetical camp where unrecorded deaths – in homicidal “gas chambers” – vastly exceeded recorded deaths. Revisionists hold that, while some German wartime documents may be lost, the ordinary deaths were essentially all the deaths, and that there were no “extermination camps.” Consistent with the extermination legend, Pressac would agree that all the deaths in such camps as Buchenwald and Dachau in Germany were essentially ordinary deaths. However, he would assert that at Auschwitz in Poland large-scale unrecorded “extermination” deaths of anonymous people were carried out and that, consequently, only a fraction – perhaps one-tenth – of the total deaths there were “ordinary” recorded deaths.

What we need to do is consider the recorded death rates in relation to the cremation capacities. The most effective method, I think, is to compare the (“non-extermination”) camps of Buchenwald and Dachau with the (“extermination”) camp of Auschwitz in this respect. This is more convincing than citing estimates of the amount of time required to cremate a corpse. To return to the analogy of driving the 20 miles between my residence in Evanston and the University of Chicago, I must essentially disregard technical data about the speed capacity of my car and the distance between the two locations and instead refer to experience – either my own or another’s – to accurately estimate the time required.

If it can be shown that the cremation capacity in each camp was proportionate to the numbers of “ordinary” and recorded deaths in each camp, then there must be an assumption that the crematories at Auschwitz played, and were intended to play, the same ordinary role as the crematories at Buchenwald and Dachau (which by universal agreement were not extermination camps).

There are a few difficulties in such a comparison, but they are surmountable. For one thing, there is a lack of complete and formal documentation of “ordinary” deaths at Auschwitz, despite the widely publicized release of the Auschwitz “death books” three years ago by Soviet authorities. Coincidentally, in a review published in 1989, I gave figures that had been given to me by the International Tracing Service in Arolsen during my visit there in 1977: 45,575 recorded deaths in 1942 and 36,960 in 1943, with death books missing for 1940, 1941, 1944, and January 1945 (when the camp was evacuated).<sup>580</sup>

<sup>580</sup> Editor’s note: 46 volumes of the Auschwitz death registers were found so far with a total of 67,283 deaths (2,988 in 1941; 36,796 in 1942; 27,499 in 1943); Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, φ 502-4; cf. Sonderstandesamt Arolsen (ed.), *Die Sterbebücher von Auschwitz*.

Although my information was not complete, it is – as we shall see – satisfactory for the present purpose. Another problem is the significance of the ca. 69,000 deaths recorded in the death certificates of the (incomplete) “death books” announced by the Soviets in 1989. Fortunately, this is not important for the present purpose. I continue to maintain that the total number of “ordinary” deaths at Auschwitz from 1940 through January 1945 is “in the range 100,000-150,000, probably closer to the former, because the camp population was small in 1940-1941 and by 1944 the Germans had made some progress against typhus.”<sup>581</sup> As we shall see, this total is not the crucial point.

The totals for Buchenwald and Dachau, camps in Germany rather than Poland, are fairly well established. The International Tracing Service report of 1977 specified 36,550 for Buchenwald and 31,951 for Dachau. In each case, though, the figure does not include an undetermined number of “persons who died shortly before the liberation and during the evacuation transports.”<sup>582</sup>

The cremation facilities at the two camps are also fairly well known. Buchenwald had a six-muffle crematory, installed in 1942, and perhaps two additional muffles installed earlier. Moreover, Buchenwald had access to the civilian crematories that existed in nearby Weimar. Dachau had a two-muffle crematory before 1942, when a four-muffle crematory was constructed.<sup>583</sup> We may therefore assume that Buchenwald and Dachau had at least six muffles each.

At first it may appear that, by comparison, Auschwitz had an excessive number of muffles: while the number of “ordinary” deaths at Auschwitz was about three to four times those at Buchenwald and Dachau, there were about eight times as many muffles. However, when the calculation is done correctly, it can be seen that Auschwitz in fact had less relative cremation capacity.

The figures for total deaths at the two camps in Germany have entirely different interpretations from those for Auschwitz. The latter was evacuated under generally orderly conditions in January 1945. Consequently, the Auschwitz total, whatever it is, does not include “ordinary” deaths during the complete chaos of spring 1945. The worst period for Auschwitz was not 1945, but 1942, when its crematory construction project was defined.

By contrast, most of the deaths in the camps in Germany proper were in 1944 and the chaotic first four months of 1945 during the disintegration and final collapse of German industry. Concentration camp personnel knew that any plans for fundamental expansion of cremation capabilities that might have been drawn up in 1944 stood little chance of being implemented. Indeed, such construction was scant in 1944 and 1945. All significant and effective decisions about crematory construction were in fact made before 1944 and could have been determined only by conditions existing prior to 1944. Consequently, in order to judge German intentions regarding the construction of crematories, we must look to the 1942-1943

---

<sup>581</sup> *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Fall 1989), pp. 369f. (My review of Arno Mayer’s book, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?*)

<sup>582</sup> A. de Cocatrix, “The number of victims of the National Socialist persecution,” Arolsen: International Tracing Service, April 1977.

<sup>583</sup> See p. 163; see also Pressac, pp. 94f, 106.

period. Therefore, the incomplete figures cited here for Auschwitz are all that are required for the present purpose.

Available figures of “ordinary” deaths in the three camps break down as shown in Table 18 (it being noted that the figure for Buchenwald is only for the first three months of 1945).<sup>584</sup>

**Table 18: Recorded deaths in the Auschwitz, Buchenwald and Dachau camps**

YEAR	AUSCHWITZ	BUCHENWALD	DACHAU
1940	?	1,772	1,515
1941	?	1,522	2,576
1942	45,575	2,898	2,470
1943	36,960	3,516	1,100
1944	?	8,644	4,794
1945	?	13,056	15,384
TOTALS	?	31,408	27,839
TOTALS?	125,000?	37,000?	32,000?

The crucial years are 1942 and 1943, because those are the latest years that could be considered to have determined German decisions about the construction of crematories in the camps.

The ratio of projected muffles to “ordinary” deaths is presented in Table 19. I have assumed 52 muffles for Auschwitz (46 for Birkenau and six for the *Stammlager* (Auschwitz I camp)), not because Auschwitz ever in fact had 52 operational muffles, but because the purpose of this calculation is to help interpret intentions in building the crematories rather than capabilities actually attained. We see, in fact, that the ratio of cremation muffles to deaths somewhat disfavors Auschwitz: that is, it was decided that Auschwitz would be less well equipped with crematories than Buchenwald and Dachau (two camps that, by universal agreement, were not extermination camps). Perhaps budgetary constraints excluded more crematories for Auschwitz.

**Table 19: Number of projected muffles per thousand recorded deaths**

YEAR	AUSCHWITZ	BUCHENWALD	DACHAU
MUFFLES	52	6	6
1942	1.14	2.07	2.43
1943	1.41	1.71	5.45

<sup>584</sup> Nuremberg document 2171-PS, published in *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression* (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1946-1948), Vol. 4, pp. 800-835; P. Berben, *Dachau 1933-1945: The Official History* (London: Norfolk Press, 1975 ed.), p. 281. I have not used Mauthausen in this comparison because, although the recorded deaths are fairly well known (see, for example, Hans Marsálek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen*, Vienna, 1974), the extent of cremation means is uncertain. Mauthausen was more decentralized than the other camps; for example, the satellite camp Gusen experienced about as many deaths as the main camp, and it and other satellite camps had their own crematoria of uncertain extent (See: Pressac, pp. 108-114, and, Marsálek, p. 157). In addition, Mauthausen on occasion used ordinary municipal crematoria, such as the one in Steyr.

On page 184 of his book, Pressac readily interprets the summer 1942 decision to provide 46 cremation muffles in Birkenau as a phase of an extermination program. In doing so, however, he ignores the figures of ordinary or recorded deaths (given here), which contradict his interpretation. The decision to shut down Crematory I with its six muffles in the Auschwitz main camp (*Stammlager*) is, therefore, inexplicable from Pressac's point of view.

Actually, the entire story was unraveled at its beginning by Heinrich Himmler who stated on April 21, 1945:<sup>585</sup>

*"In order to put a stop to the epidemics, we were forced to burn the bodies of incalculable numbers of people who had been destroyed by disease. We were therefore forced to build crematoria, and on this account they are knotting a noose for us."*

Unfortunately, Himmler did not live to say this at the Nuremberg trials. It is scandalous that it still has to be said today.

With regard to Pressac's exertions to find a homicidal gas chamber in (Birkenau) Crematory II, I refer the reader to Faurisson's critique. In his effort to prove a thesis, the falsehood of which is (or should be) obvious at the outset, Pressac in fact plays down or simply ignores the decisive facts. Nevertheless, he claims that it is we who are "maniacs who spend their lives trying to demonstrate that something never existed."<sup>586</sup>

### The "Vergasungskeller" (gassing cellar)

Earlier, I considered a widely-cited document dated January 29, 1943, in which Karl Bischoff, head of the Auschwitz construction department, reported to Hans Kammler, head of the SS engineering office in Berlin, on the operational status of Crematory II:<sup>587</sup>

*"The Crematorium II has been completed – save for some minor constructional work – by the use of all the forces available, in spite of unspeakable difficulties, the severe cold, and in 24 hour shifts. The fires were started in the ovens in the presence of Senior Engineer Prüfer, representative of the contractors of the firm of Topf and Sons, Erfurt, and they are working most satisfactorily. The formwork for the reinforced concrete ceiling of the mortuary cellar [Leichenkeller] could not yet be removed on account of the frost. This is, however, unimportant, as the gassing cellar [Vergasungskeller] can be used for this purpose [...]"*

In his book, Pressac wrote that my interpretation of the term *Vergasungskeller* "though perfect in its literary form, was technically worthless."<sup>588</sup> He interprets the term *Vergasungskeller* in this 1943 document to mean a homicidal gas cham-

<sup>585</sup> See p. 287; see also *Moment* (Jewish monthly published in Boston), Vol. 11, No. 1, (Dec. 1985), p. 51.

<sup>586</sup> Pressac, p. 216.

<sup>587</sup> See p. 148; see also Pressac, p. 211. This 1943 communication is Nuremberg document NO-4473. Original German-language text is given in: E. Kogon, *et al.*, *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas* (Frankfurt/M.: Fischer, 1986), p. 220.

<sup>588</sup> Pressac, p. 548.

ber, and made this number one in his list of 39 “criminal traces” of extermination gassings at Auschwitz.<sup>589</sup>

Although my translation of the term was technically correct, I would now say that Pressac showed that, in this case, my interpretation was not correct. However, Pressac’s interpretation is also incorrect, as shown by the evidence he himself reproduces. It is necessary to consider this matter in detail.<sup>590</sup>

The two important German words in this regard are *Begasung*, treatment with a gas, and *Vergasung*, gasification or conversion of something into a gas, even in the loose sense; for example, the German word for carburetion is *Vergasung*. Thus, although “fumigation” should normally be “*Begasung*,” for no clear reason German often allows “*Vergasung*” to substitute for “*Begasung*.” Thus, gas attacks in World War I were referred to as *Vergasung*, and professional fumigators often speak of their operations as *Vergasung* rather than *Begasung*. However, it appears that *Begasung* never substitutes for *Vergasung* and that a fumigation or delousing gas chamber is normally a “*Gaskammer*,” not a “*Vergasungskammer*” or “*Vergasungskeller*.” Accordingly, the delousing gas chambers at Auschwitz were called “*Gaskammern*.”<sup>591</sup> These are the sorts of arbitrary conventions of usage, not deducible from a dictionary, that occur in any language.

Despite all this, the normal meaning of *Vergasung*, in a technical context, is gasification, gas generation, or carburetion. In view of that and knowing that some cremation ovens were of a design requiring a combustible gas-air mixture to be introduced by blowers located outside, I interpreted the *Vergasungskeller* mentioned in the 1943 document as a place where coke or coal was converted into a combustible gas, mixed with air, and then introduced under pressure into the cremation ovens.

While this interpretation is not “technically worthless,” Pressac shows that it is not correct in this instance. His proof consists of (1) many engineering drawings of Crematory II in various stages of design, which show no such facility, and (2) engineering drawings of, and other technical data on, typical Topf company crematory ovens, which show that they were not of the design I assumed and which used as fuel coke supplied directly behind the ovens.<sup>592</sup>

On the basis of a newly discovered document, Pressac shows that the basement morgue (*Leichenkeller*), which was not available due to the frost, was *Leichenkeller 2*. He thus concludes that the *Vergasungskeller* must be *Leichenkeller 1*, and that it was designated a “*Vergasungskeller*” in this document as a result of an “enormous gaff [sic...] the first of the ‘slips’ that SS and civilians could not help making” in the alleged preferred policy of not committing incriminating words to

---

<sup>589</sup> Pressac, p. 432.

<sup>590</sup> Compare with Faurisson’s discussion of this point in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 55ff.

<sup>591</sup> Pressac, pp. 27f, 31. H. Breymesser and E. Bernfus, eds., *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, (Berlin: Reichsarbeitsblatt, 1943) normally uses “*Gaskammer*” but “*Begasungskammer*” is also used.

<sup>592</sup> Pressac, pp. 106-113, 222-225. Early in 1989, Faurisson also told me that my interpretation of the *Vergasungskeller* was not correct, but as far as I can recollect he did not raise the matter of the design of the ovens. Thus, I was not convinced at that time.

paper.<sup>593</sup> While it is true that the normal German term for a homicidal or delousing gas chamber would be “*Gaskammer*,” “*Vergasungskeller*” is linguistically possible.

As noted by others, Pressac is in the strange position of claiming that a room consistently designated *Leichenkeller* 1 on all engineering drawings was to be used only temporarily as a *Leichenkeller*, either instead of normally as a gas chamber, or simultaneously as a gas chamber and a morgue. In the latter case the unsuspecting victims must presumably stand on the corpses. In the former case (the only interpretation worth considering), the implied delay in the use of the building for extermination was “unimportant,” a major contradiction if one claims, as Pressac does, that the primary role of the building was for mass gassing.

Because this document confirms that in January 1943 the Germans were working, under great pressure, to make this installation operational as an ordinary crematory, I regard it as further evidence against the claim that it had been decided in the summer of 1942 that the primary purpose of these crematories was extermination by lethal gassing.

The use of the *Vergasungskeller* as a morgue not only did not interfere with bringing Crematorium II into operational status, it advanced it. Here I am arguing, in passing, for a focus on what the document says rather than on the term *Vergasungskeller* mentioned in it. I suspect that the realization of what the document really says is the basis for Hilberg’s failure to make more than a hurried and superficial reference to it.<sup>594</sup> Pressac, in effect, would have us ignore what the document says.

In any case, Pressac’s logic in interpreting the *Vergasungskeller* as a gas chamber depends entirely on the assumption that there was a gas chamber in Crematory II. Without that assumption we have the following situation:

1. One (and apparently only one) document concerned exclusively with the operational status of Crematory II makes reference to a *Vergasungskeller* to be temporarily used, in support of the crematory, as a morgue and not for its intended or normal function,
2. in the many engineering drawings of the crematories that Pressac has examined, there is no mention of a *Vergasungskeller*, *Gaskammer*, or anything similar,<sup>595</sup> and
3. nothing in those engineering drawings implies or calls for something describable as a *Vergasungskeller*. For example, the cremation ovens have been shown to be of a design not calling for such a facility.

The appropriate conclusion, I believe, is that the *Vergasungskeller* was not in Crematory II at all. I assume that it was somewhere in the vicinity, but in the light of current knowledge the only basis for inferring that it was in the crematory building is an assumption that there was a gas chamber there. In the absence of the massive documentation presented by Pressac, it seemed logical to assume that the *Vergasungskeller* was located in Crematory II. I made just that assumption in

---

<sup>593</sup> Pressac, p. 217.

<sup>594</sup> R. Hilberg (1985), p. 885, n. 67. (1961: p. 566, n. 52.)

<sup>595</sup> Pressac, p. 429.



writing my book, and the assumption seemed confirmed for me by the observation that crematory technology could call for such a facility. However, Pressac has shown, without realizing it, that the *Vergasungskeller* was not in Crematory II, because it does not appear on the many engineering plans and is not implied or called for by anything that appears on those plans. Only an unfounded or arbitrary prior assumption can place it there.

If the *Vergasungskeller* was not in Crematory II, then the questions of what and where it was are only of limited importance. It suffices, I believe, to show that the term could have applied to operations that transpired, or may have transpired, elsewhere in the camp.

To give my favored interpretation first, it is unlikely that the town of Auschwitz had preexisting means for production and/or distribution of fuel or town gas sufficient for the needs of the huge complex of camps we call "Auschwitz." Such needs could have been for cooking, heating, or incineration of waste, and so forth. On account of the paucity of natural gas but abundance of coal in Europe, the Germans had extensively developed the gasification of coal.<sup>596</sup> In the Auschwitz region, coal was particularly abundant, so processes of coal or coke gasification were suited for the conditions there.

In offering my earlier interpretation of the *Vergasungskeller* as a fuel gas generator for the crematory ovens, I wrote on p. 155 (Chapter 4):

*"The two most common methods of producing fuel gases from coal or coke are, first, by passing air through a bed of burning coke to produce 'coke oven gas' and second, by passing steam through the coke to produce 'water gas'."*<sup>597</sup>

I now offer almost the same interpretation, but modified so that the specific location of the *Vergasungskeller* is no longer known, and the gas generated is for general application and not specifically for cremation. This seems entirely justified by the engineering plans that indicate no *Vergasungskeller* in the crematories, by the great likelihood that the camp required fuel gas and in view of the easy availability of coal there.<sup>598</sup> Incidentally, it is unimportant, from the present point of view, if such a *Vergasungskeller* were operational or only in a state of construction; only the possibility of its temporary use as a morgue is relevant. So much the better, if such a facility was not yet operational, because then nothing would interfere with use as a morgue.

As I say, this is my "favored" or preferred interpretation, but there are a few other possibilities that are worth noting.

---

<sup>596</sup> John F. Foster and Richard J. Lund, eds., *Economics of Fuel Gas from Coal* (NY: McGraw Hill, 1950), pp. 68-97.

<sup>597</sup> The remark on the method of generation of coke oven gas can be improved. See: Foster & Lund (1950), cited above, p. 41. In any case, the German processes were sufficiently advanced that they did not necessarily fall into classic categories. See: Foster & Lund (1950), pp. 68f.

<sup>598</sup> A summary of various gas generation processes is given in Hermann Franke, ed., *Lueger. Lexikon der Technik* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1960-1972), Vol. 7 (1965), pp. 484+. Gasification of oil, or *Ölvergasung*, as contrasted to gasification of solid fuels, or *Vergasung fester Brennstoffe*, had also been practiced in Germany since the late nineteenth century. See: H. Franke, ed., *Lueger* (Stuttgart: 1960-1972), Vol. 4, p. 390.

It has already been remarked that fuel gas generated in the camp could have been used, among other things, in waste incineration. That is, the fuel gas could have served as the auxiliary fuel. There is also a second sense in which “*Vergasung*” can apply to waste incineration, because the technology views the waste as a combustible fuel being turned into gases. Incineration (or *Verbrennung*) is actually a special case of gasification (or *Vergasung*) in which all combustibles are oxidized to the highest degree possible, for example, producing carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) instead of carbon monoxide (CO, a combustible gas, in which case it would be said that *Vergasung* had taken place). Since perfect incineration does not exist in this sense, the line between *Verbrennung* and *Vergasung* can be blurred. What is termed waste gasification, or *Müllvergasung* in ordinary technical German, was developed as a practical process only after the war.<sup>599</sup> It appears that during the war, *Vergasung* could have been used in the waste incineration context only in the sense of one of many specific processes taking place inside a plant viewed as performing *Müllverbrennung*.<sup>600</sup> Thus, this second sense of application of “*Vergasung*” to waste incineration does not seem to apply, and it is very unlikely that at Auschwitz any waste incinerator would have been spoken of as performing *Vergasung*.

This possibility is nevertheless worth mentioning. There was a waste incinerator in what I would call the chimney housing behind the cremation ovens in Crematory II. The effluent gases from this incinerator combined with the effluent of the ovens in sharing the chimney and the suction type forced draft system.<sup>601</sup> I do not believe that the “*Vergasungskeller*” was this chimney housing because, apart from the reasons already given, it was not referred to as such on the drawings and seems to have had insufficient free space to serve as a plausible temporary substitute for the huge *Leichenkeller 2*.<sup>602</sup> All the same, it is at least worth noting that “*Vergasung*” could apply as an inclusive description for the two processes (cremation and waste incineration) involved there. However, I do not consider a waste incineration interpretation of the *Vergasungskeller* a likely possibility.

In the vicinity of the crematories at Birkenau there were three sewage treatment plants (*Kläranlagen*) in various stages of completion.<sup>603</sup> Sewage treatment amounts basically to the acceleration of the natural processes, in which bacteria metabolize solid waste into gasses and inoffensive solids (sludge) and to the disposal or use of these products. There are several senses, in which *Vergasung* could arise. A short outline is helpful:

1. Aeration (*Belüftung*)
2. Chlorination
3. Methane production
4. Prevention of sewer gasification (*Kanalvergasung*)
5. Sludge incineration (*Schlammverbrennung*)

<sup>599</sup> H. Franke, ed., *Lueger* (cited above), Vol. 16, p. 337.

<sup>600</sup> H. Franke, ed., *Lueger* (cited above), Vol. 7, p. 89.

<sup>601</sup> Pressac, pp. 277, 281ff, 287, 306.

<sup>602</sup> Such objections also apply against the hypothesis that one room of the small *Leichenkeller 3* (Pressac, pp. 285, 295) was the *Vergasungskeller*. See R. Faurisson, *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Spring 1991), pp. 55ff.

<sup>603</sup> See Pressac, pp. 51, 165-170, 420f, 542f, for limited data.

Sludge gasification (*Schlammvergasung*) was a postwar development and is not relevant here.

In the technical literature, aeration of sewage is classified as one form of “gas transfer,”<sup>604</sup> because a specific biochemical effect of the oxygen is sought; the specific purpose of the aeration is to make the aerobic bacteria more vigorous. This biochemical motivation is so emphatic that I have seen the word “*Begasung*” used to designate *Belüftung*.<sup>605</sup> In this connection, I have also seen the terms “*Belüftungskammer*” (aeration chamber) and “*Belüftungsschacht*” (aeration shaft).<sup>606</sup>

Chlorination is normally accomplished by converting stored liquid chlorine to the gaseous form, that is, *Vergasung*,<sup>607</sup> and then injecting the gas into the sewage or effluent, that is, *Begasung*.

In the anaerobic digestion of sewage, a number of gases are produced (sludge gas or *Faulgas*), especially methane, which has various uses as a source of energy. This gas production is normally referred to, however, as *Gaserzeugung* rather than *Vergasung*. Moreover, since the gas is produced at the top of a digestion tank, it is not likely that the process could be viewed as taking place in any sort of “*Keller*.” However, the process of useful gas production does not end there, and there are sufficient complications to allow various combinations and hence appearances of diverse technical terms. After the digestion, the removal of impurities, especially hydrogen sulfide, is required, if the methane is to have practical use. The removal was normally via dry scrubbing in a “*Raseneisenerzfilter*,”<sup>608</sup> that is, filtering in iron oxide, as was common in the gas industry.

As already remarked, sewage treatment consists of the acceleration of natural processes, so gas production also occurs spontaneously in the very sewers before the sewage reaches a treatment plant. This process is called “*Kanalvergasung*” and was studied in Germany before the war. For example, there was a 1933 doctoral dissertation on the subject.<sup>609</sup>

Ventilation is often adequate to prevent unwanted effects, such as explosions, but in the event ventilation does not suffice, there is the Gerlach device, which removes gases by suction and has both mobile and stationary versions.<sup>610</sup> In this case, the role of the plant is not to perform *Vergasung* but to counter it, that is, it does *Entgasung* because of the undesired *Vergasung*.

Sludge incineration was practiced in Germany since early in the century, but greater interest in this method of sludge disposal was aroused when large and

<sup>604</sup> Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., *Wastewater Engineering* (3rd ed., 1991), p. 276.

<sup>605</sup> H. Kretzschmar, *Technische Mikrobiologie* (Berlin and Hamburg, 1968), p. 217.

<sup>606</sup> J. Brix, H. Heyd and E. Gerlach, *Die Wasserversorgung* (1963), pp. 323, 329.

<sup>607</sup> H. Kittner, W. Starke and D. Wissel, *Wasserversorgung* (Berlin, 1964), p. 424.

<sup>608</sup> K. Imhoff, *Taschenbuch der Stadtentwässerung* (Munich and Berlin, 1943, 10th ed.), p. 207.

<sup>609</sup> K. Dau, *Über Kanalvergasungen und ihre Verhütung* (Würzburg: Dissertationsdruckerei und Verlag Konrad Tritsch, 1935).

<sup>610</sup> H. Franke, ed., *Lueger* (cited above), Vol. 10, p. 693.; F. Gerlach, “Die Beseitigung von explosiven und gesundheitsschädlichen Gasen aus Kanalisationsbauwerken,” *Gesundheits-Ingenieur*, Vol. 52, No. 8 (1929), pp. 118-122.; K. Dau, *Über Kanalvergasungen* (Würzburg: 1935), cited above, p. 61.

economic plants were built in the U.S. during the Thirties.<sup>611</sup> In this case, “*Vergasung*” arises in the same way it did at the outset of this discussion, that is, in fuel gas generation, because the sludge cannot be burned without the application of some auxiliary fuel, at least for preheating. Indeed, sludge gas is a highly convenient energy source in such a process.<sup>612</sup> A postwar development was incineration using oil as fuel in an “*Ölvergasungsbrenner*.”<sup>613</sup>

I have not located the *Vergasungskeller* in the sewage plants. Rather, I have listed five senses in which generation of, or treatment with, a gas comes up in sewage technology. I have not found the term “*Vergasungskeller*” or “*Vergasungskammer*” in the German literature on wastewater treatment, but that is not necessary. The document in question was not written by a sewage engineer; it was written by a construction engineer for the information of another construction engineer, and the author never imagined that half a century later people would be poring over his hurried note. Nevertheless, I still favor the first interpretation offered, namely, that the *Vergasungskeller* was a generator of fuel or town gas intended for general use.

Only the study of complete engineering plans for the camp could settle this question. Alas, that may be difficult. Some of the documentation provided to Pressac by the Auschwitz State Museum (the Panstwowe Muzeum Oświęcim, or “PMO,” whose help Pressac copiously acknowledges) had earlier been provided to the Auschwitz State Museum by the Israelis.<sup>614</sup> I assume the Israelis also have some documents they will not part with. In response to my inquiry for more information about the sewage treatment plants, the Museum replied to me, on August 26, 1991, that it “has several construction plans” of the plants, one of which is reproduced in Pressac’s book, but that “abundant documentation on the construction of the sewage treatment plants in Birkenau you will find in the Central State Archives in Moscow.” Thus, precisely locating the *Vergasungskeller* may be a big job.<sup>615</sup> At this point, the only thing that seems assured is that the *Vergasungskeller* was not in the crematory building.

## The War Refugee Board Report

On April 7, 1944, two Slovakian Jews, Walter Rosenberg and Alfred Wetzler, escaped from Auschwitz-Birkenau after two years’ captivity there. Their escape was reported on April 9 in a Gestapo telegram to Berlin and elsewhere.<sup>616</sup>

<sup>611</sup> K. Imhoff, “Schlammverbrennung,” *Gesundheits-Ingenieur*, Vol. 59, No. 40 (1936), pp. 583-587.

<sup>612</sup> K. Imhoff (1943), cited above, pp. 218f.

<sup>613</sup> H. Wulf, “Die Verbrennung von Schlämmen mit Ölvergasungsbrennern,” *Brennst.-Wärme-Kraft*, vol. 16, No. 8 (August 1964), pp. 397ff.; O. Pallasch and W. Triebel, eds., *Lehr- und Handbuch der Abwassertechnik* (Berlin and Munich, 1969), vol. 3, p. 193.

<sup>614</sup> Pressac, p. 331.; R. Faurisson, *Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Summer 1991), p. 156.

<sup>615</sup> In his Introduction to the new American edition of *Hitler’s War*, David Irving says that “the diaries of Himmler have vanished – partly said to be in Moscow and partly known to be in Tel Aviv, Israel; Chaim Rosenthal, a former attaché of the Israeli Consulate in New York, obtained the Himmler diaries by the most questionable means.” See *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Winter 1990-1991), p. 402. See also the *IHR Newsletter*, No. 83, November 1991, pp. 2-3.

<sup>616</sup> T. Iwaszko, “Häftlingsfluchten aus dem Konzentrationslager Auschwitz,” *Hefte von Auschwitz*,

Rosenberg and Wetzler are said to be the principal authors of the document on Auschwitz that was published by the U.S. War Refugee Board in November 1944. Supplements to the report are said to have been contributed by two Jews (Czeslaw Mordowicz and Arnost Rosin) who escaped on May 27, 1944, and by a non-Jewish Polish major who also escaped. In writing this book, I thought the document, which I call the WRB report, was important to the subject because it marked the first major commitment of an Allied power to the Auschwitz extermination claim.

A booklet published in New York in March 1944 with the endorsement of the U.S. government's Office of War Information and the National CIO War Relief Committee and purporting to be a compilation of reports about Auschwitz received through the Polish underground illustrates what was being said about Auschwitz at the time. The camp is portrayed as a "camp of death" but not as a site of mass exterminations of Jews. Such exterminations are claimed, but only as taking place at Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka.<sup>617</sup> This is an example of the failure of the Allies to claim that Auschwitz was an extermination camp even two years after its alleged attainment of that status, despite its being a huge and not at all secret operation. (The great extent of involvement by non-SS personnel ruled out secrecy for whatever transpired there.)

A chapter of Pressac's book is devoted to arguing the essential accuracy of the WRB report, despite various errors and contradictions that he notes (mainly the number and arrangement of the crematorium ovens at Birkenau).

The authorship of the WRB report remains a problem, but not an important one. What is indisputable is that it came from the circle of Rabbi Michael Dov Ber Weissmandel in Slovakia, whose members claimed to have received the story from the escaped Jews. The five escapees allegedly did a lot of name changing. According to an article by Erich Kulka in a book published in 1967,<sup>618</sup> in order to live under cover after escape, Rosenberg became Rudolf Vrba, Wetzler became Josef Lánik, Mordowicz became Petr Podulka, and Rosin became Jan Rohác. Rosenberg remained Vrba after the war and at present is on the Faculty of Pharmacology at the University of British Columbia in Canada. The other three Jews might have dropped their aliases, although Wetzler retained Lánik as a literary pseudonym.

In his 1967 article, Kulka did not mention the Polish major, who is sometimes identified as a Pole named Jerzy Wesolowski who escaped and changed his name to Jerzy Tabeau. In a 1964 article, Auschwitz State Museum (PMO) official T. Iwaszko mentioned Wesolowski/Tabeau, reporting that he was registered as prisoner No. 27273 on March 26, 1942, escaped from the camp on November 19, 1943, and made some contributions to underground literature, but Iwaszko did not quite make him the Polish major.<sup>619</sup> In 1979, John S. Conway wrote that the Polish major's "identity has not been revealed thus far. It is also not known by what

---

Vol. 7, 1964, p. 67.; E. Kulka, "Five Escapes from Auschwitz," in Suhl, p. 205.

<sup>617</sup> *Oswiecim. Camp of Death* (New York: Poland Fights, 1944), esp. pp. 45f.

<sup>618</sup> E. Kulka, in Suhl.

<sup>619</sup> T. Iwaszko in *Hefte von Auschwitz* (1964), cited above, pp. 7f, 38.

route this last section of the report fell into the hands of the Jewish leadership in Geneva.”<sup>620</sup> In his 1981 book *Auschwitz and the Allies*, Martin Gilbert mentions that the report of the “Polish major” was appended in June 1944 to the reports of the Jews by Richard Lichtheim of the Geneva office of the Jewish Agency.<sup>621</sup> Oddly, in a television documentary based on Gilbert’s book that was made a few years after its publication, we see the Polish major’s face but do not learn his name. In a 1985 article mainly about Rosenberg and Wetzler, Kulka mentioned Tabeau only as an escapee from the gypsy (*sic*) camp at Auschwitz<sup>622</sup> and then, in a 1986 article very similar to the 1985 one, Kulka identified the Polish major as Wesolowski-Tabeau.<sup>623</sup>

The WRB report contains a major contradiction of Pressac’s version of the extermination thesis. Not surprisingly, Pressac ignores this contradiction. According to the Report, there were no gassings at the *Stammlager* (main camp, identified as “Auschwitz,” as distinct from “Birkenau”). This is not stated explicitly in the WRB report, but it is clearly implicit.<sup>624</sup> Gassings are portrayed as taking place only at Birkenau or in the birchwood (“Brezinsky”) or the “bunkers” near Birkenau.

Wetzler’s part of the WRB report says he was sent to Birkenau immediately on arrival on April 13, 1944.<sup>625</sup> However, Vrba and the part of the WRB report attributed to him say he was quartered at the *Stammlager* from arrival on June 30, 1942, even while working at the Buna plant (Monowitz or Auschwitz III), until he was transferred to Birkenau in December 1942.<sup>626</sup> In his postwar book, Vrba presents himself as being deeply involved in resistance activity and says that Wetzler’s “knowledge of the camp was deep and wide,” on account of his great popularity.<sup>627</sup> Although I would be the last to believe Vrba, the point here is that the authors of the Report had extensive and detailed information about the camp. There is much in the Report that confirms this, such as the mention of the quarantine order of July 23, 1942,<sup>628</sup> the general layout of the camp, and a rough correspondence of the listed transports and registration numbers with the presumed correct ones.<sup>629</sup> As I wrote on p. 121 (Chapter 3):

*“One must assume that much of the material in the report is true. [...]*

<sup>620</sup> J. S. Conway, “Frühe Augenzeugenberichte aus Auschwitz. Glaubwürdigkeit und Wirkungsgeschichte,” *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 27, No. 2 (April 1979), p. 269.

<sup>621</sup> M. Gilbert, p. 234.

<sup>622</sup> E. Kulka, “Attempts by Jewish escapees to stop mass extermination,” *Jewish Social Studies*, Vol. 47, Fall 1985, p. 296.

<sup>623</sup> E. Kulka, “Kampf der jüdischen Häftlinge gegen die Endlösung in Auschwitz,” *Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 13, 1986, pp. 381-396 (note 53).

<sup>624</sup> US-WRB, esp. pp. 8ff, 12, 14, 29-32, 40, and pp. 11ff, 17ff from the story of the “Polish major,” who does speak of “mass executions” at the *Stammlager*, but only by shooting. He also states explicitly that Crematory I was not employed to dispose of the bodies of gassed Jews.

<sup>625</sup> US-WRB report, pp. 1, 6.

<sup>626</sup> US-WRB report, pp. 29, 32; R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1964), pp. 77, 106ff, 113, 167fff.

<sup>627</sup> R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1964), p. 218.

<sup>628</sup> US-WRB report, p. 30.

<sup>629</sup> Compare with: D. Czech, “Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau,” *Hefte von Auschwitz*, No. 3 (1960), No. 4 (1961), and No. 7 (1964).

*there is no question of the competence of the authors of the report.*”

The authors were acquainted with the interior of the camp (although not, as Pressac acknowledges, with the interior of the crematories at Birkenau).

Thus, Pressac should confront a major contradiction here. Pressac notes various contradictions in the testimonies of the usual alleged eye witnesses (such as Commandant Höss), but continues to believe that they were at least speaking of real events. However, if he is to accept the WRB report, then he must throw out (I won't say “we” because I did so long ago) the testimonies of the alleged eyewitnesses Höss, Fajnzylberg (Jankowski), Müller, and Broad, as they claimed to have witnessed mass gassings at the *Stammlager*, and, according to Pressac, the lack of documents and “the present state of the premises” make their testimonies the only “evidence to establish the reality of homicidal gassings at the *Stammlager*.”<sup>630</sup> This is not a contradiction of detail. By this I mean that one can no longer continue to hold that they were at least speaking of real events. Because they are so unreliable, their testimony on mass exterminations in other parts of the camp complex must be rejected. But because that testimony is no less reliable than the others, Pressac ought to reject all alleged eyewitness testimony. Thus, Pressac has a mass extermination program that was witnessed by no credible person.

As I said, we are dealing here with a “cornucopia of absurdities,” and it is easy to overlook the significance of this point, for which the question of the authorship of the WRB report is unimportant. The sole objective of the well informed authors in composing and propagating the Report was to claim that Jews were being exterminated *en masse* at Auschwitz. It is a piece of war propaganda, and there is no obligation to believe such claims. Nevertheless, there is no way that Pressac or anybody else may deny that, if there had in fact been mass gassings in the *Stammlager*, then they would have been spoken of in the WRB report. Therefore there were none. And yet the testimonies for the *Stammlager* are equivalent, in terms of credibility and the circumstances under which they were delivered, to the testimonies of mass gassings in other parts of the camp complex.

In contemporary exploitation of the affair of the WRB report, Vrba is really the star. Since he first publicly identified himself as Rosenberg (probably in 1958), he has published a book (in 1964) about his wartime experiences, *I Cannot Forgive*, testified at the first Zündel trial in Toronto in 1985, and appeared on

---

<sup>630</sup> Pressac, p. 123. Pressac writes on p. 132 that the *Stammlager* “gas chamber was used sporadically from the end of 1941 to 1942.” In view of the testimonies he cites, he should say rather “from the end of 1941 to at least through 1942.” For example, the Fajnzylberg testimony cited by Pressac on p. 124 speaks of a gassing of “400 Jews brought from Birkenau” on a date not earlier than November 1942, when he was assigned to the Sonderkommando of Crematorium I. The other testimonies – in Jadwiga Bezwinska, ed., *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS* (NY: Howard Fertig, 1984), pp. 114ff, 174ff, and in Filip Müller, *Eyewitness Auschwitz* (NY: Stein and Day, 1979), pp. 31-49 – also claim not merely gassings, but mass gassings of Jews in the mortuary of Crematorium I during much of 1942. One of the many contradictions in Pressac's work is that on p. 133 he also asserts, on the basis of logic that I can't see at all, that from the data given in the Leuchter report we can infer “use as a homicidal gas chamber” for Crematorium I. Another contradiction I noticed is that on p. 106 he contrasts the oil-fired ovens of Buchenwald with the coke-fired ovens of Auschwitz, but on p. 259 he says they were “identical.” Faurisson reviews additional contradictions: See *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Spring 1991), and No. 2 (Summer 1991).

various television documentaries.<sup>631</sup>

Vrba is obviously lying about experiences at Auschwitz. This can be seen by examining his book and by considering his 1985 testimony in Toronto that his book is only “an artistic picture [...] not a document for a court.”<sup>632</sup> I have previously noted the major factual errors of his book:<sup>633</sup> his belief that there were virtually no escapes from Auschwitz before April 1944<sup>634</sup> and his claim that there was an air raid on Auschwitz when he escaped in April. Actually, the first air raid was on August 20, 1944.<sup>635</sup>

I also remarked that “the general tone of [Vrba’s] book and his description of how various people behaved” further demolish his credibility, if that were possible. I did not give the best examples in my book out of fear that I might not be believed, but here I will mention some of these fantasies. Vrba claims, for example, that at the Novaky camp the Slovakian guards would hold a rifle muzzle on the tummy of a poor persecuted Jew when he was sitting on the potty, while at Auschwitz he had “seen twenty dollar bills used as toilet paper.”<sup>636</sup> He means U.S. twenty dollar notes, not German mark notes. Poetic license permits a dramatist of the john at Auschwitz to depict a pistol being held against the head by a Gestapo colonel, who would politely hand the Jew a twenty when done – which is no more incredible than what Vrba actually wrote. (Incidentally, scatological fantasies are also a striking feature of the *Talmud*.)<sup>637</sup>

On the other hand, Vrba’s description of the rackets run by the SS and inmates in charge of the “Kanada” section, “the commercial heart of Auschwitz”<sup>638</sup> where inmates’ possessions were stored, seems unusually candid to me, however embellished with inanity.

I note with gratitude that the Wetzler/Lánik book about Auschwitz is frankly acknowledged to be a novel.<sup>639</sup>

Because I focused on Vrba in Chapters 3 and 5, John S. Conway, a historian and colleague of Vrba at the University of British Columbia, published an article on the WRB report in 1979.<sup>640</sup> In 1981, Conway also published a German text of

---

<sup>631</sup> In the documentary based on M. Gilbert’s book, Vrba says that in May-June 1944 Hungarian Jewesses were arriving at Auschwitz in mink coats. At that time, he is supposed to have been hiding in Slovakia.

<sup>632</sup> *Toronto Sun*, Jan. 24, 1985, p. 52.

<sup>633</sup> See Chapter 3, pp. 124-128.

<sup>634</sup> R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1964), pp. 217, 220.; E. Kulka in *Jewish Social Studies* (Fall 1985), cited above, p. 295, specifies 55 successful escapes until the end of 1942, 154 in 1943, and 167 in 1944. E. Kulka in Suhl, p. 201, gave lower figures, but the 1985 paper used the figures given by the Auschwitz State Museum (PMO) in 1964 (T. Iwaszko in *Hefte von Auschwitz*, 1964, cited above, p. 49).

<sup>635</sup> See p. 189; see also R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1964), p. 233.

<sup>636</sup> R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1964), pp. 35, 209.

<sup>637</sup> To learn what the *Talmud* says happened to Jesus, read Gittin 57a in the Soncino Press edition (London, 1936, p. 261 with note referring to the Munich codex) or the Jüdischer Verlag edition (Berlin, 1932, p. 368).

<sup>638</sup> R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1964), p. 127.

<sup>639</sup> J. Lánik, *Was Dante nicht sah* (Vienna: Die Buchgemeinde, 1964). Translation of the Slovakian language original *Co Dante nevidel* (Bratislava, 1964).

<sup>640</sup> J. S. Conway in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (April 1979), cited above.



the WRB report, and in 1984, he published an article relating to the WRB report (and particularly to Rudolf Vrba) and Hungary.<sup>641</sup>

Conway was overdue for criticism. In his 1967 article, Kulka had not criticized Vrba's 1964 book, but by 1985, Holocaust revisionism was in full vigor. Kulka scolded Conway for being willing "to accept uncritically and as fact Vrba's distorted statements" and complained that Vrba's "contradictory and problematic statements [have been] misused [...] to prove that the [WRB] report was a distortion and that the description of the gas chambers in Auschwitz were simply a figment of the imagination."<sup>642</sup>

I would have thought that, as a result of his admission in 1985 that his book was not true, Vrba would have been finished as a player in the traveling Auschwitz show. However, it is a sad commentary on the present state of public controversy that the silly thing was actually reissued in 1989, with certain supplements, under the title *44070: The Conspiracy of the Twentieth Century*.<sup>643</sup> It appears that the original text, with all its inanities, was reproduced in this new edition. There were also additions as appendices. The part of the WRB report attributed to Wetzler and Rosenberg is reproduced, there is an appendix on "trials of Auschwitz SS-officers," there is an essay by Vrba on the economic aspects of the German persecutions of the Jews, a short vita of Vrba (not mentioning "Rosenberg"), and an essay by Conway, drawing from and supplementing his 1979 article.

Nowhere in the new edition is there an attempt to correct, explain, or apologize for the inanities and factual errors in the original edition of the book or for Vrba's 1985 admission that the book was only "an artistic picture," that is, not true. Conway does not hint at any problems or at any of the criticism he received for his gullibility with respect to Vrba. He does not apologize for his implicit endorsement of a book that all sides, including Vrba, have told him is not true. It seems that he will not or cannot learn. Nor will the publishers of "Holocaust" literature learn; there seems to be an assumption among them that critical examination of this literature is unnecessary. They seem quite willing to slap between covers almost anything as long as criticism is confined to relatively esoteric writings.

In 1990, Vrba was squabbling with Raul Hilberg, Shmuel Krakowski of Yad Vashem, and Yehuda Bauer over numbers exterminated.<sup>644</sup>

## Conclusion

To return to Pressac, his blindness to the implications of the WRB report is the rule for his whole work. I have heard revisionists speak as though Pressac's work is a respectable historical effort. The basis for this is easy to see. Having the support of influential people eager to help, Pressac was able to make available to the

---

<sup>641</sup> "Der Auschwitz-Bericht von April 1944," *Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 8, 1981, pp. 413-442.; "Der Holocaust in Ungarn. Neue Kontroversen und Überlegungen," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1984, pp. 179-212.

<sup>642</sup> E. Kulka in *Jewish Social Studies* (Fall 1985), cited above, pp. 304, 306 (note 45).

<sup>643</sup> R. Vrba and A. Bestic (1989).

<sup>644</sup> *IHR Newsletter*, No. 74, July-August 1990, p. 3. Source cited: JTA dispatch in *Jewish World* (Broward, Florida), March 9-16.

public documents, mainly of an engineering nature, that had previously been in the category of extreme esoterica, either unknown or known only to a few researchers.

We are better off on account of the book, but the gain is comparable to, say, the publication of an index or bibliography. The value is purely in the factual information. The analytical part of the book is a transparent charade by an actor who is confident in advance that the people he is serving will cooperate in the sham and will not call attention to the obvious disguise that renders him, in fact, a clown in the eyes of his targets. How else can we react to a man who insists on treating as irrelevant, at a time when it was decided to build large crematories, the fact that there was a documented catastrophic death rate? Even Pressac's formal sin on this point – of presuming that, which he is trying to prove, in order to find “traces” of it – is minor compared to the comedy of his ungainly pirouetting around and away from the central points.

I began this paper with a promise to show how Pressac seeks to have his reader focus entirely on local matters while ignoring the context of the Auschwitz concentration camp in its full dimensions. I have shown three specific important senses in which this is true.

First, in his treatment of the decisions to build crematories at Auschwitz he fails to acknowledge the relevance of the catastrophic typhus epidemics that prevailed at the time of the decisions. Second, his “criminal trace” number one is a highly questionable interpretation of a single word occurring in a document that disproves, or at least renders implausible, his major claim. Third, his discussion of the WRB report disregards the account given there, and consequently the decisive consequences of that account in evaluating the reliability of the so-called witnesses, in favor of a focus on a very picayune detail.

One should ask: how are such procedures possible in a work as replete with documentary detail as this bulky tome? That is what the notorious disorganization of the book contributes; it is a means of avoiding a focus on the simple essentials. The disorganization is there not because of the bad style of the author, but because of the bad logic applied by the author and desired of the reader.

It is fair to say that one message of Pressac's book is that, yes, the revisionists and particularly Faurisson are right in their rejections of the traditional or accepted evidence for homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz. He does not put it that bluntly, but it is there. He then claims that he, almost half a century after the alleged events, has finally gotten the evidence right. The procedure is the usual one; flip through the mountains of documents, rejecting all clearly exculpatory material as the result of deceptive German practices in keeping written records and then, when something that can be given an incriminating interpretation is found, declare it an “enormous gaff[e]” of an unintended confession.

I think I could do the equivalent for any establishment or agency that generates voluminous written records. In these days of “affirmative action” in employment, perhaps I should look for Northwestern University's gas chambers for white males, while taking the precaution of developing an explanation why I survived. Likewise, a future Pressac can concede that our Pressac is wrong, but that *he* has

finally gotten it right. Thus, this game can go on forever; it represents the future, if there is one, of the legend and remains the only kind of anti-revisionist essay possible.

## Supplement 4: Zyklon B and Gas Detectors in Birkenau Crematorium II

*The main content of this supplement first appeared in print in the Journal of Historical Review, vol. 16, no. 5, Sept.-Oct. 1997, pp. 24-30.*

### Zyklon B

In *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, I remarked that typhus was a great killer for the Germans in World War I, giving a reference published shortly after that war.<sup>645</sup> The typhus of World War I, like that of World War II, was carried by lice. In response to this specific problem, the German company DEGESCH (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Schädlingsbekämpfung* – German Pest Control Co.) developed the Zyklon B pesticide<sup>646</sup> and made it available for commercial use in 1923.

Zyklon B, referred to here merely as Zyklon, is a very effective pesticide consisting of liquid hydrogen cyanide (HCN, an acid) absorbed into some inert material such as wood pulp, with an irritant added to warn bystanders of its presence. HCN is also called “prussic acid” and in German “Blausäure” (blue acid), because HCN tends to leave blue stains in the presence of iron compounds like rust; the resulting insoluble and non-toxic iron salt of HCN, Iron Blue, is commonly used in blue dyes.

In its gaseous or liquid form, HCN is very deadly and is used in American execution gas chambers, where it is traditionally generated by mixing an acid (normally sulfuric acid) with potassium cyanide or sodium cyanide, resulting in rapid release of HCN in its gaseous form.

HCN is useless as a battlefield gas because it is a true gas, slightly lighter than air, and disperses too rapidly for that application. World War I battlefield gases were actually dusts that hovered about the target area.

The pesticide Zyklon works somewhat differently. It is supplied in a very tightly sealed container. When a space (*e.g.* a barracks or building) is to be treated with it, that space is tightly sealed, and trained personnel empty cans of Zyklon on the floor, preferably spreading the Zyklon out as much as possible. They then leave the space, close it, and wait the time required for the liquid HCN to pass into the gaseous form by evaporation, fill the space, and kill the target pests. Then the space is opened and ventilated.

This is a very time consuming process because the evaporation is slow, and for safety reasons the time required for ventilation is lengthy. The boiling point of HCN is 25.6°C (78°F). That does not mean the space must have that ambient

---

<sup>645</sup> Chapter 4, p. 162, citing the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 12 ed., vol. 32, (1922 – third volume supplementing the 11th edition), p. 157.

<sup>646</sup> Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt, *Auschwitz, 1270 to the Present*, W.W. Norton, NY, 1996, p. 219.

temperature in order for the gas to be released; water does not have to be brought to its boiling point in order to evaporate. However, the process is slow at any lower temperature and especially slow in winter temperatures.

An information booklet for Zyklon<sup>647</sup> gives typical times of 2-72 hours for the gassing process and at least 10 hours for ventilation; the former depends very much on the temperature and the target pests and the latter on the physical properties of the space and its contents. For example, clothing and bedding should be beaten even after ventilation.

Another step recommended at the end of a Zyklon gassing and ventilation process is the test for residual HCN gas. The typical test uses a mixture of copper acetate and benzidine acetate and test paper which turns dark blue if the HCN level is dangerously high. A temperature of at least 15°C (60°F) is required to perform this test, so there are many circumstances under which it cannot be performed.<sup>648</sup>

Use of Zyklon is inherently dangerous, and during the war there existed a German regulation that it could be used only by, or under license from, DEGESCH, which was officially responsible for training all operators using it.<sup>649</sup>

There have also been gas chambers designed specifically to use Zyklon to disinfect articles such as clothing with HCN, especially in Germany.<sup>650</sup> With few exceptions the interiors of these gas chambers are heated, in order to accelerate the development of the gaseous HCN from the liquid form, and for other reasons. Gaseous HCN is water soluble, so high temperature is desired to reduce moisture in the gas chamber. Also, lice and some other pests are easier to kill at higher temperatures, because their metabolism rates are higher. Desired temperatures are in the range 25-35°C (77-95°F).

In such gas chambers, the air/gaseous HCN mixture is expelled from the top when the gassing process is completed, for safety reasons and perhaps because fresh air that enters during the ventilation is cool and the warmer air/ HCN gas mixture tends to the top of the chamber (as already mentioned, gaseous HCN, by itself, is only slightly lighter than air).

A related point is that the standard German Zyklon gas chamber of the time

---

<sup>647</sup> Booklet *Zyklon for Pest Control*, published by DEGESCH, apparently during the 70s. Similar information is also given in a German document that appeared at the Nuremberg trials as document NI-9912 and is presented in English translation by J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, NY, 1989, pp. 18-20. The reader should understand that the title of this book is misleading, as the only real "gas chambers" whose "technique and operation" are discussed are fumigation gas chambers. The homicidal gas chambers are only imagined, based on alleged "criminal traces". It is common to refer to this book in discussion of Auschwitz, because it is the greatest single published source of reproductions of original documents and photographs for the camp.

<sup>648</sup> F. Puntigam, H. Breymesser and E. Bernfus, *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, Reichsarbeitsblatt (special publication), Reichsarbeitsministerium, Berlin, 1943, p. 21. DEGESCH booklet (*op. cit.*, pp. 7,24).

<sup>649</sup> R.P. Tew, *Pest Control in Germany during the period 1939-1945*, H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1951, pp. 57, 96. No. 32 in the surveys of the British Intelligence Objectives Sub-Committee.

<sup>650</sup> On these gas chambers, see mainly the book by F. Puntigam *et al.* (1943), pp. 9-68. There is also information in the aforementioned DEGESCH booklet.

used a circulatory system developed by DEGESCH. In this system the air/ HCN mixture is continually recirculated, *i.e.* it continually exits and re-enters the gas chamber. Circulation greatly reduces the length of time required to generate the gas from the Zyklon and work on the target pests. At the conclusion of the gassing, expulsion of the gas and the introduction of fresh air are accomplished by opening and closing the relevant ports in this circulatory system. Overall, a gas chamber with circulation is about three times more effective than one without, *i.e.* can do about three times more work.<sup>651</sup> The practical minimum time required to kill lice (among the most difficult and resistant creatures) with Zyklon is about 3/4 of an hour. In a heated gas chamber with circulation, a total time of about an hour for gas generation and killing of the lice, followed by a ventilation period of about 20 minutes, is attainable under practical operational conditions.<sup>652</sup>

The best material for a gas chamber using HCN is steel. If bricks or concrete are used, then the interiors must be coated with a sealant to prevent retention of the gas in the walls of the gas chamber.<sup>653</sup>

## Gas Detectors

The extermination legend claims that the pesticide Zyklon B was used to exterminate Jews in a “gas chamber” within Auschwitz Crematorium II at Birkenau (see Fig. 33), specifically, in Leichenkeller 1 (morgue cellar 1), whose alleged real purpose was concealed by being so designated.

In his 1989 book, Pressac<sup>654</sup> remarked on a telegram of 26 Feb. 1943 from the Auschwitz construction department to the furnace maker Topf. At that date, the construction of Crematorium II was nearing completion. The telegram requested delivery of 10 gas detectors for Crematorium II, as had been earlier discussed. The specific gas to be detected was not stated, but by a process of tortured reasoning, Pressac concluded that the detectors were for HCN gas, rather than for “the products of combustion, such as CO or CO<sub>2</sub>, in the furnace room”, and classified this document as one of his so-called “criminal traces”. Robert Faurisson wrote, in reply, that Pressac himself had solved this problem and that there was no reason to believe the detectors were for HCN.<sup>655</sup>

Pressac did more research and published a new book in 1993, in which he produced a document newly discovered in the recently opened Moscow archives.<sup>656</sup> It is a letter dated 2 March 1943 from the Topf company (by Senior Engineer Prüfer and a Topf colleague) to the Auschwitz construction department, and it shows that HCN was indeed the specific gas to be detected by the detectors. It reads:

---

<sup>651</sup> Puntigam *et al.* (1943), p. 33.

<sup>652</sup> Puntigam *et al.* (1943), pp. 31f, 60f.

<sup>653</sup> DEGESCH booklet, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>654</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 371, 432f.

<sup>655</sup> R. Faurisson, “Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers,” *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 11, no. 1, Spring 1991, p. 59.

<sup>656</sup> Jean-Claude Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz: la machinerie du meurtre de masse*, CNRS Éditions, Paris, 1993. The document is reproduced, together with an English translation, by J.-C. Pressac and Robert-Jan Van Pelt in their article in *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, Y. Gutman and M. Berenbaum, eds., Indiana Univ. Press, Bloomington, 1994, pp. 230f.

*“We confirm receipt of your telegram specifying ‘Immediately send 10 gas detectors as agreed, price quote to follow.’*

*We hereby inform you that two weeks ago we inquired, of five different companies, concerning the residual HCN detection devices sought by you. We have received negative responses from 3 companies and 2 have not yet answered.*

*If [Wenn] 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.”*

Faurisson’s reply was that Zyklon B was used for delousing operations throughout the camp and of course in Crematorium II. Naturally HCN gas detectors would have been required in such operations, in which they are standard equipment.<sup>657</sup>

## A Problem

In both cases Faurisson gave the simple, obvious replies that I would have given under the circumstances. However, I believe this interpretation is wrong, for reasons that may be seen by examining the document. The main obstacle to interpreting this letter in terms of Zyklon B is the roles of Topf and Prüfer.

Zyklon was a product of the DEGESCH company; Zyklon and associated equipment such as gas detectors and gas mask filters were also manufactured by other companies such as Tesch & Stabenow and Drägerwerke. At Auschwitz, delousing operations with Zyklon were such major and continuous tasks that there existed a special department, the *Referat für Schädlingbekämpfung* (Pest Control Office), that conducted them. This department on occasion even communicated directly with DEGESCH.<sup>658</sup>

Topf was a furnace maker with crematorium ovens as a sideline and was the principal civilian contractor in the construction of crematoria at Auschwitz. Prüfer was the main Topf contact of the Auschwitz construction department and of course was not associated with the special SS delousing squads that regularly worked with Zyklon B. Why should Prüfer have been searching, indeed with great difficulty, for devices that were standard equipment for the delousing squads and were readily available from the DEGESCH and other companies, which had developed and supplied Zyklon? The standard DEGESCH detector for HCN required exposing a test paper and observing the color assumed. The Prüfer letter even implies that he does not know whether the desired devices exist, was confronting this specific need for the first time, and does not know very much about it, inferences that are very important in interpreting the letter. I do not believe the letter had anything to do with Zyklon.

There may however have been one connection between Topf and Zyklon.

<sup>657</sup> R. Faurisson, “Jean-Claude Pressac’s New Auschwitz Book,” *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 14, no. 1, Jan./Feb. 1994, p. 23.

<sup>658</sup> Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, p. 571 in the 1961 Quadrangle edition; vol. 3, p. 892 in the 1985 Holmes & Meier edition. Hilberg cites a letter from the Referat to DEGESCH.

Robert Faurisson has brought to my attention an anti-revisionist, Pressac supporting book published in France in early 1997. A footnote declares:<sup>659</sup>

*“The study of the history of the Topf and Sons company of Erfurt would be essential to show the progression to mass crime. Topf made, in the Twenties, crematoria but also grain silos. In the after sale services and maintenance for these silos, Topf also involved itself in HCN disinfection and furnished all necessary material. Thus the two branches of activity of the firm converge in a striking manner toward the crematoria – gas chambers of Birkenau. On this particular sort of study, the works of Pressac are of the greatest utility, and it is in this way that they should be used.”*

The author gives no sources, but I think the claim of such Topf involvement with HCN, presumably via Zyklon, is quite plausible. Under conditions where Topf would have been the only company that a farmer dealt with in constructing his silo, it would have been natural for Topf to serve as retailer of supporting materials and equipment made by DEGESCH and other companies. However, such a Topf role had no bearing on conditions at Auschwitz in 1941-1945, where a special department regularly conducted operations with Zyklon. Their personnel would have been responsible for declaring when a treated facility was again safe to use. Is it plausible that Prüfer could have been involved in this when, as his letter shows, he didn't know very much about it?

There remains one possibility. Perhaps some unusual feature of the cremation process, not understood by the Zyklon delousing personnel, raised a novel problem with the Zyklon that Prüfer was asked to solve. I can't imagine such a feature, since cremation with coke seems basically like any other use of coke. However, if such an unusual feature existed, would it not have come up earlier in the six muffle crematorium, also supplied by Topf, that existed in the *Stammlager* or Auschwitz I? In 1942, this sole crematorium was working at capacity, and the disastrous typhus epidemics were being fought with Zyklon. However, the February to March 1943 correspondence marked the first confrontation of Prüfer with the problem involved. Some novel feature of Crematorium II had to be the problem.

It is also clear that the letter has nothing to do with gas detectors as defenses against chemical warfare. The German chemical warfare services were highly competent and organized and would not have sent a furnace maker on a quest for such equipment.

From one point of view, the problem raised has little to do with the “extermination” allegations. If the Zyklon were being used to kill people, rather than lice, then presumably the same specially trained squads would have been used or at least consulted, and the usual HCN gas detectors would have been used in the last stages of gassing operations. There would have been no problems in acquiring such standard equipment. Those who believe Zyklon was used for homicidal purposes should be as puzzled by this document as I was.

From another point of view, this problem is very relevant to the claim of “extermination”, as explained below.

---

<sup>659</sup> Jean-François Forges, *Éduquer contre Auschwitz*, ESF, Paris, 1997, p. 28.



## An Alternative Interpretation

The Topf letter of 2 March 1943 is strange, and for a while I suspected its authenticity. However, I have found an interpretation, which may be correct, and the main purpose of this article is to propose it. After I have done that, I shall return to the question of the relevance of this problem to the “extermination” allegations.

“HCN” is of course a compound of hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen and may be generated whenever materials containing these elements are burned. For example, the fuel used for the crematorium ovens was coke, and it is well known that HCN gas is a possible by-product in the process of making coke from coal. However, there is apparently no danger of HCN release when coke, of whatever grade, is burned as a fuel; otherwise it would not be in such common use. HCN gas could not have been thus generated in the crematorium.

A remaining possibility is that HCN release was possible in the waste incinerator, which shared the chimney with the cremation ovens. Many materials may release HCN when burned. Among these are many fabrics, a highly relevant observation, because the waste incinerator was most likely used to incinerate used camp fabrics (*e.g.* inmate uniforms and bed linen and mattresses). For example, silk and wool can release HCN when burned, a fact that has been known since the Thirties.

As shown in Fig. 34, the chimney of Crematorium II was divided into three ducts. Six furnaces used this chimney, namely the waste incinerator and the five cremation furnaces (each with three muffles). The waste incinerator was on the opposite side of the chimney in relation to the cremation furnaces. These six furnaces used the three ducts on the basis of two per duct; thus, the waste incinerator shared one of the three ducts with one of the cremation furnaces (the flues leading from the furnaces to the chimney were underground).<sup>660</sup> The waste incinerator was also supplied by Topf,<sup>661</sup> and it could have been Prüfer’s responsibility to take into account any HCN danger arising from it. Also, a gas detector differing from that used in the Zyklon delousing operations would seem fitting; perhaps a detector generating an audible alarm was desired.

While a concern for HCN release in combustion is routine today, it would have been novel in 1943, a fact that could explain the novelty for Prüfer, of the desire for an HCN detector. Another thing that could account for this novelty is that the waste incinerator design was itself novel. I have no expertise in the field, but I would think intuitively that a waste incinerator design sharing a chimney with other equipment, at which people are working, is dangerous.

The question of the quantities of HCN released in the burning of materials is complicated and depends on “the chemical nature of the material, temperature,

---

<sup>660</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 284-287 (drawings of 23 Jan. 1942, on which Fig. 2 is based); pp. 306-312 (drawings of 19 March 1943, showing the same duct arrangement as in earlier drawings). Pressac (1989), p. 288 also reproduces a profile drawing for this arrangement; this profile drawing is also reproduced by Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945*, Henry Holt, NY, 1990, p. 193. The “Ofen” is a cremation oven; if the reader uses a magnifying glass and squints hard, the badly lettered word “Müllverbrennungsofen” (waste incinerator) can be seen.

<sup>661</sup> Pressac (1989), p. 217.

oxygen availability, and burning time.” Since HCN is itself combustible, it makes a difference whether the combustion is “static” or “dynamic”, an example of the latter being when there is forced air blowing and the HCN is swept away from the hot zone before it can itself be decomposed in any way. However, HCN can be released under either condition. Another complication is that HCN can be released in the smoldering after a fire has been extinguished.<sup>662</sup>

The term “residual” that appears in the letter in question could apply to either released HCN that, ideally, would have been consumed during the incineration process but wasn’t or to HCN released after incineration during smoldering. The chimney of Crematorium II used, as of 29 January 1943, a forced draft system based on suction, but on 25 March 1943, Topf ordered this system removed due to overheating of its motors.<sup>663</sup>

## A Specific Possibility

It remains to suggest a specific potential source for HCN development in the waste incinerator. In wartime Germany, many articles had to be ersatz (artificial or synthetic), because of shortages of materials normally imported. Cotton was in very short supply, and little was used for fabrics. Wool was available but not in normal quantities. In fact, Germany relied heavily on the manufacture of rayon, and during the war, army uniforms contained as much as 65% rayon. One must assume concentration camp uniforms and other fabrics used in the camps had high rayon content. Could the incineration of such rayon have produced HCN gas? It may seem not, because rayon has no nitrogen in its chemical composition. In making these statements, I am using the word “rayon” in the normally accepted sense; rayon is regenerated cellulose made from natural cellulose extracted from materials such as cotton linters or wood pulp. Cotton was scarce in wartime Germany, so almost all rayon was made from wood pulp.<sup>664</sup>

The burning of rayon can generate HCN gas, if the rayon is impregnated with, but not chemically bound to, compounds of ammonia, which supply the necessary nitrogen. This was established some years ago by T. Morikawa, who conducted experiments that established that ammonia and its compounds, combined with “cellulosic materials”, can indeed result in the evolution of HCN when burned. The general conclusion was that such evolution was about the same as for substances having nitrogen in their chemical compositions in comparable amounts.<sup>665</sup> It is of great relevance, for this discussion, that Morikawa’s study of this point

---

<sup>662</sup> Bryan Ballantyne, “Hydrogen cyanide as a product of combustion and a factor in morbidity and mortality from fires,” in *Clinical and Experimental Toxicology of Cyanides*, Bryan Ballantyne & Timothy C. Marrs, eds., Wright, Bristol, 1987, pp. 248-291. Yoshio Tsuchiya, “Significance of HCN generation in fire gas toxicity,” *Journal of Combustion Toxicology*, vol. 4, August 1977, pp. 271-282.

<sup>663</sup> Pressac (1989), 214, 230, 306-310, 488. Pressac and Van Pelt (1994), pp. 232f.

<sup>664</sup> A.R. Urquhart, *The German Rayon Industry During the Period 1939-1945*, H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1952, pp. 13-16, 275. This work was no. 33 in a series of British postwar studies of intelligence objectives.

<sup>665</sup> Tokio Morikawa, “Evolution of hydrogen cyanide during combustion and pyrolysis,” *Journal of Combustion Toxicology*, vol. 5, pp. 315-330, August 1978.

was motivated by the fact that ammonium compounds are added to many fabrics to make them flame retardant (this is sometimes called “fireproofing”, but that cannot be done literally with ordinary fabrics). Thus, Morikawa’s experiments used, as the source of nitrogen, diammonium phosphate, a common flame retardant for fabrics.

During World War II, diammonium phosphate was commonly used in Germany to make fabrics, particularly rayon, flame retardant. Two such products were marketed by I.G. Farben under the trade names Akaustan N and Akaustan N 1139. Another product, Akaustan K, used other ammonium compounds as the flame retardant.<sup>666</sup> A disadvantage of such flame retardants is that they are water soluble and gradually “leach” out when the fabrics are washed. Thus, such soluble flame retardants “are applied with the idea of periodic reprocessing in order to maintain the desired properties [by] simple immersion in aqueous solutions” of the retardant.<sup>667</sup> That is, washing is followed by immersion in a solution of the flame retardant substance, then drying out. Another defense against leaching, employed by the Germans, used sulfamide (strictly speaking sulfuryl amide,  $\text{SO}_2(\text{NH}_2)_2$ ) in conjunction with a standard waterproofing agent, thus making reprocessing unnecessary.<sup>668</sup> Sulfamide is obtained by treating sulfuryl chloride with ammonia, and one gets the impression from Morikawa that one could also expect evolution of HCN in burning of cellulose impregnated with it.

While I do not have a document that says so, I consider it very plausible that many concentration camp fabrics were treated with flame retardants for security reasons, *i.e.* to limit the effects of fires started by inmates. This would have been particularly the case with bed linens and mattress fillings. Thus, I am proposing the possibility that fabrics used in the camps, destined to be disposed of by incineration, were known to present a danger of evolution of HCN in such incineration.

The favored German process for rayon manufacture was the viscose, which is also the favored process today. However, two German factories used the older and simpler cuprammonium process. That the cuprammonium process involved a solution of ammonia does not appear relevant to the present problem. What may be relevant is that a price of its simplicity was that the cuprammonium process required celluloses of a high degree of purity. Thus, cotton linters were considered the standard cellulose source for cuprammonium rayon, but on account of wartime shortages, the two German cuprammonium factories used wood pulp instead. This resulted in an inferior quality rayon. Much of the cuprammonium rayon was used for army uniforms, but there were other uses, for example military upholstery, mattress fillings, and parachutes. I have no source saying that it was used in concentration camp fabrics, but in view of its inferior quality, this is a very admissible conjecture. One version of the cuprammonium rayon used for mattress fillings was impregnated with urea and formaldehyde, with ammonium nitrate as a catalyst, in order to impart springiness to it.<sup>669</sup> It is known that urea can cause

---

<sup>666</sup> Urquhart (1952), p. 272.

<sup>667</sup> Robert W. Little, *Flameproofing Textile Fabrics*, Reinhold, NY, 1947, pp. 167-170.

<sup>668</sup> Urquhart (1952), p. 272.

<sup>669</sup> Urquhart (1952), pp. 15ff, 28, 150-159, 273ff.

some ammonium based flame retardants to react with cellulose, thus giving a fabric so treated resistance to leaching.<sup>670</sup>

## Summary

In summary I am saying

- it is certain the Topf letter has nothing to do with Zyklon.
- It is almost certain that the HCN danger referred to arose from the waste incinerator. I would be astonished if it were shown that such was not the case.
- It is probable that the HCN detectors were wanted because of a potential danger of HCN development in the incineration of fabrics, particularly rayons treated with flame retardants. However, I am far from certain on this, and I will not be astonished if other materials, consumed in the waste incinerator, were shown to have been suspected by the Auschwitz management as potential sources of HCN development.

## Observations

Above I promised to return to the question of the relevance of the problem treated here to the “extermination” allegations. The mass of documents shows that Auschwitz was a large concentration camp with a disastrous death rate, due mainly to typhus carried by lice. In response to such problems, the Germans made great use of the pesticide Zyklon B and constructed large crematoria. There are no records showing that Jews were “gassed” or “exterminated”. That is clear, and it ought not be necessary to argue that such was not the case. The documentation is immense, and the physical facts concerning the camp are conclusive. For more detail, see the remarks I delivered at the 1992 IHR Convention on the death rates and the crematoria capacities at Auschwitz and other camps.<sup>671</sup>

Another approach uses the normal historical method; you study what the people of the time were doing. I have discussed elsewhere the trap that the historian Walter Laqueur got himself into by applying this normal historical method to Auschwitz.<sup>672</sup> For a more general and introductory discussion, see Faurisson’s tutorial.<sup>673</sup>

For practical purposes, the entire “extermination” legend rests on the claim that Auschwitz was an “extermination camp” where about a million Jews were gassed with Zyklon B in otherwise designated rooms within the crematorium buildings. Since that is emphatically not what the historical record says, the promoters of the legend are highly selective in choosing documents, which Pressac calls “criminal traces,” which, it is claimed, prove their thesis. The HCN gas de-

<sup>670</sup> *McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology*, 7th edition (1992), vol. 7, pp. 139f (article on “Flameproofing”).

<sup>671</sup> A.R. Butz, “Some Thoughts on Pressac’s Opus”, *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 13, no. 3, May/June 1993, pp. 23-37. Supplement 3 here.

<sup>672</sup> A.R. Butz, “Context and Perspective in the ‘Holocaust’ Controversy”, *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 3, no. 4, Winter 1982, pp. 371-405. Supplement 2 here.

<sup>673</sup> R. Faurisson, “Auschwitz: Facts and legend,” *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 16, no. 4, July-Aug. 1997, pp. 14-19.

tectors are one of the “criminal traces” on Pressac’s pathetically short list.<sup>674</sup>

In historiography, there is an alternative and more commonplace description of Pressac’s procedure with “criminal traces”. It is bad historiography of the simplest sort: tendentious selection of a very small part of the data, resulting in grossly distorted history.

Normally, one cannot get away with this. But today a Pressac, waving aside historical reasoning and the mountain of documentary evidence, comes rushing forward waving some document and saying, in effect, “but how about this?”, and he is respected instead of being ignored or laughed at.<sup>675</sup> He is credited by some with finally proving the extermination allegation as it relates to Auschwitz, although it had for years been claimed that it had been proven and that there was nothing to argue about.

Thus, to the person who objects that I have treated petty details here, which are incommensurate with the scale of the historical claim involved, I reply: you are right, but it isn’t my fault! Ordinary historical reasoning observes that nobody acted, during the war, as though “extermination” was going on, and that the Jews were still there at war’s end.<sup>676</sup> However, a lot of influential people won’t accept ordinary historical reasoning, and the debate, to the extent that it exists, has revolved around the petty details.

The promoters of the legend may get away with such practices for a while in arguing the reality of physical exterminations of Jews during World War II. There are two leading reasons for this. Most obvious is the fact of the entrenched status of the legend. What ought to require proof has been allowed to flourish unproved, and the revisionists have in effect been forced to try to argue a negative. Another reason, less obvious but very simple, is that the revisionists may not be able to immediately offer correct replies to the sallies of the defenders of the legend. This appears to me to have been the case with the Topf letter. I don’t believe Faurisson’s immediate replies (which I would also have made) were correct. In fact, nobody could be relied on to be correct under the circumstances and in the time frame involved. A comparison: there is much building activity at Northwestern University now. Does anybody believe that, fifty years from now, perhaps after some cataclysm, anybody could reliably interpret individual documents that were records of this construction? Of course not. Nobody could do that, and nobody could infallibly interpret every Auschwitz document from the period 1941-1945. Indeed, the hypothesis I have advanced here may be wrong, even though I have had a few years to consider the solitary document in question.

---

<sup>674</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 432-457.

<sup>675</sup> On Pressac’s 1989 book see e.g. the *NY Times*, 18 Dec. 1989. On his 1993 book, which reproduced the Topf letter in question here, see (all 1993) *l’Express*, 23 Sept. pp. 76-87; *Libération*, 24 Sept. pp. 28f; *Le Monde*, 26-27 Sept. p. 7; *Die Welt*, 27 Sept. p. 1; AP report in the *Denver Post*, 2 Oct. p. 6A; *Die Woche*, 7 Oct. p. 8; *NY Times*, 28 Oct. p. A3 and 31 Oct. sec. 4, p. 2 and 8 Nov. p. A14; *Chicago Tribune*, 28 Nov. sec. 1, p. 25 and 13 Dec. sec. 5, p. 1.

<sup>676</sup> Butz (1982). Supplement 2 here. For some Jewish demography see Chapters 1 and 7 herein. Much more is to be found in Walter Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, IHR, 1983.

Some years ago I warned of these dangers.<sup>677</sup> It is not out of the question that, some day, an authentic Auschwitz document might utterly confound the revisionists, *i.e.* raise some apparently relevant question of detail which they will be unable to answer. I can only urge that the context, that is, the massive documentation and historical circumstance supporting the revisionist position, be kept in mind in the event of such a development.

---

<sup>677</sup> Butz (1982). Supplement 2 here.



## Supplement 5: *Vergasungskeller*

*An early version of this supplement appeared in the Journal of Historical Review, vol. 16, no. 4, July-Aug. 1997, pp. 20-22.*

Veteran revisionists recognize that an outstanding small problem has been the “*Vergasungskeller*” that was evidently in or near Crematorium II in the Birkenau part of the Auschwitz camp.

Crematorium II (and its mirror image Crematorium III) had two huge underground morgues, *Leichenkeller* 1 (LK 1) and LK 2, and a smaller morgue LK 3. LK 1 and LK 2 were simple concrete morgues in which bodies were simply laid on the floor. See Fig. 33. Essentially everything said here concerning Crematorium II should be presumed to hold also for Crematorium III. With one exception to be noted, nothing said here applies to Crematorium I (in the *Stammlager* part of the Auschwitz camp, rather than Birkenau, and taken out of service in July 1943). Apart from remarks near the end about the work of Samuel Crowell, nothing said here applies to Crematoria IV or V at Birkenau.

A letter to SS headquarters Berlin, from the Auschwitz construction department, dated 29 January 1943, when the construction of Crematorium II was nearing completion, reports that frost prohibits removal of the formwork for the ceiling of the “*Leichenkeller*” (without specifying which of the three is meant) but that this is unimportant, since the “*Vergasungskeller*” can be used for that purpose, *i.e.* as a morgue. The document had the number NO-4473 at the Nuremberg trials. Specifically, NO-4473 reads:

*“The Crematorium II has been completed – save for some minor constructional work – by the use of all the forces available, in spite of unspeakable difficulties, the severe cold, and in 24 hour shifts. The fires were started in the ovens in the presence of Senior Engineer Prüfer, representative of the contractors of the firm of Topf and Sons, Erfurt, and they are working most satisfactorily. The formwork for the reinforced concrete ceiling of the Leichenkeller could not yet be removed on account of the frost. This is, however, unimportant, as the Vergasungskeller can be used for this purpose.*

*The firm of Topf and Sons was not, on account of the unavailability of rail transport, able to deliver the aeration and ventilation equipment on time, as had been requested by the Central Building Management. As soon as the aeration and ventilation equipment arrive, the installing will start so that the complete installation may be expected to be ready for use by 20 February 1943.*

*A report of the inspecting engineer of the firm of Topf and Sons, Erfurt, is enclosed.”*

When NO-4473 is interpreted with the help of some documents reproduced by Pressac,<sup>678</sup> it is shown that the “*Leichenkeller*” is LK 2. Pressac believes that the

<sup>678</sup> J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foun-



“*Vergasungskeller*” is LK 1 and that a “slip”, indeed “enormous gaff” (sic), caused the author of the document to betray the true purpose of LK 1, referring to it as a “gassing cellar” (although the usual German word for such a concept is “*Gaskammer*”). On no known set of engineering drawings is a “*Vergasungskeller*” indicated.<sup>679</sup>

Many of those who would have us believe that there were homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz insist on this interpretation. An interesting exception has been the Austrian-born Raul Hilberg. He cites and even quotes from NO-4473 in the “Killing Center Operations” chapter of *The Destruction of the European Jews*, but he is silent on the “*Vergasungskeller*”.

In my 1976 book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, I offered that the *Vergasungskeller* was a part of the crematorium building devoted to generating a combustible gas for the ovens.<sup>680</sup> This interpretation was linguistically correct and could be technically correct, depending on the design of the ovens. The primary meaning of “*Vergasung*” is gas generation or carburetion, *i.e.* turning something into a gas (a “*Vergaser*” is a carburetor). A secondary meaning is application of a gas as in fumigation or in gas warfare. It is also the word Germans use today to refer to the alleged gassing of Jews; however, they use “*Gaskammer*” rather than “*Vergasungskammer*” or “*Vergasungskeller*” for the facility imagined to have accomplished this. Such usage also applies in the literature on fumigation.<sup>681</sup>

By 1989, Robert Faurisson realized that my original interpretation was wrong, and later in 1989, Pressac<sup>682</sup> conclusively showed that it was wrong, based on the design of the cremation ovens. In 1991, Faurisson offered a theory<sup>683</sup> that the *Vergasungskeller* was a storage area for fumigation supplies within LK 3.

In 1992, I showed that there were many ways “*Vergasung*” can come up in sewage treatment technology and offered that the *Vergasungskeller* might be found in the sewage treatment plant next to the crematorium. However, I favored the interpretation that the *Vergasungskeller* was simply a facility for generating fuel gas for the camp.<sup>684</sup> NO-4473 suggests, but does not require, that the *Vergasungskeller* was located within the crematorium building.

The purpose of this note is to offer another interpretation, which I now believe

---

dation, NY, 1989, p. 548. The reader should understand that the title of this book is misleading, as the only real “gas chambers” whose “technique and operation” are discussed are fumigation gas chambers. The homicidal gas chambers are only imagined, based on alleged “criminal traces”, a few of which are dealt with here, directly or indirectly. It is common to refer to this book in discussion of Auschwitz because it is the greatest single published source of reproductions of original documents and photographs for the camp.

<sup>679</sup> Pressac (1989) pp. 211, 217, 432, 548.

<sup>680</sup> Chapter 4 herein.

<sup>681</sup> An example of the two usages is in one paragraph in *Nationalsozialistische Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse*, Adalbert Rückerl, ed., Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, Munich, 1977, p. 12, where we are told that “*Judenvergasung*” (Jew gassing) took place in “*Gaskammern*”. About the same distinction in usage held in the fumigation field, as can be inferred from F. Puntigam *et al.*, *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, Berlin, 1943.

<sup>682</sup> Pressac (1989) pp. 106-113, 222-225, 548.

<sup>683</sup> R. Faurisson, *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 11, no. 1, Spring 1991, pp. 55ff.

<sup>684</sup> A.R. Butz, *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 13, no. 3, May/June 1993, pp. 27-31.

is more plausible than any earlier offered by me or anybody else. Before I do that, I should remark that the problem here is what the *Vergasungskeller* was, not whether it was a homicidal gas chamber. Those who claim it was a homicidal gas chamber focus their attention entirely on that one word in the document. If they would instead focus on what the document says, they would realize that it is impossible to make that interpretation work. The document shows that in January 1943 the Germans were in a great rush to use the building as an ordinary crematorium.

As Faurisson discussed earlier,<sup>685</sup> during World War II the combatants paid great heed that new structures be considered, if possible, as air raid shelters. There were two principal dangers that such shelters were to provide protection against: bombs and gas attacks. On account of World War I experiences, the possibilities of the latter were taken very seriously. Indeed, many simply assumed that gas would be used, despite treaties outlawing its use. Typically, a gas shelter was conceived of as a bomb shelter, preferably underground and very strong structurally, with some features added to make it secure against gas; a gas shelter had to be gas tight but allow people to breathe. Since in many cases it was not economic to provide such structures for at most only occasional use, it was recognized that such shelters could exist in the form of embellishments to structures that exist for other purposes. However, the number of suitable such structures was limited. For example, the typical underground cellar belongs to a building with several stories; the collapse of these in an air raid could prevent people from leaving the cellar.<sup>686</sup>

Germany started its air raid gas shelter program early with a 10 October 1933 decree of the Ministry of Finance providing financial incentives for the construction of shelters. The decree was followed by the *Luftschutzgesetz* (Air Defense Law) of 26 June 1935. Three German decrees in May 1937, in application of the *Luftschutzgesetz*, alarmed the British Chargé d'Affaires in Berlin, who compared the earnest German attitudes on air defenses to British apathy. The provision of shelters advanced far in Germany before the war, and of course was accelerated with the outbreak of war. On defense against gas, Germany was deeply committed to the shelter approach in its civil defense program, in contrast to the British, who put more emphasis on distribution of gas masks. However, it should be stressed that in World War II thinking, bomb and gas defenses went together, and provision of the one was unlikely without the other.<sup>687</sup>

Since the 1991 Persian Gulf War, Israel has had a law requiring that every newly constructed domicile have a room equipped as a gas shelter.<sup>688</sup>

My proposal is that the *Vergasungskeller* was a gas shelter. It need not have been located within Crematorium II, but I believe it most likely was, on account

<sup>685</sup> Faurisson, *op. cit.*, pp. 52f.

<sup>686</sup> A.M. Prentiss, *Chemicals in War*, Mc-Graw-Hill, NY, 1937. G. Woker, *Der kommende Gift- und Brandkrieg*, Oldenburg, Leipzig, 1932.

<sup>687</sup> Alden H. Watt, *Gas Warfare*, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, NY, 1942, p. 252. Terence H. O'Brien, *Civil Defence*, H.M. Stationery Office and Longmans, London, 1955, pp. 102ff, 329. Stephen E. Ambrose, ed., *Handbook On German Military Forces*, Louisiana State Univ. Press, Baton Rouge, 1990, p. 518. The last is a reproduction of a book issued in March 1945 by the U.S. Army.

<sup>688</sup> *Chicago Tribune*, 7 Sept. 1996, sec. 1, p. 2.

of the fact that Crematoria II and III, with their large concrete cellars, were obviously ideal for adaptation as air raid shelters. Indeed, when this problem is looked at from the point of view of defense against air raids it seems there was no better choice at Auschwitz. The German authorities responsible for providing air raid shelters would have insisted that the necessary embellishments be made to these structures, which were far more suited to such purposes than, *e.g.*, Crematorium I at the *Stammlager*, which despite being above ground was converted to an air raid shelter after it was taken out of service as a crematorium in July 1943.<sup>689</sup> My reading of some of the relevant chemical warfare literature convinces me that Crematoria II and III were conceived of by the Germans as having this additional role.

I have never seen the word “*Vergasungskeller*” in a lexicon; indeed I have seen it only in discussions of NO-4473!<sup>690</sup> I have seen two German-Russian dictionaries, one a military dictionary, that say “*Gaskeller*” means “gas shelter”.<sup>691</sup> However, we should not consider ourselves bound to dictionaries on this. If one asks the question: In a World War II military context, what might “*Vergasungskeller*” and/or “*Gaskeller*” mean? I think that “gas shelter” is the answer that comes naturally to mind and that other meanings are somewhat strained. Of course, other meanings come naturally to mind in non-military contexts.

As a personal example, I can report that I have been unable to find the term “control lab” (or “control laboratory”, “controls lab”, “controls laboratory”) in my *IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms* (edition of 1972), although every university Dept. of Electrical Engineering in the USA has a “control lab,” and that is how we normally refer to such a place. I have also been unable to find the term in an unabridged *Webster’s*, in an on-line version of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and in several other dictionaries I have.

If this interpretation of the *Vergasungskeller* of NO-4473 is correct, then we should view all three cellars in Crematorium II as air raid shelters, with only one being provided with the additional measures to make it effective as a gas shelter. That could only be LK 1, since NO-4473 implies it is not LK 2, LK 3 was very small and, conclusively, because LK 1 was the only one of the three provided with a gas-tight door.<sup>692</sup> Moreover, while all parts of the building had motor driven air extraction systems, it appears that only LK 1 had a motor driven air intake system.<sup>693</sup>

The extermination legend claims that homicidal gas chambers existed at

<sup>689</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 132f, 144, 156f. The engineering drawings Pressac reproduces are dated 21 & 24 September 1944, but I do not know the actual date of the conversion. Pressac erroneously places the first Allied air raid on 13 September 1944; it was on 20 August 1944.

<sup>690</sup> Dictionaries are somewhat politicized, so do not assume that “*Vergasungskeller*” will never appear in one that defines it as equivalent to “*Gaskammer*”. For example my *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, G. Wahrig, ed., Bertelsmann Lexikon-Verlag, 1973, defines “*Gaskammer*” only as something for killing people in concentration camps with poison gas, although the word was used in the fumigation field long before World War II. The justification that would be claimed for defining “*Vergasungskeller*” thus is that it was used that way in NO-4473! Orwell, anyone?

<sup>691</sup> L.F. Parparov, ed., *Nemetsko-Russkii Voennyi Slovar*, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1964. A.A. Lepinga and N.P. Strakhovoi, eds., *Nemetsko-Russkii Slovar*, Sov. Entsiklopediia, Moscow, 1968.

<sup>692</sup> Pressac (1989), 223, 231.

<sup>693</sup> Pressac (1989), 284ff, 290f, 355-374.

Auschwitz and employed the pesticide Zyklon B, which releases HCN gas (hydrogen cyanide). Pressac also believes the *Vergasungskeller* was LK 1, but he interprets it as a gas chamber employing Zyklon B. Under my theory, he is then right on location but wrong on function. LK 1 had the basic features of a gas shelter.

Pressac admits that the air exhaust (at the bottom) and air intake (near the top) systems of LK 1 were misplaced for a gas chamber employing HCN.<sup>694</sup> Although HCN is only slightly lighter than air, there are various practical reasons why gas chambers employing it normally expel the gas from the top when the gassing process is completed.<sup>695</sup> Carbon dioxide is much heavier than air and is most naturally expelled from the bottom of the relevant space. Moreover, preferred German practice of the time used a circulatory system for disinfestation gas chambers that employed Zyklon B, rather than a simple system of intake/exhaust. Another feature of any serious Zyklon gas chamber, lacked by LK 1, was a heating system, required to accelerate the development of HCN gas from the Zyklon carrier material (usually gypsum). LK 1 had whatever temperature the elements gave it,<sup>696</sup> a tolerable situation for an air raid/gas shelter. For explanations, see Supplement 4. The construction of LK 1 was exactly that of a gas shelter. One must stand on one's head to interpret it as a gas chamber.

The reader should understand that here I am only considering the physical details of the construction of LK 1 that oblige us to interpret it as a gas shelter rather than gas chamber. There is much more evidence that LK 1 was not a gas chamber. The purpose of this note is only to interpret the word "*Vergasungskeller*" as used in one document.

Why would the author of NO-4473 not refer to a *Leichenkeller* as a *Leichenkeller*? I don't think a slip is involved. We normally do not consider ourselves bound to use only formal designations. More commonly, we refer to things according to their function or in any case the function that happens to be in mind at the time. The gas shelter features of LK 1 were its principal structural distinction from LK 2, and those features were being taken into account in the construction at the time. It was natural that LK 1 might be referred to as the gas shelter.

As another example of a use of terminology suggested by function, the engineers Jährling and Messing referred to LK 2 of Crematoria II and III, during construction, via the terms "*Auskleideraum*" and "*Auskleidekeller*" (undressing room or cellar), another one of what Pressac considers "slips" that betrayed a criminal purpose.<sup>697</sup> This has been another point raised by those who would put a homi-

<sup>694</sup> Pressac (1989), 224, 274, 289ff, 322, 338.

<sup>695</sup> Puntigam, *op. cit.*

<sup>696</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 221, 223, 230, notes that at one point consideration was given to "pre-heating" LK 1, but the idea was dropped 3 weeks later. LK 1 was not heated. I have an idea on the purpose imagined for the pre-heating, but it would be premature to present it. In any case, heat was not considered vital to the function of LK 1. The notion that a crowd of people in LK 1 would provide the necessary heat for efficient gassing is a fig leaf that doesn't work, because they would not generate that much heat, and because according to the legend the Zyklon would have been strewn about the floor, thus assuming a temperature close to that of the floor.

<sup>697</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 223, 373.

cidal interpretation on Crematoria II and III; according to this theory, the victims would undress themselves in LK 2 and then be gassed in LK 1.

It seems hard to believe these were “slips,” because they were so frequently committed. Jährling used this designation in a document of 6 March 1943, and then Messing used it in three documents later in March. If these were “slips”, it would seem that by this time the bosses would have told them to clean up their language. They evidently didn’t, because Messing used the designation in two more documents in April.<sup>698</sup>

The truth about the undressing is much more prosaic. Pressac believes that, when the Germans viewed Crematoria II and III as ordinary crematoria, then the sequence of processing bodies was contemplated to be LK 3 to LK 2 to LK 1, but that LK 3 was eventually eliminated from the regular sequence.<sup>699</sup> However that may be, if the dead bodies were contemplated to start in LK 2, they would then be undressed there.<sup>700</sup> They would be stored in LK 1 while awaiting cremation. Presumably, LK 3 was only used when a body needed some sort of special processing, e.g. dissection or the famous extraction of gold fillings from teeth.

I am struck by the humorous simplicity of the theory offered here.

In March 1997, Samuel Crowell also proposed an interpretation of LK 1 as a gas shelter that goes far beyond, and in some respects departs on secondary levels from, the interpretations proposed here. Crowell’s theory is to be found at the Web site of CODOH (Committee for Open Debate of the Holocaust).<sup>701</sup> He went beyond my theory in two principal respects. First, he attributed to Crematoria II and III a broader role within the air raid/gas shelter paradigm. For example, showers and undressing are interpreted by him in terms of “decontamination”, a feature of that paradigm. Second, he interpreted features of Crematoria IV and V in terms of air raid and gas shelters, matters on which he cites much contemporaneous German literature. Crowell has bitten off a big piece, and evaluation of his theories will take time. I believe he tends at points to over-hasty interpretation in terms of air raid and gas shelters, without adequate consideration of alternative interpretations, but my hunch is that he is mostly right.

---

<sup>698</sup> Pressac (1989), pp. 431-435, 438f.

<sup>699</sup> Pressac (1989) 284ff. Of course, revisionists hold that they always were ordinary crematoria.

<sup>700</sup> Faurisson, *op. cit.*, pp. 49f., advanced this interpretation but only tentatively, because he had not been able to verify that the word “Auskleideraum” is used that way in the special terminology of morgues (that seems to be what Faurisson meant). I do not think the question is important, because there is no reason to assume that Jährling (a heating technician employed by the SS) and Messing (a fitter employed by the Topf company that was providing the crematorium ovens) cared very much about the special terminology of morgues. I have spent many years with engineers, and I know they tend to express themselves without great concern for lexical standards, especially outside their own fields. Jährling and Messing could never have suspected that their hasty words would be subject to such contentions half a century later!

<sup>701</sup> [www.codoh.com/incon/inconpressac.html](http://www.codoh.com/incon/inconpressac.html)

# Illustrations




Fig. 1: Europe before World War I.




Fig. 2: Europe between the two World Wars.



Fig. 3: Nazi dominated Europe.






Fig. 4: Europe after World War I.




Fig. 5: Plan of the Auschwitz region.




Fig. 6: Interior of disinfestation chamber at Dachau; left: DEGESCH Kreislaufanlage (circulation device); right: look through the chamber. (This photo was taken by the author in 1973.)





Fig. 7: Bodies being cremated in open pits, allegedly north of Krematorium V, Birkenau. Photos allegedly taken by the former Polish Auschwitz inmate David Szmulewski.<sup>1</sup>



Fig. 8: Scenes from the trial of camp guards at Dachau.<sup>2</sup>



*Fig. 9: Yard at Belsen after British capture of the camp.<sup>3</sup>*



*Fig. 10: Mass grave at Belsen; bottom: British liberators deliberately exposed SS women to contagious diseases.<sup>4</sup>*




*Fig. 11: British guard post at entrance to Belsen camp.<sup>5</sup>*





*Fig. 12: Women guards at Belsen, lined up after capture of the camp; bottom right: Irma Grese, who was supposedly the most hated of all guards.<sup>6</sup>*



*Fig. 13: Crematorium building at Dachau; top two pictures: after the liberation; bottom picture: in 1998. Editor's note: Note the differences between those pictures:*

*a) today, a ramp allows access for persons in wheelchairs;  
b) a shed (circle top two pictures) was removed; two openings (arrows lower picture) are now visible at this spot, allegedly used to fill Zyklon B into the shower room – the claimed gas chamber, which, according to the Dachau Museum, was never used.<sup>7</sup>*



*Fig. 14: Delousing Senator Wherry after tour of Dachau.<sup>8</sup>*



*Fig. 15: Dead bodies found on train at Dachau.<sup>9</sup>*



Fig. 16: Shower baths at Dachau; top: Members of U.S. Congress inspecting it after the war. From left to right: Sen. Wherry (NE), Sen. Brooks (IL), Rep. Vorhys (OH), and Rep. Richards (SC); bottom: Dachau Museum 1998 with sign claiming that this room was never used as a gas chamber (see inset).<sup>10</sup>




Fig. 17: Dachau crematorium with four muffles, three of which are visible here; top: U.S. Representative Vorhys inspects it after the war; bottom: Museum Dachau 1998.<sup>11</sup>



Fig. 18: Crematorium at Buchenwald with six muffles; top: U.S. Congressmen inspecting it after the war; bottom: Buchenwald museum 1998.<sup>12</sup>



Fig. 19: Entrance to Dachau shower bath which was baptized "gas chamber" after the war.<sup>13</sup>  
(Editor's note: Through a window at the rear of the building the hot water boiler and pipes of this shower are visible. Also, the shower heads are in fact attached to water pipes, as can be established with an induction locator.)






Fig. 20: Liberated Dachau inmates mistreat (top) and murdered (bottom) camp guards.<sup>14</sup>



*Fig. 21: Liberation Day at Dachau; top: view from the main entrance tower; bottom left: cheering prisoners; bottom right: camp guards are summarily executed.<sup>15</sup>*



*Fig. 22: Door of disinfestation chamber at Dachau. The inscriptions on the door specify that the chamber was last used from 7:30 to 10 in the morning. The warning reads "Caution! Gas! Life danger! Do not open!" The U.S. Army caption for this photograph declares: "Gas chambers, conveniently located to the crematory, are examined by a soldier of the U.S. Seventh Army. These chambers were used by Nazi guards for killing prisoners of the infamous Dachau concentration camp."<sup>16</sup>*




Fig. 23: Some of the principal German camps. Theresienstadt was not really a camp, but a ghetto or village, as you wish.




Fig. 24. Russian soap "evidence" at the IMT.<sup>17</sup>

**DOCUMENT 022-L**

**EXCERPT FROM A REPORT OF THE WAR REFUGEE BOARD, WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 1944, ON GERMAN EXTERMINATION CAMPS — AUSCHWITZ AND BIRKENAU — GIVING AN ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF JEWS GASED IN BIRKENAU BETWEEN APRIL 1942 AND APRIL 1944 (EXHIBIT USA-294)**

**EXPLANATORY NOTE:**

Offset printed copy; orig. in archives of U. S. State Dept; report consists of two accounts of escaped concentration camp inmates—two young Slovakian Jews and a Polish major

Executive Office of the President  
 War Refugee Board  
 Washington, D. C.

German Extermination Camps —  
 Auschwitz and Birkenau.  
 (page 33)

Careful estimate of the number of Jews gassed  
 in BIRKENAU between April, 1942 and April, 1944  
 (according to countries of origin).

Poland (transported by truck) .....	approximately	300,000
"          "          " train) .....	"	600,000
Holland .....	"	100,000
Greece .....	"	45,000
France .....	"	150,000
Belgium .....	"	50,000
Germany .....	"	60,000
Yugoslavia, Italy and Norway .....	"	50,000
Lithuania .....	"	50,000
Bohemia, Moravia and Austria .....	"	30,000
Slovakia .....	"	30,000
Various camps for foreign Jews in Poland..	"	300,000
	<b>approximately</b>	<b>1,765,000</b>

Fig. 25: A page from document 022-L, as reproduced in the 42<sup>nd</sup> volume record of the International Military Tribunal.



Fig. 26: Said to be a photograph of the furnace room of crematorium II at Auschwitz.<sup>18</sup>




Fig. 27: A can of Zyklon B.<sup>19</sup> The label says “POISON GAS!”





Fig. 28: Several cans of Zyklon B: top: in the camp Lublin-Majdanek as found by the Red Army; bottom: from an advertisement of the DEGESCH firm.<sup>20</sup>




Fig. 29: Plan of Birkenau. The location of the "Red House" or "Bunker", top left, is claimed by "eye witnesses", but unconfirmed.

Brieftelegramm

( Offen )

Budapest, den 30. Juni 1944 -

Ankunft: 5. Juli 1944 - 11.05 Uhr

13479  
4. Juli 1944

Nr. 1838 v. 30. VI. Im Anschluß an Drahtbericht - Nr. 1657

+) bei Hl. II V.S. 145 vom 13. Juni.

- St. Krieger
- Ges. Leiter I
- Ges. Leiter II
- Arb.-Exp. Budapest
- Botsch. v. Rintelen
- Ges. Schürre
- " Frohwein
- " v. Grundherr
- Dr. Megerle
- VLR Ripken
- " Melchers
- LR v. Grotte

I.) Abtransport Juden aus Zone III planmäßig mit 50.805 abgeschlossen. Gesamtziffer aus Zonen I - III 340.162.

II.) Konzentrierung in Zone IV und Abtransport mit 41.499 planmäßig abgeschlossen. Gesamtziffer 381.661 Fortgang der Aktion ist gesondert mit Fernschreiber - Nr. 279 - vom 27. Juni Nr. 287 vom 29. Juni und - Nr. 289 vom 30. Juni nach Fuschl berichtet worden. Konzentrierung in Zone V (bisher nicht erfaßter Raum westlich der Donau ohne Budapest) hat 29. Juni begonnen. Gleichzeitig hat kleinere Sonderaktion in Vorstädten von Budapest als Vorbereitungsmaßnahme begonnen. Ferner laufen noch einige kleine Sondertransporte mit politischen, intellektuellen, kinderreichen und Facharbeiter-Juden.

Veesennayer.

Handwritten notes and signatures:  
yM Grün...  
m. d. E...  
y/2d A...  
S...  
T... 1/2

K213896

487144

Fig. 30: Document NG-2263, reproduced from Braham, *The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry.*



*Fig. 31: The crematorium at Lublin-Majdanek camp. This crematorium had five muffles, three of which are visible here.<sup>21</sup>*




Fig. 32: A collection of medical specimens allegedly found at Buchenwald.<sup>22</sup>




Fig. 33: Plan of Auschwitz Crematorium II.

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




Fig. 34: Arrangement of flues and ducts for Auschwitz crematorium II.<sup>23</sup>

## Sources of Illustrations

- <sup>1</sup> Panstwowe Muzeum Oświęcim, neg. 277, 278; J.-C. Pressac (1989), p. 422.
- <sup>2</sup> “Teacher’s Guide to the Holocaust,” Florida Center for Instructional Technology, <http://fcit.coedu.usf.edu/holocaust/GALL31R/11453.htm>; [~ /82887.htm](http://fcit.coedu.usf.edu/holocaust/GALL31R/11453.htm); [~ /11827.htm](http://fcit.coedu.usf.edu/holocaust/GALL31R/11453.htm). The originals are in the German Bundesarchiv.
- <sup>3</sup> Imperial War Museum, Horror 11 BU 3764.
- <sup>4</sup> Top: Imperial War Museum, Horror 9 BU 3744; bottom: [www.scrapbookpages.com/BergenBelsen/BergenBelsen05.html](http://www.scrapbookpages.com/BergenBelsen/BergenBelsen05.html).
- <sup>5</sup> Imperial War Museum, Horror 8 BU 4092.
- <sup>6</sup> Top: National Archives, 306-NT-1338-1; bottom left & right: [www.scrapbookpages.com/BergenBelsen/BergenBelsen08.html](http://www.scrapbookpages.com/BergenBelsen/BergenBelsen08.html).
- <sup>7</sup> Top: National Archives, 208-AA-129J-30; middle and bottom: “The Concentration Camps,” picture collection on CD, taken *in loco* by various individuals in 1998.
- <sup>8</sup> US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 204837.
- <sup>9</sup> US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 206191.
- <sup>10</sup> Top: US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 204838; bottom: “The Concentration Camps” CD.
- <sup>11</sup> Top: US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 264013; bottom: “The Concentration Camps” CD.
- <sup>12</sup> Top: US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 263997; bottom: “The Concentration Camps” CD.
- <sup>13</sup> “The Concentration Camps” CD.
- <sup>14</sup> Top: US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 208766; bottom: “Teacher’s Guide to the Holocaust,” <http://fcit.coedu.usf.edu/holocaust/gallery2/82868.htm> (original in the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum).
- <sup>15</sup> Top: US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 206311; bottom left: [www.scrapbookpages.com/DachauScrapbook/DachauLiberation/LiberationDay.html](http://www.scrapbookpages.com/DachauScrapbook/DachauLiberation/LiberationDay.html); bottom right: [~/SoldiersKilled.html](http://www.scrapbookpages.com/DachauScrapbook/DachauLiberation/LiberationDay.html) (US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 208705).
- <sup>16</sup> US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 206194.
- <sup>17</sup> National Archives, 238-NT-270.
- <sup>18</sup> Panstwowe Muzeum Oświęcim, neg. 291.
- <sup>19</sup> Jürgen Kalthoff, Martin Werner, *Die Händler des Zyklon B*, VSA-Verlag, Hamburg 1998, cover.
- <sup>20</sup> Top left: “Teacher’s Guide to the Holocaust,” <http://fcit.coedu.usf.edu/holocaust/gallery2/50575.htm> (originals from U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum); top right: National Archives, 208-AA-132H-2; bottom: G. Peters, *Blausäure zur Schädlingsbekämpfung*, F. Enke, Stuttgart, 1933, p. 80.
- <sup>21</sup> National Archives, 208-AA-132H-1.
- <sup>22</sup> US Army Audio-Visual Agency SC 203584.
- <sup>23</sup> Panstwowe Muzeum Oświęcim, file BW 30/14, neg. 20946/1.



# References

- Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale*, 9 vols., Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Vatican City, 1967-1974.
- Stephen E. Ambrose, ed., *Handbook On German Military Forces*, Louisiana State Univ. Press, Baton Rouge, 1990.
- L.S. Amery, general editor, *The Times History of the War in South Africa*, 7 vols., Sampson Low, Marston & Co., London, 1907 (vol. 5), 1909 (vol. 6).
- Burton C. Andrus, *I Was the Nuremberg Jailer*, Coward-McCann, New York, 1969.
- Anonymous (David L. Hoggan), *The Myth of the Six Million*, Noontide Press, Los Angeles, 1969.
- Jacob Apenszlak, ed., *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*, American Federation for Polish Jews, 1943.
- Austin J. App, *The Six Million Swindle*, Boniface Press, 8207 Flower Ave., Takoma Park, Md. 20012, 1973.
- Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Viking, New York, 1963 (revised and enlarged edition in 1964).
- Emil Aretz, *Hexen-Einmal-Eins einer Lüge*, 3rd., Verlag Hohe Warte – Franz von Bebenburg, München, 1973.
- Eugène Aronéanu, ed., *Camps de Concentration*, Service d'Information des Crimes de Guerre Paris, 1946.
- John Clive Ball, *Air Photo Evidence*, Ball Resource Service Ltd., Delta, BC, 1992.
- Bryan Ballantyne, Timothy C. Marrs (eds.), *Clinical and Experimental Toxicology of Cyanides*, Wright, Bristol, 1987.
- Maurice Bardèche, *Nuremberg II, ou Les Faux Mommyeurs*, Les Sept Couleurs, Paris, 1950.
- Harry Elmer Barnes, "The Public Stake in Revisionism," *Rampart J. of Individualist Thought*, vol. 3, no. 2 (Summer 1967), 19-41.
- Yehuda Bauer, *American Jewry and the Holocaust*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1981.
- John Beatty, *The Iron Curtain Over America*, Wilkinson Publishing, Dallas, Texas, 1951.
- R. L. Bebb & L. B. Wakefield, "German Synthetic Rubber Developments" in G. S. Whitby, C. C. Davis & R. F. Dunbrook, eds., *Synthetic Rubber*, 937-986, John Wiley, New York and Chapman & Hall, London, 1954.
- Montgomery Belgion, *Victor's Justice*, Henry Regnery, Hinsdale, Illinois, 1949.
- Paul Berben, *Dachau 1933-1945: The Official History*, Norfolk Press, London, 1975.
- Ted Berkman, *Cast a Giant Shadow*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1962.
- Jadwiga Bezwinska, ed., *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS*, Howard Fertig, NY, 1984.
- Bibliography of the Holocaust and After*, Israel Book and Printing Center, Tel Aviv.
- John Morton Blum, *From the Morgenthau Diaries. Years of War 1941-1945* (3rd vol. in a series), Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1967.
- Nachmann Blumental, ed., *Dokumenty i Materialy*, vol. 1, Obozy (Camps) Wydawnictwa Centralnej Zydowskiej Komisji Historycznej, Lodz, 1946.
- Eric H. Boehm, ed., *We Survived*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1949.
- Michel Borwicz, *Écrits des Condamnés à Mort Sous l'Occupation Allemande*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1954.
- Randolph A. Braham, ed., *The Destruction of Hungarian Jewry*, 2 vols., Pro Arte, New York, 1963.
- H. Breymesser and E. Bernfus, eds., *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, Reichsarbeitsblatt, Berlin, 1943.
- Brown Book: War and Nazi Criminals in West Germany*, Verlag Zeit im Bild, Berlin (DDR), 1965. Listed title may not include words "Brown Book".
- Dino A. Brugioni and Robert G. Poirier, *The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex*, Public Affairs Office, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, DC, 1979.
- Margaret Buber, *Under Two Dictators*, Dodd, Mead & Co., New York.

- Howard A. Buechner, *Dachau. The Hour of the Avenger. An Eyewitness Account*, Metairie, LA, Thunderbird Press, 1986
- Bundesministerium der Finanzen (ed.), *Entschädigung von NS-Unrecht*, Berlin 2002.
- J. G. Burg, *Schuld und Schicksal*, Damm Verlag, München, 1962.
- J. G. Burg, *Sündenböcke*, G. Fischer, München, 1967.
- J. G. Burg, *NS-Verbrechen*, G. Fischer, München, 1968.
- Christopher Burney, *The Dungeon Democracy*, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York, 1946.
- Edouard Calic, *Secret Conversations with Hitler*, John Day, New York, 1971.
- Cambridge Ancient History*, various editors, 12 vols., 1st ed., Cambridge, 1923-1939.
- Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, Yale, New Haven, 1940.
- Kit C. Carter and Robert Mueller, *The Army Air Forces in World War II – Combat Chronology – 1941-1945*, Albert F. Simpson Historical Research Center, Air University, and Office of Air Force History, 1973. Superintendent of Documents stock number 0870-00334.
- Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, *German Crimes in Poland*, vol. 1, Warsaw, 1946.
- William Henry Chamberlin, *America's Second Crusade*, Henry Regnery, Chicago, 1950.
- Thies Christophersen, *Die Auschwitz Lüge*, 2nd ed., Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch, 1973. English translation from Western Unity Movement, P.O. Box 156, Verdun 19, Quebec, Canada, 1974.
- Elie A. Cohen, *Human Behavior in the Concentration Camp*, W. W. Norton, New York, 1953.
- Margaret L. Coit, *Mr. Baruch*, Riverside Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1957.
- Benjamin Colby, *'Twas a Famous Victory*, Arlington House, New Rochelle, New York, 1974.
- Christopher Bush Coleman, *Constantine the Great and Christianity*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1914.
- Christopher Bush Coleman, *The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1922.
- Ian Colvin, *Master Spy*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951.
- Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror*, Macmillan, New York, 1968.
- Vesley Frank Craven, James Lea Cate & USAF Historical Div., eds., *The Army Air Forces in World War II*, vol. 3, University of Chicago, 1951.
- Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945*, Henry Holt, New York, 1990.
- Eugene Davidson, *The Trial of the Germans*, Macmillan, New York, 1966.
- K. Dau, *Über Kanalvergasungen und ihre Verhütung*, Dissertationsdruckerei und Verlag Konrad Tritsch, Würzburg, 1935.
- Maurice R. Davie, *Refugees in America*, Harper, New York, 1947.
- Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1975.
- Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust and the Historians*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1981.
- Andrea Devoto *Bibliografia dell'Oppressione Nazista Fino al 1962*, Leo S. Olschki, Firenze, 1964.
- Alexander Donat, ed., *The Death Camp Treblinka*, Holocaust Library, New York, 1979.
- Quincy L. Dowd, *Funeral Management and Costs*, University of Chicago, 1921.
- Josiah E. DuBois, Jr., *The Devil's Chemists*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1952.
- R. F. Dunbrook, "Historical Review" in G. S. Whitby *et al.* (see Bebb and Wakefield above), 32-55.
- Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt, *Auschwitz, 1270 to the Present*, W.W. Norton, NY, 1996.
- Adolf Eichmann. *The Attorney-General of the Government of Israel vs. Adolf, the Son of Adolf Karl Eichmann*, Minutes of Sessions, Jerusalem, 1962.
- Encyclopedia Britannica*, 12 ed., vol. 32, 1922 – third volume supplementing the 11th ed.
- Encyclopedia Judaica*, 16 vols., Keter Pub. House, Jerusalem, and Macmillan, New York, 1971.
- Isidore Epstein, ed., *The Talmud (Babylonian)*, many vols., Soncino Press, London, 1936.
- Henry L. Feingold, *The Politics of Rescue*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 1970.
- Jean-François Forges, *Éduquer contre Auschwitz*, ESF, Paris, 1997.
- John F. Foster and Richard J. Lund, eds., *Economics of Fuel Gas from Coal* McGraw Hill, New

York, 1950.

Anne Frank *Diary of a Young Girl*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1952.

Tenney Frank, ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, 6 vols., Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, 1933-1940.

Hermann Franke, ed., *Lueger. Lexikon der Technik*, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Stuttgart, 1960-1972.

Saul Friedlaender, *Kurt Gerstein: The Ambiguity of Good*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1969.

Filip (or Philip) Friedman, *This Was Oswiecim*, United Jewish Relief Appeal, London, 1946.

Philip Friedman and Koppel S. Pinson, "Some Books on the Jewish Catastrophe," *Jewish Social Studies*, (January 1950), 83-94.

Gregory (Grzegorz) Frumkin, *Population Changes in Europe Since 1939*, George Allen & Unwin, London, and Augustus M. Kelley, New York, 1951.

Alexander Fuks, "Aspects of the Jewish Revolt in A.D. 115-117," *J.Roman Studies*, vol. 51, 1961, 98-104.

Ernst Gauss (ed.), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte: Ein Handbuch über strittige Fragen des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen, 1994.

G. M. Gilbert, *Nuremberg Diary*, Farrar, Strauss & Co., New York, 1947.

Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1981.

Jacob Glatstein, Israel Knox and Samuel Margoshes, eds., *Anthology of Holocaust Literature*, Jewish Pub. Society of America, Philadelphia, 1969.

John E. Gordon, "Louse-Borne Typhus Fever in the European Theater of Operations, US Army, 1945," in Forest Ray Moulton, ed., *Rickettsial Diseases of Man*, Am. Acad. for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC, 1948, 16-27.

Wigbert Grabert (ed.), *Geschichtsbetrachtung als Wagnis*, Grabert, Tübingen, 1984.

Jürgen Graf, *The Giant with Feet of Clay*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Capshaw, AL, 2001.

Michael Grant, *The Jews in the Roman World*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1973.

Solomon Grayzel, *A History of the Jews*, Jewish Pub. Society of America, Philadelphia, 1947.

Samuel Gringauz, "The Ghetto as an Experiment of Jewish Social Organization," *Jewish Social Studies*, (January 1949), 3-20.

Samuel Gringauz, "Some Methodological Problems in the Study of the Ghetto," *Jewish Social Studies*, (January 1950), 65-72.

Nerin E. Gun, *The Day of the Americans*, Fleet Pub. Corp., 1966.

Y. Gutman and M. Berenbaum, eds., *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1994.

William A. Hardenbergh, "Research Background of Insect and Rodent Control," in *Preventive Medicine in World War II, vol. II, Environmental Hygiene*, John Boyd Coates, Jr. & Ebbe Curtis Hoff, eds., Office of the Surgeon General, Washington, DC, 1955, 251.

Richard Harwood, *Did Six Million Really Die?*, Historical Review Press, Richmond, Surrey, 1974.

William Best Hesseltine, *Civil War Prisons*, Ohio State University Press, Columbus, 1930.

Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1961 & 1967.

Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Holmes & Meier [3 vols.], New York, 1985.

Adolf Hitler, *My New Order*, Raoul de Roussy de Sales, ed., Reynal & Hitchcock, New York, 1941.

Heinz Höhne, *The Order of the Death's Head*, tr. by Richard Barry, Ballantine Books, New York, 1971.

Frank A. Howard, *Buna Rubber: The Birth of an Industry*, D. Van Nostrand, New York, 1947.

Cordell Hull, *Memoirs*, vol. 1, Macmillan, New York, 1948.

K. Imhoff, *Taschenbuch der Stadtentwässerung*, 10th ed., Munich and Berlin, 1943.

IMT (International Military Tribunal), *Trial of the Major War Criminals*, IMT, Nuremberg, 42 vols., 1947-1949. May be listed under "US Army Civil Affairs Division. Trial of the major war criminals [...]"

Internationales Buchenwald-Komitee, *Buchenwald*, Roederberg-Verlag, Frankfurt, 1960.

Fred L. Israel, ed., *The War Diary of Breckenridge Long*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, 1966.

- Eberhard Jaeckel, *Hitler's Weltanschauung*, Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Connecticut, 1972.
- Robert John & Sami Hadawi, *The Palestine Diary*, 2 vols., New World Press, New York, 1970.
- Allen J. Johnson & George H. Auth, *Fuels and Combustion Handbook*, First ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951.
- Louis de Jong, "Die Niederlande und Auschwitz," *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 17, no. 1 (January 1969), 1-16. In English translation in *Yad Vashem Studies*, vol. 7, 39 – 55.
- Jürgen Kalthoff, Martin Werner, *Die Händler des Zyklon B*, VSA-Verlag, Hamburg 1998
- Douglas M. Kelley, *22 Cells in Nuremberg*, Greenberg, New York, 1947.
- Robert M. W. Kempner, *Nazi Subversive Organization, Past and Future*, stencil, privately published, October 30, 1943.
- John F. Kennedy, *Profiles in Courage*, Harper, New York, 1955. Memorial edition 1964.
- Jon Kimche & David Kimche, *The Secret Roads*, Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, New York, 1955. Introduction by David Ben-Gurion.
- E. F. Knipling, "DDT and Other Insecticides for the Control of Lice and Fleas Attacking Man," in Moulton (see Gordon), 215-223.
- Robert L. Koehl, *RKFDV: German Resettlement and Population Policy 1939-1945*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1957.
- E. Kogon, et al., *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Fischer, Frankfurt/M., 1986.
- E. Kogon, et al., *Nazi Mass Murder: A Documentary History of the Use of Poison Gas*, Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1994.
- Morris W. Kolander, "War Crimes Trials in Germany," *Pennsylvania Bar Assn. Quarterly*, vol. 18, (April 1947), 274-280.
- Komitee der Antifaschistischen Widerstandskämpfer in der DDR, *Sachsenhausen*, Kongress-Verlag, Berlin, 1962.
- Leszek A. Kosinski, "Changes in the Ethnic Structure of East Central Europe, 1930-1960," *Geographical Review*, vol. 59, 1969, 388-402. Also "Migration of Population in East-Central Europe, 1939-1955," *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, vol. 11, 1969, 357-373.
- Helmut Krausnick, Hans Buchheim, Martin Broszat & Hans-Adolf Jacobsen, *The Anatomy of the SS State*, Walker, New York, 1968.
- H. Kretzschmar, *Technische Mikrobiologie*, Berlin and Hamburg, 1968.
- Hermann Langbein, *Der Auschwitz Prozess. Eine Dokumentation*, 2 vols., Europa Verlag, Wien, 1965.
- J. Länik, *Co Dante nevidel*, Bratislava, 1964.
- J. Länik, *Was Dante nicht sah*, Die Buchgemeinde, Vienna, 1964.
- Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret*, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1980.
- Walter Laqueur, Richard Breitman, *Breaking the Silence*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1986,
- Hans Latenser, *Die andere Seite im Auschwitz Prozess 1963/65*, Seewald Verlag, Stuttgart, 1966.
- Johann M. Lenz, *Christ in Dachau* (tr. Countess Barbara Waldstein), Missionsdruckerei St. Gabriel, Moedling bei Wien, 1960.
- A.A. Lepinga and N.P. Strakhovoi, eds., *Nemetsko-Russkii Slovar*, Sov. Entsiklopediia, Moscow, 1968.
- Daniel Lerner, *Psychological Warfare Against Nazi Germany*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1971.
- Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto, 1988.
- Louis P. Lochner, ed., *The Goebbels Diaries*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1948. Republished by Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1970.
- David Marcus, "War Crimes" article in *Britannica Book of the Year – 1947*, 819-821, Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago.
- Hans Marsálek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen*, Vienna, 1974.
- James J. Martin, *Revisionist Viewpoints*, Ralph Myles, Colorado Springs, 1971.
- Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, *Treblinka – Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?*, Theses & Dis-

sertations Press, Chicago 2003.

Arno J. Mayer, *Why did the Heavens not Darken? The 'Final Solution' in History*, Pantheon Books, New York 1990.

C. C. McCown, "The Density of Population in Ancient Palestine," *J. Biblical Lit.*, vol. 66, 1947, 425-436.

James G. McDonald, *My Mission in Israel*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1951.

*McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology*, 7th edition, 1992.

Metcalf and Eddy, Inc., *Wastewater Engineering*, 3rd ed., 1991.

Jules Michelet, *Satanism and Witchcraft*, Citadel Press, New York, 1939.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., "The Morgenthau Diaries – Part VI," *Collier's* (November 1, 1947), 22+.

*Morgenthau Diary (Germany)*, 2 vols. published by US Senate Committee on the Judiciary, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, November 20, 1967. Superintendent of Documents nos. Y4.J 89/2:M 82/2/v. 1 and v. 2. The book *Das Morgenthau Tagebuch*, ed. Hermann Schild, Druffel-Verlag, Leoni am Starnberger See, 1970, consists mainly of excerpts from the two volumes, translated into German.

Arthur D. Morse, *While Six Million Died*, Random House, New York, 1968.

George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology*, Grosset and Dunlap, New York, 1964. Printing of 1971.

Filip Müller, *Eyewitness Auschwitz*, Stein and Day, NY, 1979.

Teodor Musiol, *Dachau, 1933-1945*, Instytut Slaski w Opulo, Katowice.

Dillon S. Meyer, *Uprooted Americans*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1971.

Bernd Naumann, *Auschwitz* (tr. Jean Steinberg), Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1966. Original German edition from Athenaeum Verlag, Frankfurt, 1965.

W. J. S. Naunton, "Synthetic Rubber" in *History of the Rubber Industry*, P. Schidrowitz & T.R. Dawson, eds., pub. for The Institute of the Rubber Industry by W. Heffer & Sons Ltd., Cambridge, UK, 1952, 100-109.

Netherlands Red Cross, *Auschwitz*, Hoofdbestuur van de Vereniging het Nederlandsche Roode Kruis, 6 vols., The Hague, 1947-1953.

Oskar Neumann (or J. Oskar Neumann), *Im Schatten des Todes*, Tel-Aviv, 1956.

Francis R. Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick 1999.

NMT (Nuremberg Military Tribunal), *Trials of War Criminals*, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1950, 15 vols. May be listed under "US Defense Dept., Adjutant General. Trials of war criminals [...]"

Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz*, Frederick Fell, New York, 1960.

O'Brien, *Civil Defence*, H.M. Stationery Office and Longmans, London, 1955.

*Oswiecim. Camp of Death*, Poland Fights, New York, 1944.

James E. Packer, "Housing and Population in Imperial Ostia and Rome," *J. Roman Studies*, vol. 57, 1967, 80-95.

O. Pallasch and W. Triebel, eds., *Lehr- und Handbuch der Abwassertechnik*, Berlin and Munich, 1969.

L. F. Parparov, ed., *Nemetsko-Russkii Voennyi Slovar*, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1964.

Jean Pélissier, *Camps de la Mort*, Éditions Mellottée, Paris, 1946.

Raymond Phillips, ed., *Trial of Josef Kramer and Forty-Four Others (The Belsen Trial)*, William Hodge, London, 1949.

Léon Poliakov & Josef Wulf, *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden*, Arani-Verlags, Berlin-Grunewald, 1955.

Léon Poliakov & Josef Wulf, *Das Dritte Reich und Seine Diener*, Arani-Verlags, Berlin-Grunewald, 1956.

C. J. Polson, R. P. Brittain & T. K. Marshall, *Disposal of the Dead*, 2nd ed., Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, 1962.

A. M. Prentiss, *Chemicals in War*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1937.

Jean-Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York, 1989. The reader should understand that the title of this book is misleading, as the only real "gas chambers" whose "technique and operation" are discussed are fumigation gas

chambers. The homicidal gas chambers are only imagined, based on alleged “criminal traces.” This book is the greatest single published source of reproductions of original documents and photographs for the camp.

Jean-Claude Pressac, *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz: La Machinerie du Meurtre de Masse*, CNRS Éditions, Paris, 1993. The reader should understand that the title of this book is misleading, as it does not treat any *machinery* of mass murder.

Terrence Prittie, *Eshkol: The Man and the Nation*, Pitman, New York, 1969.

F. Puntigam, et al., *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, Reichsarbeitsblattes, Berlin, 1943.

F. Puntigam, H. Breymesser and E. Bernfus, *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, Reichsarbeitsblatt (special publication), Reichsarbeitsministerium, Berlin, 1943.

Hermann Raschhofer, *Political Assassination*, Fritz Schlichtenmayer, Tübingen, 1964.

Paul Rassinier, *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse*, 5th ed., La Librairie Française, Paris, 1961. English translation *Debunking the Genocide Myth*, Noontide Press, Torrance, CA, 1978. Subsequently republished by the Institute for Historical Review under the title, *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*.

Paul Rassinier, *Ulysse Trahi par les siens*, La Librairie Française, Paris, 1961 (not referenced on any specific point here).

Paul Rassinier, *Le Véritable Procès Eichmann*, Les Sept Couleurs, Paris, 1962. German translation *Zum Fall Eichmann: Was ist Wahrheit?*, Druffel-Verlag, Leoni am Starnberger See, 1963. English translation *The Real Eichmann Trial*, Historical Review Press, Southam, UK, 1979.

Paul Rassinier, *Le Drame des Juifs Européens*, Les Sept Couleurs, Paris, 1964. German translation *Das Drama der Juden Europas*, Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, Hanover, 1965. English translation *Drama of the European Jews*, Steppingstones Publications, Silver Spring, Maryland 20901, 1975.

Paul Rassinier, *L'Opération Vicaire*, La Table Ronde, Paris, 1965.

Paul Rassinier, *Debunking the Genocide Myth*, Institute for Historical Review, Torrance 1978.

Red Cross. International Documents sur l'activité du CICR en faveur des civils détenus dans les camps de concentration en Allemagne (1939-1945), Geneva, 1947.

Red Cross. International. *Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross on its Activities During the Second World War (Sept 1, 1939-June 30, 1947)*, 3 vols., Geneva, 1948.

Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, 2nd ed., Vallentine, Mitchell, London, 1968.

Anthony Rhodes, *The Vatican in the Age of the Dictators 1922-1945*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1973.

Wilmot Robertson, *The Dispossessed Majority*, Howard Allen, Cape Canaveral, Florida, 1972. Revised 1973.

Henri Roques, *The "Confessions" of Kurt Gerstein*, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, California, 1989

Samuel I. Rosenman, *Working With Roosevelt*, Harper, New York, 1952.

Wolf Dieter Rothe, *Die Endlösung der Judenfrage, Band I, Zeugen*, E. Bierbaum Verlag, Frankfurt, 1974.

Hans Rothfels, *The German Opposition to Hitler*, Henry Regnery, Chicago, 1962.

Adalbert Rückerl, ed., *Nationalsozialistische Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse*, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, Munich, 1977.

Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust: The Growing Critique of "Truth" and "Memory"*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2003.

Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report. Expert Report on Chemical and Technical Aspects of the 'Gas Chambers' of Auschwitz*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2003.

Arthur Ruppin, *The Jewish Fate and Future*, Macmillan, London, 1940.

C.F. Rüter et al. (ed.), *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen*, 28 vols. & reg., University Press, Amsterdam/APA Holland University Press, Amsterdam/Saur, München 1968-2003.

Abram Leon Sachar, *The History of the Jews*, 5th ed., Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1964.

Walter N. Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, IHR, Newport Beach, California, 1983.

Paul Schmidt, *Hitler's Interpreter*, William Heinemann, London, 1951.

Raimund Schnabel, *Macht ohne Moral*, Frankfurt/Main, 1957.

Gerhard Schoenberner, *The Yellow Star*, Transworld, London, 1969. Also in paperback from

- Bantam, New York, 1969. Originally published in German as *Der Gelbe Stern*, 1960 & 1969.
- Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre, *The Katyn Forest Massacre*, part 5, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1952. May be listed under "US House of Representatives; Katyn Forest Massacre."
- Gitta Sereny, *Into That Darkness*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.
- Wolftram Setz, *Lorenzo Vallas Schrift gegen die Konstantinische Schenkung*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 1975.
- William L. Shirer, *End of a Berlin Diary*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1947.
- William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1960.
- Derrick Sington, *Belsen Uncovered*, Duckworth, London, 1946.
- Constance Babington Smith, *Evidence in Camera*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1958.
- Marcus J. Smith, *Dachau, The Harrowing of Hell*, University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1972.
- R. Harris Smith, *OSS*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1972.
- Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Harper & Row, New York, 1973.
- Sonderstandesamt Arolsen (ed.), *Die Sterbebücher von Auschwitz*, Saur, München 1995.
- Albert Speer, *Inside the Third Reich*, Macmillan, New York, 1970.
- Wilhelm Stäglich, *Der Auschwitz Mythos*, Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen, 1979. English translation *Auschwitz; A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, California, 1986.
- Michel Sturdza, *The Suicide of Europe*, Western Islands, Belmont, Massachusetts, 1968. A censored and edited translation of the Romanian language original, *Romania si sfarsitul Europei*, Madrid, 1966.
- Yuri Suhl, ed., *They Fought Back*, Crown, New York, 1967.
- Talmud*, Soncino Press, London, 1936
- Talmud*, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1932.
- Telford Taylor, "The Nuremberg War Crimes Trials," in *International Conciliation* (April 1949), 241-375. Reproduced in following reference.
- Telford Taylor, *Final Report to the Secretary of the Army on the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials Under Control Council Law No. 10*, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC (August 15, 1949). Preceding reference reproduced pp. 121-237.
- R.P. Tew, *Pest Control in Germany during the period 1939-1945*, H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1951.
- H. R. Trevor-Roper, *The Last Days of Hitler*, Macmillan, New York, 1947.
- A. R. Urquhart, *The German Rayon Industry During the Period 1939-1945*, H.M. Stationery Office, London, 1952. This work was number 33 in a series of British postwar studies of intelligence objectives.
- US Chief of Counsel for the Prosecution of Nazi Criminality, *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*, 11 vols., US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1948-1948.
- US Displaced Persons Commission, *The DP Story*, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1952.
- US Special Committee to Study the Rubber Situation, *Report of the Rubber Survey Committee*, US Government Printing Office, September 10, 1942. The bulk of the report is reproduced in Charles Morrow Wilson, *Trees and Test Tubes, the Story of Rubber*, Henry Holt, New York, 1943, 261-330.
- US-WRB (US War Refugee Board), *German Extermination Camps – Auschwitz and Birkenau*, Executive Office of the President, Washington, DC, November 1944. This is the "WRB report" which is also supposed to be document 022-L.
- US-WRB (US War Refugee Board), *Final Summary Report of the Executive Director*, Executive Office of the President, Washington, DC, September 15, 1945.
- Freda Uteley, *The High Cost of Vengeance*, Regnery, Chicago, 1949.
- Frederick J. P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, C. C. Nelson, Appleton, Wisconsin, 1953. New edition from Devin-Adair, New York, 1968.
- Rolf Volgel, ed., *The German Path to Israel*, Oswald Wolff, London, 1969. Foreword by Konrad Adenauer.
- Rudolf Vrba & Alan Bestic, *I Cannot Forgive*, Grove, New York, 1964.

- Rudolf Vrba and Alan Bestic, *44070: The Conspiracy of the Twentieth Century*, Star and Cross, Bellingham, Washington, 1989.
- Sam Waagenaar, *The Pope's Jews*, Alcove Press, London, 1974.
- G. Wahrig, ed., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Bertelsmann Lexikon-Verlag, 1973.
- Alden H. Watt, *Gas Warfare*, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, NY, 1942.
- G. Woker, *Der kommende Gift- und Brandkrieg*, Oldenburg, Leipzig, 1932.
- Yad Vashem (or Washem) Studies*, 8 vols., Jerusalem, 1957-1970.
- Yigael Yadin, *Bar-Kokhba*, Random House, New York and Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1971.
- Harold Zink, *American Military Government in Germany*, Macmillan, New York, 1947.



# Index

## — A —

- Abbé Pierre: 13  
Abetz, Ambassador: 252, 255  
Abwehr, German military intelligence: 50f., 121, 403  
Action Reinhardt: 264, 273  
Adamovic, von: 193  
air photos: 10f., 78f., 187f., 213, 374, 400, 404  
air raid shelter: 445f.  
air raids: 26, 55, 445  
    Allied: 22, 55, 91-94, 175, 187f., 195, 249, 287, 314, 382  
    Auschwitz: 10, 126, 187-190, 289f., 398, 427  
    British: 93, 188  
    Dachau: 64  
    defense: 446  
    German: 93ff., 353  
    Himmler remark: 238, 240  
    Hitler remark: 237  
    oil-related: 188f.  
    Rome: 353ff., 400  
    Russian: 189  
    U.S.: 187  
aircraft factory, underground: 59  
Albania: 49  
Alexandria, Egypt: 295, 383  
Alexandria, VA: 47  
Alfonso of Aragon: 385  
Alsace-Lorraine: 49  
Alstötter: 35  
Altenburg: 195  
American Council for Judaism: 26  
American Friends Service Committee: 275  
American Jewish Committee: 28, 30, 99, 392  
American Jewish Congress: 32, 81, 102f., 111  
Amsterdam: 59, 109, 141, 159, 395  
Antioch: 383  
Antonescu, Ion: 177f.  
Antonescu, Mihai: 177, 257  
Apenszlak, J.: 115  
App, Austin J.: 27, 370  
Arab-Jewish war: 28, 46  
Arabs: 28, 49, 86, 89, 106, 110, 192, 211, 258, 281f., 299f., 387, 406  
Arendt, Hannah: 227  
Aretz, Emil: 26f.  
Arminius: 94f.  
Arndt: 313  
Arnhem: 304  
Aronéanu, Eugène: 57  
Asch, Sholem: 102  
Aschenbrenner, Jupp: 243  
Auschwitz State Museum: 15, 423f.  
Austria: 49, 67, 98, 111f., 260, 265, 276, 281ff., 325  
Auswärtiges Amt: see Foreign Office: German

## — B —

- B'nai B'rith: 202, 277  
Babi Yar (Kiev): 113  
Bäck, Leo: 140, 395  
Baer, Richard: 229  
Baldwin, Hanson: 26, 28, 42  
Balfour Declaration: 258, 282  
Ball, John C.: 404, 485  
Baltic countries (see also individual entries): 30, 351  
Banat: 49  
Baranovichi: 246  
Baranowsky: 325  
Bar-Kokhba: 295, 296  
Barnes, Harry Elmer: 27, 90, 299  
Baronius: 385  
Baruch, Bernard M.: 76, 78, 79, 90, 165  
Basle: 74, 78, 384  
Battle of the Bulge: 40  
Bauer, Yehuda: 428  
Bäuerle, Franz: 313  
BBC: 216, 307, 310  
Beaty, John: 17, 399  
Becher, Kurt: 190, 200  
Becker, August: 242, 247  
Begin, Menachem: 387  
Beineburg, GLt: 344  
Beker, J. K.: 293  
Belgium: 50, 109, 111, 131, 252, 265, 283, 284, 321, 347, 395  
Belgrade: 83, 170, 279  
Bellacita: 178  
Benes, Edward: 272, 399  
Ben-Gurion, David: 190  
Bennett, John: 374  
Bentley, Elisabeth: 87  
Berger, Gottlob: 239, 402  
Berlin: passim  
Bermuda: 86  
Bermuda Conference: 105, 108, 109  
Bern: 89, 109, 115, 123, 399  
Bernays, Murray C.: 38  
Bernstein, Bernard: 90  
Bessarabia: 109, 177  
Bessarabia, ship: 177  
Bestic, Alan: 125  
Beth Jacob School: 102  
Bethar (Bittir): 295, 296  
Bethell, Nicholas: 299  
Bethlen, Count: 194  
Bettelheim, Bruno: 150  
Bialystok: 109, 269, 271  
Bickerbach, Prof.: 343  
Biddle, Francis: 37, 202  
Bird, Eugene K.: 299  
Birobidzhan: 272, 273  
Bischoff, Karl: 417  
Bismarck, Otto von: 346  
Bittkau: 314  
Blaha, Franz: 65  
Blechhammer: 189  
Blitz: 93  
Blomberg, Werner von: 50  
Blum, John M.: 81  
Boehm, Eric H.: 268, 407  
Boer War: 162  
Bohemia-Moravia: 49, 51, 58, 145, 181, 182, 253, 260, 351  
Borgongini-Duca, Francesco: 350  
Bormann, Martin: 39, 208, 209  
Boxer, Barbara: 13  
Brack, Viktor: 215, 216, 243  
Braham, Randolph L.: 211  
Brand, Joel: 134, 211, 212  
Brandt: 146  
Brandt, Karl: 35  
Brandt, Willy: 292, 293, 294  
Bratislava: 125, 128, 170, 172, 253, 254, 257, 401  
Breitman, Richard: 10  
Brescia, Arnold of: 383  
Brest-Litovsk: 108, 360  
Brezezna: 90  
Broad, Pery: 426  
Brooks, Senator: 464  
Brüning, Heinrich: 303  
Bryce, Lord: 287  
Bucharest: 170, 176, 177, 178, 179, 253, 257  
Buchholz: 313  
Buck: 343  
Budapest: 105, 121, 124, 125, 170, 173, 174, 175, 176, 180, 181, 182, 184, 186, 187, 190,

- 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197,  
210, 213, 279
- Buffarini, Guido: 350
- Bukovina: 109, 177, 286
- Bulgaria: 30, 49, 177, 178, 207,  
255, 256, 257
- Buna: see rubber: synthetic
- Bund: 397
- Bunker: 139, 410, 425, 477
- Burckhardt, Carl Jacob: 83, 84,  
207
- Burg, J. G.: see Ginsburg, Josef
- Burger, StF: 337
- Burney, Christopher: 60, 62
- Burzio, Giuseppe: 127, 128, 347,  
348, 360
- Buss, Felix: 313
- Butz, Arthur R.: 363, 365, 376,  
380, 392
- Byzantia: 383, 384
- C —
- Calley: 208
- Cambodia: 22
- camps
- Andersonville: 162
- Auschwitz: passim
- Auschwitz I (*Stammlager*):  
69, 70, 71, 79, 118, 120,  
142, 143, 144, 145, 148,  
153, 154, 158, 219, 232,  
410, 411, 416, 417, 425,  
426, 435, 443, 446
- Beaune la Rolande: 321, 322
- Belzec: 56, 85, 90, 102, 114,  
115, 132, 136, 183, 215,  
264, 305, 307, 308, 357,  
393, 404, 405, 424
- Bergen-Belsen: 21, 55, 56, 58,  
59, 62, 66, 90, 136, 158,  
162, 212, 218, 234, 309,  
310, 314, 319, 336, 337,  
338, 339, 340, 341, 342,  
343, 344, 398, 407
- Beuchow: 59
- Birkenau (Auschwitz II): 10,  
57, 69, 70, 71, 72, 79, 80,  
89, 90, 117, 118, 119, 120,  
123, 125, 133, 135, 139,  
140, 141, 143, 144, 145,  
147, 149, 150, 151, 153,  
154, 155, 156, 157, 158,  
159, 161, 164, 165, 166,  
185, 186, 218, 219, 223,  
226, 258, 261, 319, 320,  
321, 322, 323, 343, 360,  
398, 410, 411, 416, 417,  
421, 423, 424, 425, 426,  
431, 433, 435, 443, 455,  
477
- Buchenwald: 8, 25, 40, 55, 56,  
59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 90,  
119, 148, 162, 163, 216,  
222, 231, 309, 314, 370,  
398, 407, 414, 415, 416
- Chelmno: 56, 85, 90, 102,  
114, 115, 215, 247, 357
- Dachau: 21, 40, 55, 56, 58, 59,  
62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 90,  
130, 133, 138, 157, 162,  
163, 201, 221, 309, 313,  
314, 315, 325, 326, 328,  
350, 407, 414, 415, 416
- displaced persons: 24, 276,  
277, 280, 281, 286
- Dora: 59
- Douglas: 162
- Drancy: 104, 321, 322, 323
- Ellrich: 59
- Elsing: 59
- Flossenbürg: 40, 119, 162
- Gandersheim: 59
- Gross-Rosen: 119, 138, 162
- Gurs: 171
- Gusen: 119, 160, 162, 309,  
310
- Halberstadt: 59
- Hartheim: 67
- Herzogenbusch: 162
- Kistarcea: 174
- Kolo: 264
- Kulmhof: see Chelmno
- Majdanek: 56, 57, 81, 117,  
138, 155, 162, 212, 215,  
217, 261, 264, 274, 304,  
305, 311
- Marienka: 172
- Mauthausen: 63, 90, 119, 131,  
160, 162, 309, 310, 314,  
325, 326
- Mechelen: 321, 322, 323
- Monowitz (Auschwitz III): 70,  
71, 120, 142, 144, 153,  
154, 158, 217, 319, 425
- Natzweiler: 162, 220, 329,  
333, 343
- Neuengamme: 162, 334
- Oranienburg: 137, 309, 310,  
314
- Pithiviers: 321, 322
- POW: 69, 162
- Ravensbrück: 90, 162, 319
- recreational activities: 71
- Rock Island: 162
- Sachsenhausen: 70, 90, 119,  
130, 162, 163, 325, 334
- Sered: 172
- Sobibor: 215, 261, 264, 304,  
319, 393, 404, 405, 424
- Struthof: 343
- Stutthof: 162
- Treblinka: 21, 56, 90, 110,  
111, 114, 115, 132, 135,  
136, 139, 215, 261, 270,  
290, 304, 307, 308, 360,  
380, 393, 404, 405, 406,  
424
- Vittel: 171
- Westerbork: 58, 158, 319,  
320, 321, 322, 323
- Wolzek: 132
- Canada: 285, 424
- Canada area, Auschwitz: 126, 156
- Canaris, Wilhelm: 50, 51, 78, 403
- cannibalism: 340
- Carpatho-Ukraine: 186, 272
- Carter, Kit C.: 188
- Cassius Dio: 295
- Cavendish-Bentinck, William:  
399
- Central Intelligence Agency  
(CIA): 11, 121, 147, 374, 400
- Central State Archives in  
Moscow: 423, 433
- Centre de Documentation juive  
contemporaine: 32, 33, 297,  
312
- Chamberlin, William Henry: 298
- Chambers, Whittaker: 87
- Chicago Tribune: 45, 208, 278
- China: 275, 406
- Christophersen, Thies: 8, 27, 153,  
154, 163, 164, 165, 189, 370
- Churchill, Winston: 50, 81, 98,  
109, 274, 391, 396, 399
- Clark, Attorney General: 203
- Clay, Lucius D.: 42, 61, 62, 280
- CODOH: 448
- Cohen, Elie A.: 141, 142, 144,  
145, 150
- Cohen, Meyer: 278
- Colby, Benjamin: 93, 95
- Colvin, Ian: 50, 51, 107
- Comité International  
d'Auschwitz: 232
- Commonweal: 114
- Communism, Communist: 27, 30,  
31, 32, 33, 57, 87, 88, 89, 91,  
121, 122, 142, 143, 202, 205,  
209, 235, 265, 266, 269, 273,  
345, 346
- Compton, Karl T.: 76
- Conant, James D.: 76
- Constantine, Donation of: 21,  
362, 363, 383, 386
- Constantine, Emperor: 22, 383,

- 384  
Constantinople: 383  
Conway, John S.: 424, 427, 428  
Cracow: 108, 118, 119, 121, 185, 269, 355  
Cramer, Myron C.: 39  
Craven, Wesley F.: 188  
cremation capacity  
    Auschwitz: 119, 151, 400, 410, 411, 413, 415, 416, 435  
    Buchenwald: 414, 415, 416  
    Dachau: 414, 415, 416  
    German camps: 414  
Croatia: 49, 168, 172, 179, 180, 181, 183, 253, 255, 347, 348  
Crowell, Samuel: 443, 448  
Cusanus, Nikolaus von: 384  
Cyclon: see Zyklon B  
Cyprus: 295  
Cyrenaica: 295  
Czechoslovakia: 24, 30, 32, 49, 98, 99, 111, 124, 125, 131, 168, 181, 185, 187, 265, 272, 279, 283, 284, 307, 308, 346, 399, 401  
Czernowitz: 177, 286
- D —  
Dachau, town: 64  
Daily Herald: 95  
Daily Northwestern: 21  
Daily Telegraph: 47  
Dante, Alighieri: 383  
Darquier de Pellepoix, Louis: 373  
Das Reich: 91, 116  
Das Schwarze Korps: 345  
Davidson, Eugene: 223  
Davis, William R.: 202  
Dawidowicz, Lucy: 24, 269, 270, 297, 357  
D-Day: 81, 187, 212  
DDT: 137  
Deane, Ernest C.: 45  
DEGESCH: 136, 137, 138, 309, 314, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435  
delousing: 21, 132, 147, 165, 409, 418, 419  
Denmark: 50, 109, 140, 265, 283  
deportations: passim  
Deutsche Ausrüstungswerke: 148, 156  
diamond cutting: 59  
Dibelius, Otto: 308, 312, 313, 314  
Diesel engine: 115, 136, 305, 306, 307, 401  
disinfection: 56  
disinfestation: 65, 67, 136, 137, 138, 165, 304, 309, 314, 367, 402, 412, 435, 447, 454, 470  
displaced persons: 145, 276, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 284, 406  
Diwald, Hellmut: 372, 373, 374  
Dniester: 177  
Dohnanyi, Hans von: 403  
Donovan, William: 121, 122  
Dora: 90  
Douglas-Hamilton, James: 299  
Dr. Klein: 340, 341  
Drägerwerke: 434  
Dresden: 22, 55, 249, 382  
DuBois, Josiah: 47, 48, 81, 87, 88, 89, 115, 143, 152, 200  
DuBost, Charles: 137  
Dulles, Allen: 107  
Dunant, George: 401  
Duprat, François: 371
- E —  
East Indies: 73  
East London Observer: 115  
Economic-Administrative Main Office: see WVHA  
Eden, Anthony: 108, 185, 398  
Eggleston, George T.: 203  
Egypt: 295  
Ehlers, Hermann: 313, 314  
Eichmann, Karl Adolf: 23, 25, 53, 105, 112, 125, 134, 145, 146, 181, 182, 190, 192, 193, 194, 198, 199, 200, 208, 224, 226, 227, 228, 229, 234, 235, 259, 267, 366, 372, 401  
    debut in wartime propaganda: 112  
Eike, Theodor: 326, 342  
Eill: 329  
Einsatzgruppen: 35, 36, 56, 106, 218, 241, 242, 243, 246, 247, 248, 249, 261, 262, 285  
Einstein: 41  
Einstein Fund: 273  
Einstein, Albert: 273  
Eisenhower, Dwight D.: 122, 278, 279  
Eiserle: 329, 330, 332  
Elias, Joseph: 123, 127  
Elowitz, Morris: 42  
Elss, Ebbe: 313  
Endlösung: see Final Solution  
England: passim  
Entress, Friedrich: 139  
Epstein, Julius: 298, 299  
Eskimos: 345, 389  
Estonia: 30, 49, 91, 111, 283  
Eusebius: 295  
euthanasia: 35, 216, 217, 304  
Everett, Willis M.: 42
- Every: 64  
extermination  
    by asphyxiation: 114, 242, 350, 393  
    by blood poisoning: 102  
    by electrocution: 102, 114, 115, 183, 393  
    by gas chamber: see gas chambers, homicidal  
    by lime and chlorine: 393  
    by phenol injections: 159
- F —  
Fadiman, Clifton: 94, 95, 96  
Fajnzylberg: 426  
Fanton, Dwight: 42  
Farago, Ladislav: 208  
Farley, James A.: 202  
Faschingbauer: 329  
Faulhaber, Michael von: 216  
Faurisson, Robert: 365, 368, 370, 373, 374, 376, 382, 388, 409, 417, 429, 433, 434, 435, 439, 440, 444, 445  
Feingold, Henry L.: 81  
Felderer, Ditleb: 371  
fertilizer, from human corpses: 83, 296  
Final Solution: 36, 123, 251, 252, 257, 259, 260, 263, 271, 369, 374, 376, 377  
    definition: 21  
Finland: 49  
First Amendment: 14  
Fischer, Ludwig: 112  
flames, chimneys in Auschwitz: 152  
Flick: 35  
flying saucers: 289  
Flynn, John T.: 91  
Foreign Office  
    British: 86, 398, 399  
    German: 83, 101, 116, 145, 190, 191, 193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256, 257, 267, 346, 352  
    Swedish: 311, 312  
    U.S.: see U.S. State Department  
    Vatican: 354  
Foust, Hal: 45, 46, 278  
Frahm, Herbert Ernst Karl: see Brandt, Willy  
France: 32, 39, 50, 73, 87, 88, 99, 100, 104, 109, 111, 131, 171, 201, 205, 251, 252, 255, 265, 279, 283, 284, 285, 321, 346, 347, 361, 362, 373, 395, 399,

- 435  
 Frank, Anne: 59  
 Frank, family: 59  
 Frank, Hans: 222  
 Frankfurter, Felix: 82, 399  
 Frankland: 188  
 Franz, August: 314  
 Freemasons: 234  
 Frericks, UStF: 338  
 Frick, Wilhelm: 201  
 Friedman, Filip: 189  
 Fritsch, Werner von: 50  
 Frumkin, Gregory (Grzegorz): 32  
 Frydman, Szajko: 244
- G —
- Galicja: 103  
 Garlinski, Jozef: 126, 127  
 Garner, John N.: 202  
 gas chambers, disinfestation: 65, 67, 136, 138, 314, 409, 418, 419, 432, 433, 447, 454, 470  
 gas chambers, homicidal: 9, 10, 17, 23, 25, 26, 56, 67, 102, 108, 135, 141, 151, 154, 247, 263, 271, 287, 299, 367, 388, 389, 393, 394, 395, 398, 401, 402, 410, 414  
 Auschwitz: 11, 14, 67, 89, 114, 142, 154, 230, 309, 429  
 Belzec: 306, 307  
 Birkenau: 71, 79, 118, 127, 132, 139, 140, 149, 154, 156, 157, 165, 185, 187, 188, 219, 223, 226, 290, 336, 343, 344, 411, 417, 418, 419, 428, 433, 435, 444, 445, 446, 447  
 Brest-Litovsk: 360  
 Cracow: 269  
 Dachau: 43, 62, 64, 65, 67, 138, 461, 464, 467, 470  
 Diesel: 305  
 euthanasia: 216  
 Gerstein: 137, 306, 311  
 Gusen: 309  
 Hungary: 184  
 Japan: 389  
 Majdanek: 155  
 Mauthausen: 309  
 Northwestern University: 429  
 Poland: 216, 262  
 Struthof: 343  
 Treblinka: 132, 308, 360  
 USA: 431  
 gas detectors: 433, 434, 435, 440  
 gas shelter: 445, 446, 447, 448  
 gas truck: 56, 91, 115, 241, 242, 246, 247, 357  
 gasmobile: see gas truck  
 Gaus, Friedrich: 204, 205  
 Geiger: 191, 198  
 General Government of Poland: 49, 132, 146, 192, 264, 270, 357, 392  
 Geneva: 81, 82, 84, 103, 167, 176, 207, 347, 393, 425  
 Geneva conventions: 46, 70, 90, 173  
 Germany: passim  
 Gerstein, Kurt: 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315  
 Gerstein, Kurt: 8, 137, 138, 215, 216, 217, 303, 345  
 Gestapo: 50, 51, 53, 104, 124, 131, 132, 145, 176, 224, 225, 240, 245, 282, 303, 304, 327, 328, 329, 332, 343, 423, 427  
 Gewecke: 245  
 Gilbert, G.M.: 220, 221  
 Gilbert, Martin: 10, 391, 392, 393, 425  
 Ginsburg, Josef: 26, 286, 352  
 Globocnik, Odilio: 304, 305  
 Glücks, Richard: 52, 134, 135, 139, 160, 191, 328, 330, 333, 336, 337, 342, 343  
 Goddard Arthur: 299  
 Goebbels, Joseph: 34, 49, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 116, 241, 309  
 Goedecker, Bernhard J.: 313  
 gold teeth: 132, 307, 448  
 Goldman, Nahum: 393  
 Goldstein, Israel: 100, 106  
 Göring, Hermann: 23, 34, 35, 36, 49, 201, 202, 207, 208, 220, 221, 222, 223, 234, 240, 251, 252, 253, 259, 261, 263  
 Grabert, Wigbert: 292, 487  
 Grafeneck: 304  
 Graham, Robert A.: 8, 346, 361, 362, 363  
 Grant, Michael: 295  
 Grayzel, Solomon: 262, 263  
 Great Britain: passim  
 Greece: 59, 108, 111, 131, 171, 265, 283, 358  
 Greifelt, Ulrich: 35, 53  
 Greiser, Artur: 146  
 Grenfell, Russell: 298  
 Grese, Irma: 460  
 Grodno: 109, 269, 271  
 Grosch, Wolfgang: 156  
 Grundlach, HStF: 309  
 Guenther, Hans F.K.: 309  
 Guenther, Rolf: 304, 308, 309, 314
- Guggenheim, Paul: 81, 82, 83, 84  
 Guillaume, Günter: 294  
 Gun, Nerin E.: 64, 65  
 gypsies: 32, 227, 242, 247, 248, 268, 325, 382  
 gypsy camp: 158, 165, 425
- H —
- Haas, StF: 337  
 Habsburg Empire: 69  
 Hadamar: 221, 304  
 Hadrian: 295, 296  
 Haensch, Walter: 248  
 Häfliger: 205  
 Haganah: 46  
 Hague Conventions: 90, 178  
 Hague, The: 15, 73, 74  
 Hamburg: 22, 93, 249  
 Hanke, Karl: 222  
 Hargreaves, Reginald: 96  
 Harmense: 70, 71  
 Harrison, Leland: 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 115, 278  
 Hartenstein: 333, 336, 343  
 Harvard: 8, 38, 76, 202  
 Harwood, Richard: 27, 370, 371, 373  
 Hau Eisen: 313  
 Havana: 86  
 head, shrunken: 60  
 Heckenholt: 305, 306, 307  
 Hemingway, Ernest: 95  
 Hencke, Andor: 192, 198  
 Hendrik: 313  
 Hertz, Rabbi: 103  
 Hess, Rudolf: 34, 299  
 Heydrich, Reinhard: 34, 36, 50, 51, 52, 131, 135, 145, 182, 224, 243, 245, 251, 252, 253, 259, 260, 261, 262, 382  
 Hilberg, Raul: 10, 18, 24, 25, 33, 36, 83, 130, 136, 138, 154, 156, 160, 189, 199, 216, 217, 261, 262, 264, 265, 288, 289, 290, 297, 388, 405, 406, 407, 419, 428, 444  
 credentials: 297  
 on Vergasungskeller: 419  
 Hildebrandt, Richard: 53, 267, 268  
 Hilldring, J. H.: 48, 49  
 Hillel: 375  
 Hilmer, OSF: 338  
 Himmler, Heinrich: 34, 36, 49, 50, 51, 52, 71, 119, 126, 127, 134, 135, 139, 145, 146, 147, 160, 166, 182, 190, 200, 211, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 243,

- 244, 245, 247, 262, 287, 305,  
308, 309, 343, 401, 402, 412,  
417  
on crematories: 287, 417  
Posen speech: 237, 238, 239,  
240, 244  
visit to Auschwitz: 126  
Hiroshima: 22, 249, 382  
Hirschfeld, Hans: 293, 294  
Hirt, Prof.: 343  
Hiss, Alger: 87  
Hiss, Donald: 87  
Hitler, Adolf: 10, 22, 30, 34, 36,  
49, 51, 68, 84, 86, 87, 92, 93,  
94, 95, 96, 97, 100, 101, 103,  
107, 112, 138, 139, 173, 184,  
206, 216, 219, 220, 221, 222,  
224, 234, 236, 237, 243, 246,  
262, 293, 294, 305, 311, 327,  
345, 350, 356, 382, 388, 401,  
402, 403  
opposition: 22, 403  
proposed excommunication:  
356  
testament: 237  
Hochhuth, Rolf: 26, 137, 345,  
361  
Hofmann, Franz: 232  
Hofmann, Otto: 53  
Hoggan, David L.: 298  
Holland: see Netherlands  
Holocaust revisionism: 21, 409,  
428  
introduction to: 21  
Holocaust, NBC-TV  
‘docudrama’: 13, 371  
homosexuals: 309  
Hoover, Herbert: 202  
Horstmann, HStF: 341  
Horthy, Miklós: 172, 173, 174,  
181, 186, 195, 197, 236, 237  
hospital  
Auschwitz: 120, 142, 144,  
145, 328, 333, 334  
Bergen-Belsen: 338  
Buchenwald: 60  
Dachau: 66, 328  
Monowitz: 71, 144, 158, 319  
Natzweiler: 330  
Höss, Rudolf: 130, 133, 134, 135,  
139, 141, 147, 151, 152, 153,  
154, 157, 164, 166, 190, 199,  
215, 216, 219, 225, 229, 230,  
240, 248, 262, 327, 334, 335,  
343, 405, 410, 411, 426  
Höttl, Wilhelm: 105, 106, 107,  
229  
Howard, Frank A.: 73, 74, 76, 77  
Huene, Baron von: 313  
Huettig: 329  
Hugenberg, Alfred: 312  
Hull, Cordell: 34, 81, 87, 88, 185  
Hüls: 69, 78  
Hungary: 10, 30, 32, 49, 86, 109,  
121, 122, 123, 124, 131, 134,  
168, 171, 172, 173, 174, 179,  
180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 186,  
189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194,  
195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 209,  
210, 211, 212, 222, 252, 257,  
265, 271, 283, 290, 347, 349,  
395, 428  
Hutton, J. Bernard: 299  
Hyman, Joseph C.: 179  
— I —  
I.G. Farbenindustrie AG: 35, 36,  
44, 47, 48, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73,  
74, 75, 78, 115, 120, 150, 153,  
154, 158, 217, 226, 438  
ICRC/IRC: see Red Cross  
Illinois: 410  
India: 266  
Indiana: 410  
Innitzer, Theodor: 355, 356  
Institut für Zeitgeschichte: 67,  
312  
International Tracing Service:  
127, 414, 415  
Iran: 266  
Irish rebellion: 249  
Iron Guard: 176  
Irving, David: 388  
Israel: 49, 124, 129, 190, 206,  
208, 226, 227, 229, 234, 235,  
266, 281, 282, 286, 291, 300,  
301, 345, 368, 387, 393, 445  
Israel, Fred L.: 81  
Istanbul: 178, 275, 358  
Italy: 49, 97, 109, 111, 123, 168,  
187, 199, 200, 265, 275, 279,  
283, 284, 345, 350, 355, 383,  
384  
Iwaszko, T.: 424  
— J —  
Jackson, Robert H.: 38, 39, 40,  
43, 44, 208, 209, 220, 234  
Jacob, Bruno: 42  
Jadin: 343  
Jährling, Rudolf: 447, 448  
Janisch, Josef: 149  
Jankowski: 426  
Japan: 47, 73  
Jaross: 194  
Jefferson, Thomas: 205  
Jehovah’s Witnesses: 57  
Jerusalem: 46, 47, 49, 53, 100,  
125, 226, 227, 291, 295, 310,  
383, 391  
Hebrew University: 28, 127  
Jewish Agency: 100, 105, 122,  
393, 396, 399, 425  
Jewish Chronicle: 109  
Jewish immigration  
to Palestine: 106, 211, 277,  
281, 282  
to USA: 29, 274, 277, 282,  
283  
Jewish Labor Committee: 114  
Jewish leaders: 22, 121, 361, 395,  
410, 425  
Jewish population statistics: 21,  
28, 30, 31, 32, 146, 251, 264,  
273, 285, 286, 287, 366, 375  
Jewish soap: see soap  
Jo’Passtor Bizottsag: 123, 175  
Joan of Arc: 233  
Joffroy, Pierre: 312  
John, Otto: 51  
Johnson, Edwin C.: 106  
Joint Distribution Committee:  
170, 179, 266, 269, 273, 274,  
279, 392, 396, 397  
Jones, Jesse H.: 74, 75, 76  
Jonowska: 90  
Jüdische Unterstützungsstelle,  
JUS: 269, 396  
Jung, Seth: 102  
Jüttner, Hans: 135  
— K —  
Kallay, Nicholas von: 109  
Kaltenbrunner, Ernst: 51, 52, 63,  
84, 107, 130, 131, 145, 152,  
207, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224,  
225, 268, 366  
Kammler, Hans: 147, 148, 417  
Kanada: 427  
Karski, Jan: 393, 394, 399  
Kasche, Minister: 255  
Kastner, Rudolf: 190  
Kattowitz (Katowice): 69, 72,  
104, 108, 143, 158, 327, 328  
Katyn: 206, 207, 208, 244, 299,  
358  
Katzmann, Fritz: 146  
Kaufman, Dr. Kurt: 152, 153  
Keitel, Wilhelm: 207  
Kelley, Douglas M.: 34, 35, 223  
Kempner, Robert M. W.: 48, 200,  
201, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207,  
208, 209, 213, 239, 240, 293  
Kennedy, John F.: 23, 51  
Kharkov: 183  
Kiev: 112, 113  
Killinger, Ambassador von: 256

- Kirschbaum, Joseph: 41, 42  
 Kirschneck, Hans: 149  
 Klieger, Ruth: 278  
 Klukowski: 264  
 Knobloch: 245  
 Knoll, Fritz: 333  
 Koch, Erich: 60, 61, 62, 299  
 Koch, Ilse: 60, 61, 62, 299  
 Koch, Karl: 313, 314  
 Koehl, Robert L.: 263, 264, 270  
 Königsberg: 109  
 Korherr Report: 146, 265, 270  
 Korherr Richard: 146  
 Korzen, Meir: 266, 272, 280, 286  
 Kosinski, Leszek A.: 31, 32  
 Kovno: 269, 271  
 Krakowski, Shmuel: 428  
 Kramer, Josef: 56, 218, 219, 220, 225, 234, 235, 325, 336, 343  
 Krantz, Fritz: 310  
 Krasnodar: 247  
 Krauch, Karl: 35  
 Kremer, T.: 149, 150  
 Kripo (German Criminal Police): 50, 131, 217  
 Krume, Hermann: 145  
 Krupp: 36, 71, 134  
 Krupp, Alfred: 39  
 Krupp, Gustav: 35, 39  
 Kube, Wilhelm: 244, 245  
 Kubek, Anthony: 81  
 Kubovy, Aryeh Leon: 36  
 Kuckertz: 338  
 Kulka, Erich: 127, 424, 425, 428  
 Kvaternik, Eugene: 348  
  
 — L —  
 Lademacher, USF: 338  
 Lagerfelt, Baron: 311  
 LaGuardia, Fiorello: 48, 275, 278  
 lampshades (human skin): 17, 60, 61, 62, 65  
 Langbein, Hermann: 37  
 Lánik, Josef: 424, 427  
 Laqueur, Walter: 10, 362, 363, 391, 392, 439  
 Laternser, Hans: 37  
 Latvia: 30, 49, 52, 91, 111, 140, 268, 269, 283  
 Law, Richard: 398  
 Lawrence, Charles: 42  
 Lawrence, William H.: 112, 155  
 Laws, judge: 204  
 Leeb, Wilhelm von: 35  
 Lehman, Herbert: 275, 277  
 Leibbrandt, Georg: 244  
 Lemberg: see Lwow  
 Lenz, Johann M.: 64  
 Leoni: 315  
  
 Lerman, Miles: 13  
 Lersner, Baron von: 358  
 Leuchter, Fred A.: 14, 409  
 Levi, Primo: 189  
 Levin, Nora: 24, 189, 297  
 Levy, Joseph M.: 184  
 Lewis, John L.: 202  
 Ley, Robert: 39, 109  
 Liaison Office for Ethnic Germans, VoMi: 53  
 Lichtheim, Richard: 393, 425  
 Lidice: 145, 183, 382  
 Life magazine: 228, 229  
 Lincoln, Abraham: 51, 97  
 Linden: 64  
 Lindner, Herbert: 305  
 Linfield, H. S.: 28, 29, 30  
 Linsmeier: 338  
 Linz: 67, 112, 309, 310, 326  
 Lisbon: 51, 86, 392  
 List, Wilhelm: 35  
 Lithuania: 30, 49, 91, 111, 246, 269, 283  
 Litzmannstadt: see Lodz  
 Lochner, Louis P.: 241  
 Lodz: 145, 227  
 Lodz, Ghetto of: 104, 146, 227, 269, 270, 351, 357  
 Lohse, Hinrich: 146, 215, 243, 244, 245  
 Lolling, Dr.: 337, 341  
 London: 15, 37, 38, 39, 47, 82, 90, 95, 98, 99, 101, 104, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 183, 185, 206, 311, 348, 371, 391, 393, 396, 398, 399  
 London Agreement: 39  
 Long, J. Breckenridge: 81, 85, 86, 87, 89, 105  
 Lorenz, Werner: 53  
 Loritz: 325  
 Lubell, Sam: 76  
 Lublin: see Majdanek  
 Ludin: 194  
 Ludwigshafen: 68, 69, 72, 78  
 Luther, Martin: 251, 257, 267, 385  
 Luxembourg: 24, 109, 265, 330  
 Luxembourg Treaty: 300, 301  
 Lwow: 269, 271, 286, 304, 305, 347  
  
 — M —  
 Madagascar: 251, 252, 258  
 Magee, Warren E.: 204  
 Maglione, Luigi: 347, 350, 353, 354, 357, 360  
 Malaria: 72  
 Malaya: 73  
  
 Malmédy: 40, 42  
 Maloney, William P.: 202  
 Malvezzi: 347  
 Mann, Golo: 372  
 Mann, Thomas: 216  
 Marcone, Abbé: 348  
 Marcus, David: 46, 47, 48, 49, 90, 129, 406  
 Marcuse, Herbert: 201, 293  
 Marie-Benoît: 361  
 Maritain, Jacques: 114  
 Maritza, ship: 178  
 Markov, Marko: 207  
 Martin, James J.: 91, 95  
 Mary, Queen of Scots: 233  
 Mason, Frank E.: 241  
 Maurer: 337  
 Mayer, Saly: 392, 401  
 McClelland, R. D.: 123  
 McDonough, George A.: 41  
 McGown, Harold D.: 42, 43  
 McHaney, James M.: 209  
 McNamee, Joseph T.: 280  
 Meader, George: 280, 281  
 medical experiments: 35, 57, 59, 60, 132, 144, 220  
 Meer, Ter: 115  
 Meglio, Giuseppe Di: 351, 352, 358  
 Meier, Franz: 327  
 Meier, OstF: 330  
 Mein Kampf: 294  
 Meisel, Yankel: 126  
 Mengele, Josef: 335, 336  
 Menne, Alex: 313  
 Menzel: 41  
 Messing, Heinrich: 447, 448  
 Meyer: 327, 338  
 Meyer, Keith: 342  
 Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw: 112  
 Milch, Erhard: 35  
 Mildner, Rudolf: 132, 133  
 Milka, ship: 178  
 Minsk: 91, 140, 206, 245, 246, 267, 273  
 Minskoff: 143, 226  
 Mirbach, von: 194, 195, 198  
 MIT: 76  
 Mittelelungen: 357  
 Mochalski: 313  
 Molotov, Vyacheslav M.: 246  
 Momigliano, Arnaldo: 8  
 Mommsen: 8  
 Monsky, Henry: 277  
 Montini, Giovanni: 357  
 Morale Operations Branch (MO): 122  
 Mordowicz, Czeslaw: 127, 424  
 Morgan, Frederick E.: 277, 278,

- 279  
Morgen, Konrad: 60, 216, 217, 219  
Morgenthau Plan: 81, 90  
Morgenthau, Henry jr.: 34, 81, 85, 87, 88, 89, 90, 122, 274, 399  
Morikawa, T.: 437, 438  
Morse, Arthur D.: 81  
Moscow: 101, 205, 206, 246, 293, 423, 433  
Mother Teresa: 13  
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick: 300  
Mueller, Robert: 188  
Mulka, Robert K. L.: 230, 232, 381  
Müller: 344  
Müller, Filip: 125, 426  
Müller, Heinrich, Gestapo: 50, 131  
Müller, USF: 338  
Münch, Hans: 143, 226  
Munich: 26, 40, 67, 216, 243, 286, 312, 313, 315, 325, 329, 350, 371  
Mussolini, Benito: 200, 345
- N —  
Nagasaki: 22, 249  
Nanking: 183  
Nation: 205  
Nation Europa: 189, 370  
National Review: 96  
Naumann, Bernd: 37  
Naville, F.: 207  
Nebe, Arthur: 50, 242  
Nebelthau: 313  
Netherlands: 24, 50, 58, 93, 98, 109, 110, 111, 120, 131, 141, 142, 223, 252, 265, 273, 283, 319, 347, 357, 358, 395  
Neumann, J. Oskar: 124, 260  
New Deal: 275, 353  
New Republic: 114  
New York City: 22, 32, 38, 46, 73, 86, 89, 90, 91, 101, 102, 114, 150, 170, 172, 176, 179, 202, 203, 244, 266, 269, 273, 275, 285, 293, 297, 357, 362, 382, 392, 424  
New York Review: 9  
New York State: 124, 205, 275  
New York Times: 9, 26, 28, 34, 41, 46, 62, 82, 85, 91, 97, 100, 104, 105, 108, 113, 116, 183, 198, 201, 208, 246, 260, 270, 293, 371, 373, 374, 375  
New York University: 374  
New Yorker: 94
- Nice: 201  
Niemöller, Martin: 137, 308, 310, 312, 313, 314, 315  
Niemöller, Mrs.: 315  
Nieuwenhuizen, Emil: 313  
Nikitchenko, J.T.: 38  
Northwestern University: 8, 13, 15, 371, 374, 375, 429  
Norway: 50, 74, 111, 265, 293  
Novaky: 427  
Nyiszli, Miklos: 149, 150, 405  
Nyiszli, N. Margareta: 150
- O —  
Obermeyer: 307  
Odessa: 91, 109  
Office of Strategic Services, OSS: 83, 107, 121, 122, 142, 201, 293, 350  
Office of War Information, OWI: 122, 143, 220, 424  
Ohlendorf, Otto: 35, 242, 247, 248  
oil: 67, 68, 72, 73, 75, 78, 89, 152, 155, 187, 188, 189, 202, 300, 374, 398, 423  
open air cremations: 79, 118, 119, 120, 147, 150, 186, 212  
Operation 'Keelhaul': 298, 299  
Oranienburg: 57, 118, 121, 134, 304, 327, 328, 329, 336  
Organization Todt: 191, 192  
Orsenigo, Cesare: 312, 346, 351, 355, 356, 357, 358  
Osborne, F. D'Arcy: 353, 354  
Oslo: 107  
Osservatore Romano: 350  
Ossipova: 245, 246  
Oster, Hans: 22, 403  
Oswego, NY: 29, 275  
Oswiecim = Auschwitz, passim  
Otte: 241  
Otter, Baron von: 308, 311, 312, 315  
Oven, Wilfred von: 241  
Overmeyer: 305
- P —  
Paassen, Pierre van: 108  
Palestine: 21, 25, 28, 29, 31, 46, 49, 52, 85, 86, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112, 114, 122, 173, 174, 177, 178, 192, 211, 212, 258, 274, 275, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 284, 285, 286, 294, 295, 296, 299, 347, 366, 397, 406, 407  
Palmyra: 102  
Panzer, Friedrich: 50
- Papen, Fritz von: 358, 359  
Paris: 32, 48, 138, 252, 278, 297, 312, 346  
Parkman, Francis: 8  
partisans: 26, 69, 104, 241, 242, 245, 246, 248, 249, 266  
Patek: 64  
Patton, George S.: 278, 279  
Pearl Harbor: 73, 74, 88, 203  
Pearson, Drew: 202  
Pehle, John: 87, 88  
Peiper, Joachim: 42, 43  
Perl, William: 42  
Persia: 266  
Peter: 329, 330  
Petersen: 239  
Pfannenstiel, Wilhelm: 304, 305, 306, 308, 310  
Pickard: 330  
Pinter, Stephen S.: 66  
Piorowski: 329  
Pister, Hermann: 60  
Ploesti: 187, 188, 189  
Plorin: 327  
Podulka, Petr: 127, 424  
Pohl, Oswald: 35, 52, 131, 135, 139, 150, 160, 163, 164, 219, 225, 238, 240, 330, 333, 336, 341, 342  
Poland: passim  
Poliakov, Leon: 24, 53, 145, 297  
Polish exile government: 82, 115, 206, 348, 393, 396  
Ponger, Kurt: 107  
Pope  
  John XXIII: 358  
  Paul VI: 357  
  Pius XI: 346  
  Pius XII: 11, 146, 345, 346, 348, 349, 350, 354, 355, 360, 361, 366  
  Sylvester I: 383, 384  
Popoff, Minister: 255, 256  
Portugal: 50, 78, 174  
Posen: 237, 239  
Potau: 327  
Powers, judge: 239  
Prague: 99, 261, 304  
Pressac, Jean-Claude: 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 417, 418, 419, 420, 423, 425, 426, 428, 429, 433, 435, 439, 440, 443, 444, 447, 448  
Preysing, Konrad Count von: 349, 354  
prisoners of war: 58, 59, 63, 78, 90, 133, 162, 239, 309, 334  
  American: 17, 43, 116, 206, 208

- British: 17, 58, 70, 116, 142, 143, 206  
 Civil War: 162  
 French: 58, 287  
 German: 23  
 Polish: 69, 329, 330  
 Russian: 58, 69, 70, 113, 131, 145, 162, 163, 164, 287, 315, 329, 330  
 western: 405  
 Prokovieva, Anna: 245  
 Prüfer, Kurt: 148, 417, 433, 434, 435, 436, 443  
 Psychological Warfare Branch (PWB): 122  
 Purvis, Melvin: 37
- Q —  
 quarantine: 139, 140, 158, 160, 411, 412, 425
- R —  
 Raczkiewicz, Wladislas: 348  
 Raisko: 70, 71, 153, 154  
 Rang, UStF: 338  
 Rasch, Otto: 242  
 Rassiner, Paul: 8, 25, 26, 27, 33, 43, 137, 149, 150, 264, 285, 315, 370, 372, 403  
 Rauff, Walther: 242  
 Rawa-Russka: 103  
 Reconstruction Finance Corporation: 74  
 Red Cross: 9, 22, 63, 70, 83, 89, 133, 142, 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 188, 192, 197, 206, 207, 210, 211, 213, 224, 242, 258, 265, 342, 352, 366, 392, 400, 401, 405, 410  
 at Auschwitz: 143  
 at Dachau: 63, 64  
 at Theresienstadt: 99, 140, 182  
 at Transnistria: 286  
 Budapest: 174  
 Dutch: 15, 117, 141, 159, 161, 265, 319  
 entering camps: 84  
 German: 169, 269  
 Katyn: 206  
 Polish: 206  
 Rumania: 176, 178  
 Swedish: 173  
 Swiss: 286  
 Reddhaser, OSTF: 338  
 Rehling: 313  
 Reich Security Main Office: see RSHA
- Reichel: 194, 198  
 Reichskommissar for the Ostland: 215, 243, 244  
 Reiss, Lutz: 313  
 Reitlinger, Gerald: 10, 24, 25, 31, 32, 36, 53, 83, 104, 106, 109, 120, 121, 123, 124, 127, 128, 130, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 149, 154, 158, 159, 160, 189, 199, 216, 217, 227, 239, 244, 245, 261, 262, 264, 265, 266, 273, 284, 288, 289, 290, 297, 319  
 credentials: 297  
 use of WRB report: 120  
 Rhodes, Anthony: 347, 349, 355  
 Ribbentrop, Joachim von: 23, 34, 44, 191, 194, 195, 197, 198, 202, 204, 256  
 Richards, Rep.: 464  
 Richter: 257  
 Richtofen, Manfred von: 223  
 Riegner, Gerhard: 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 124, 393, 399  
 Rifkind, Simon H.: 278  
 Riga: 140, 162, 243, 267, 268, 269, 271, 407  
 Ritter: 190, 191, 192, 193, 211  
 RKFDV, Reich Commission for the Strengthening of Germandom: 53  
 Röchling, Hermann: 43  
 Roden, Edward van: 42  
 Roeder, Manfred: 370  
 Rogers: 110  
 Rogge, O. John: 202, 203, 204, 205, 206  
 Rohác, Jan: 424  
 Rohác, Jan: 127  
 Röhm purge: 50, 133  
 Roman empire: 294  
 Rome: 11, 127, 128, 255, 295, 348, 353, 354, 355, 360, 361, 362, 383, 384, 386, 395, 400  
 Rommel, Erwin: 51  
 Roncalli, Angelo: 358, 359  
 Roosevelt, Franklin D.: 9, 34, 37, 75, 80, 81, 82, 85, 88, 98, 109, 113, 183, 188, 202, 274, 275, 347, 353, 399  
 Roques, Henri: 303, 310, 313  
 Rosenberg, Alfred: 97, 215, 238, 239, 240, 244, 263, 352  
 Rosenberg, Walter: 125, 126, 127, 423, 424, 425, 426, 428  
 Rosenfeld, A. H.: 41, 42, 43  
 Rosenman, Samuel: 37  
 Rosenthal, Walter: see Rosin, Arnost: 127, 424
- Rothe, Wolf Dieter: 27, 261  
 Rothfels, Hans: 403  
 Rotterdam: 93  
 RSHA, Reich Security Main Office: 50, 51, 53, 107, 131, 181, 182, 217, 219, 223, 224, 240, 244, 252, 253, 254, 257, 304, 308, 309, 310, 314, 352, 412  
 rubber: 67, 68, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79  
 crisis: 73, 75, 77  
 synthetic (Buna): 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 115, 120, 134, 158, 425  
 Rudolf, Gernar: 409  
 Rumania: 30, 32, 49, 68, 86, 87, 88, 109, 111, 171, 176, 177, 178, 179, 187, 211, 212, 253, 257, 265, 278, 283, 286, 352, 358  
 Ruppin, Arthur: 28, 30, 186  
 RuSHA, Race and Settlement Main Office: 35, 53, 145, 263, 267, 268  
 Russia: passim
- S —  
 SA (Sturm-Abteilung): 133, 317  
 Sachs: 205  
 Safran, Alexandru: 179  
 Sales, Raoul de Roussy de: 94, 95, 96  
 Salonika: 59, 108  
 Sapiuha, Adam: 355  
 Sassen, Wilhelm S.: 228, 229  
 sauna: 156  
 Saurer: 242  
 Scattolini, Virgilio: 350  
 Scavizzi, Pirro: 351, 355, 356, 357, 358  
 Schaaf, OSTF: 337, 338  
 Scharowsky, Herbert: 313  
 Schellenberg, Walter: 50, 51  
 Schilling, Dr.: 194  
 Schkopau: 69, 78  
 Schlaeger: 314  
 Schmidt: 193  
 Schmidt, Helmut: 294  
 Schmidt, Paul Otto: 237  
 Schmidt-Lechner, Dr.: 205  
 Schnabel, Dr.: 338, 341  
 Schneider: 152  
 Schoeps, Hans-Joachim: 372  
 Schuette, Oswald F.: 89  
 Schulte, Eduard: 10  
 Schulz, Dorothea: 313  
 Schuschnigg, Kurt Edler von:



- 315, 326  
Schwartz, Joseph J.: 392  
Schwarz: 144  
SD, Sicherheitsdienst: 50, 51,  
105, 106, 107, 121, 132, 197,  
224, 225, 242, 309, 328, 333  
Sea of Azov: 87, 177, 267  
Seaver, Richard: 150  
selections, Auschwitz: 11, 141,  
142, 143, 144, 165, 246  
Serbia: 49  
Sereny, Gitta: 380, 381, 382, 390,  
404, 407  
Sforza, Count: 110  
Shanghai: 266  
Shirer, William L.: 114, 115  
Siemens: 71  
Silberschein, Abraham: 124, 393  
Silesia: 69, 104, 222, 327, 339,  
391  
Simpson, Gordon: 42  
six million figure: 17, 18, 26, 32,  
33, 52, 289, 294, 296, 299,  
300, 365, 366, 372, 375, 399  
origin of: 102, 105, 106, 114,  
223, 229  
Slovakia: 49, 117, 121, 122, 124,  
127, 168, 171, 172, 179, 180,  
181, 183, 186, 194, 211, 212,  
253, 254, 255, 258, 267, 268,  
271, 321, 322, 347, 348, 349,  
360, 424  
Smith, Howard K.: 95  
soap, of human fat: 60, 83, 84,  
114, 128, 296, 360  
Sobibor: 56  
Soblen, R. A.: 293, 294  
Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I.: 243,  
299  
Sommer, HStF: 337  
Sonderbehandlung (special  
treatment): 118, 142, 144,  
145, 146, 147, 243, 244  
Sonderkommando: 248  
Soos, G.: 123, 127  
Sorceresse: 233  
Soviet Union: passim  
Spain: 50, 59, 78, 174, 199, 252,  
373, 391  
Specter, Arlen: 13  
Speer, Albert: 153, 191, 222, 223,  
225  
Spielberg, Steven: 13  
Spiktor, Prof.: 286  
Springer, Axel: 372  
Squire, Paul C.: 81, 83, 84  
SS (Schutzstaffel): passim  
SS-Führungshauptamt: 135, 200,  
315  
SS-Ranks: 317  
Stäglich, Wilhelm: 8, 153, 154,  
163, 164, 165, 189, 190, 292,  
370, 373  
Stahlecker, Franz W.: 242, 243  
Stahmer, Otto: 207  
Stalin, Josef: 246, 274  
Stalin, jr.: 315  
Stalingrad: 146  
Standard Oil: 73, 74, 75, 76, 78,  
151  
Stangl, Franz: 380, 390, 405  
steam baths: 111, 115, 136, 155,  
156  
Steengracht, Gustav: 192, 193,  
197, 212, 267, 268  
Steiner, Frank: 42  
stench around Auschwitz: 132,  
151, 152, 153, 154, 166, 233,  
246  
Steusch: 385  
Stewart, Douglas MacCollum:  
203, 204, 209  
Stimson, Henry L.: 37, 88, 89  
Stockholm: 97, 104, 107, 108,  
109, 112, 183, 293, 315  
Stout, Rex: 94  
Straub: 314  
Strauch, R. R.: 243  
Streckenbach, Bruno: 242  
Streicher, Julius: 234  
Stempel, Herbert von: 203, 204  
Stresemann, Gustav: 303  
Stresse, OSTF: 338  
Struma, ship: 178  
Stumm, Braun von: 101, 116  
Stürmer, Der: 234, 345  
Suhl, Yuri: 126, 127  
Survey Graphic: 114  
Sweden: 50, 78, 97, 104, 107,  
108, 112, 173, 174, 176, 186,  
197, 212, 293, 308, 311, 371  
Switzerland: 50, 74, 78, 81, 86,  
103, 107, 109, 117, 124, 127,  
174, 176, 177, 185, 192, 197,  
205, 207, 212, 392, 393, 399  
Szeptyczyki, André: 360  
Szmulewski, David: 455  
Sztójay, Doeme: 184, 185  
— T —  
Tabeau, Jerzy: 424, 425  
Taft, Robert A.: 23  
Talmud: 124, 270, 294, 295, 296,  
297  
scatological fantasies: 427  
Tardini, Domenico: 354  
Tarnow: 90  
Taylor, Allen J.P.: 298  
Taylor, Myron: 347  
Taylor, Telford: 43, 44, 45, 46,  
47, 48, 209, 220  
Terezin: see Theresienstadt  
Tesch and Stabenow: 138, 434  
Tesch, Bruno: 138  
Thadden, Eberhard von: 191, 192,  
193, 194, 198, 199, 205, 209,  
213, 267  
Theresienstadt: 58, 93, 99, 123,  
139, 140, 141, 146, 149, 158,  
169, 170, 181, 182, 185, 258,  
260, 261, 269, 309, 319, 342,  
395, 401  
Jews transported to  
Auschwitz: 123, 140, 258  
Thompson, Dorothy: 95  
Thomsen, Hans: 203, 204  
Thon, Harry W.: 42  
Tiso, Joseph: 172, 254  
Topf & Sons: 147, 148, 149, 417,  
418, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437,  
439, 440, 443  
torture/coercion of  
witnesses/defendants: 40, 41,  
43, 129, 204, 209, 213, 233,  
234, 235, 236, 380  
Trajan: 295  
Trampedach: 244  
Transilvania, ship: 177  
Transnistria: 177, 179, 286  
trial documents  
003-L: 146  
011-L: 127  
022-L: 123, 473  
119-USSR: 243  
1553-PS: 137, 138, 303, 311,  
313, 314, 315  
180-L: 243  
1919-PS: 238, 239, 240  
2171-PS: 416  
2273-PS: 243  
2605-PS: 190  
2738-PS: 105  
3428-PS: 238, 245  
3590-PS: 40  
3660-PS: 245  
3663-PS: 244, 245  
3669-PS: 245  
501-PS: 242, 247  
NG-1815: 211  
NG-2059: 191  
NG-2060: 191  
NG-2061: 191, 196  
NG-2190: 191  
NG-2196: 211  
NG-2230: 192  
NG-2233: 192, 198, 210  
NG-2235: 192

- NG-2236: 192  
 NG-2237: 193  
 NG-2238: 193  
 NG-2262: 193, 199  
 NG-2263: 190, 193, 478  
 NG-2325: 215  
 NG-2424: 193, 197  
 NG-2586: 251  
 NG-2586-G: 259  
 NG-2586-J: 251, 258, 267  
 NG-2980: 193, 198  
 NG-4669: 256  
 NG-5510: 193  
 NG-5532: 194  
 NG-5533: 194, 197  
 NG-5535: 211  
 NG-5546: 211  
 NG-5565: 194  
 NG-5567: 194, 210  
 NG-5568: 194  
 NG-5569: 194  
 NG-5570: 194  
 NG-5571: 195  
 NG-5573: 195  
 NG-5576: 195  
 NG-5586: 211  
 NG-5594: 195  
 NG-5595: 195  
 NG-5596: 195  
 NG-5597: 195  
 NG-5599: 195  
 NG-5600: 195  
 NG-5602: 195  
 NG-5603: 195  
 NG-5604: 195  
 NG-5605: 196  
 NG-5607: 196  
 NG-5608: 196  
 NG-5613: 196  
 NG-5615: 196  
 NG-5616: 196  
 NG-5617: 196  
 NG-5618: 196  
 NG-5619: 196  
 NG-5620: 196  
 NG-5621: 196  
 NG-5622: 196  
 NG-5623: 196  
 NG-5624: 196  
 NG-5637: 197  
 NG-5684: 197, 198  
 NO-0365: 215  
 NO-1128: 243  
 NO-1247: 268  
 NO-1624: 267, 268  
 NO-246: 146  
 NO-3000: 243  
 NO-3159: 243  
 NO-4465: 156  
 NO-4466: 151  
 NO-4473: 148, 154, 155, 156,  
     290, 443, 444, 446, 447  
 NO-5193: 146  
 NO-5193-8: 265  
 NO-5909: 239  
 trials: 22, 25, 34, 45  
     Auschwitz 1963-65: 10, 37,  
         43, 125, 133, 139, 148,  
         229, 230, 381  
     Bergen-Belsen: 37, 325  
     British: 43  
     Dachau: 40, 41, 42, 43, 61,  
         234, 299  
     Dutch: 37  
     Eichmann: 25, 43, 107, 226,  
         310  
     French: 37  
     I.G. Farben: 44, 47, 48, 115,  
         123, 143, 153, 154, 226  
     illegal: 19, 41, 298  
     Italian: 37  
     Japan: 47  
     mock: 40, 42  
     Moscow: 235  
     Nuremberg (IMT/NMT):  
         passim  
     Polish: 37  
     Russian: 37  
     West German: 27  
 Truman, Harry S.: 38, 75, 282  
 Tuka, Voitsch: 254, 267  
 Turkey: 78, 178, 185, 358, 393  
 typhus: 21, 55, 56, 66, 136, 159,  
     348, 350, 367, 415  
     at Auschwitz: 72, 79, 120,  
         158, 159, 163, 411, 412,  
         429, 435, 439  
     at Bergen-Belsen: 55, 56, 59  
     at Dachau: 66  
     treatment by Pressac: 411  
     WWI: 162, 431  
 — U —  
 U.S. Air Force: 187, 188, 189  
 U.S. Army: 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48,  
     66, 75, 88, 201, 276, 278, 280,  
     310, 470  
     Audio-visual Agency: 15  
     Civil Affairs Division, CAD:  
         48, 90  
     Counter-Intelligence Corps,  
         CIC: 107  
     disinfestation chamber: 137  
     Judge Advocate General,  
         JAG: 37, 39, 42, 47, 48,  
         201  
     Ranks: 317  
     War Crimes Branch: 37, 39,  
         40, 41, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49,  
         129, 406  
     U.S. Civil War: 97, 161  
     U.S. Congress: 13, 75, 106, 202,  
         275, 280  
     U.S. Holocaust Memorial  
         Museum: 13  
     U.S. Justice Department: 202,  
         203  
     U.S. Navy: 37, 48, 75, 88  
     U.S. State Department: 15, 37,  
         48, 49, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 87,  
         88, 89, 99, 101, 102, 103, 105,  
         115, 199, 208, 274, 280, 394,  
         399  
     U.S. Treasury Department: 48,  
         81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 103, 105,  
         143, 274, 277  
     U.S. War Department: 17, 37, 66,  
         201, 274, 280  
     Ukraine: 49, 50, 52, 177, 267,  
         273, 275, 356  
     Ullmann, William L.: 89  
     UNRRA: 88, 273, 274, 275, 276,  
         277, 278, 279, 282, 286  
     USA: passim  
     Utley, Freda: 298  
     Utting & Rogers: 155  
 — V —  
 Vaillant-Couturier, Marie Claude:  
     133  
 Valla, Lorenzo: 384, 385, 386,  
     387  
 Valpertz: 313  
 Vandenberg, Arthur: 280  
 Vatican: 8, 9, 82, 83, 84, 85, 128,  
     197, 308, 312, 345, 346, 347,  
     348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353,  
     354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359,  
     360, 361, 362, 363, 366, 385,  
     400, 410  
 Veale, Frederick J. P.: 93, 298  
 Veessenmayer, Edmund: 190, 191,  
     192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197,  
     209, 210, 211  
 Vergasung: 154, 155, 418, 421,  
     422  
 Vergasungskeller: 154, 155, 156,  
     290, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421,  
     423, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447  
     Hilberg reference: 419  
 Versailles: 346  
     Treaty of: 30, 49  
 Vichy: 99, 373  
 Vienna: 107, 174, 181, 182, 187,  
     193, 194, 260, 266, 279, 355  
 Vietnam: 249

- Vileika: 246  
Vilna: 269, 271  
Vliet, John H. van: 208  
Vogler, HStF: 338  
Volkenrath: 342  
Völkischer Beobachter: 116  
Vorhys, Rep.: 464, 465  
Vrba, Rudolf: 124, 125, 126, 127, 188, 189, 190, 405, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428
- W —
- Waagenaar, Sam: 347, 355  
Waffen-SS: 50, 130, 137, 156  
Wagner, Horst: 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 209, 213, 251  
Wagner, HStF: 329  
Walendy, Udo: 370  
Wallace, Henry: 205  
Wallenberg, Raoul: 121  
Walsh, Major: 123  
Wannsee Conference: 251, 259, 261, 262  
Wannsee Protocol: 259  
War Production Board: 75  
War Refugee Board: 88, 89, 121, 122, 123, 134, 143, 183, 192, 274, 275, 398, 424  
War Refugee Board Report: 89, 90, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 133, 136, 139, 140, 141, 149, 151, 157, 159, 185, 258, 324, 398, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429  
article by Conway: 424  
Pressac treatment: 424  
use by Reitlinger: 120  
Warsaw: 83, 93, 102, 103, 112, 135, 152, 183, 261, 269, 270  
Warsaw: 304, 308, 311, 312, 347, 351, 380, 396  
Warsaw ghetto: 108, 270, 347, 359, 395  
epidemics: 132  
Wartheland: 357  
Washington: 9, 15, 19, 34, 46, 47, 48, 56, 73, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 89, 90, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 110, 113, 114, 116, 121, 123, 125, 129, 179, 197, 203, 208, 213, 246, 278, 296, 383, 394, 398, 399, 406  
Washington, George: 383  
Waterloo, Battle of: 22  
Webster: 188  
Wehr, Otto: 314  
Wehrmacht: 50, 59, 116, 131, 169, 244, 247, 249, 344  
Weinbacher, Karl: 138  
Weinemann, Erwin: 182  
Weir, John M.: 37, 47  
Weissmandel, Michael Dov Ber: 124, 125, 127, 297, 424  
Weizmann, Chaim: 103, 105, 277, 393, 396, 398  
Weizsäcker, Ernst von: 35, 204, 253, 255  
Welles, Sumner: 81, 82, 83, 85, 87, 88, 99, 100  
Wennerstrum, Charles F.: 44, 45  
Wesolowski, Jerzy: 424, 425  
Wetzal, Alfred: 215, 243  
Wetzler, Alfred: 125, 126, 127, 423, 424, 425, 427, 428  
Wheeler, Burton K.: 202  
Wherry, Senator: 462, 464  
Whipp, C. W.: 95, 96  
White Russia: 49, 52, 244, 273, 275  
White, Harry Dexter: 88, 89, 122, 277  
Wickert: 63, 64  
Wiernik, Jankiel: 405  
Wiesel, Elie: 394  
Wiesenthal, Simon: 375  
Wilkie, Wendell: 103  
Wille, USF: 338  
Wilson, Colin: 27, 371  
Winkelmann, Otto: 199  
Winter, Dr.: 308  
Wirth, Christian: 217, 306, 307, 308  
Wise, Stephen S.: 61, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 98, 101, 102, 103, 277, 280, 297, 350, 393  
Wisliceny, Dieter: 190  
Wissberg: 191, 198  
witchcraft: 23, 294  
witchcraft trials: 9, 233, 236  
Wochner: 343  
Wolfe, Prof.: 374  
Wolff, Jeanette: 268, 407  
Wolff, Karl: 402  
World Jewish Congress: 10, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 111, 113, 122, 124, 185, 270, 274, 287, 357, 393, 396, 397, 399, 402  
World War I: 30, 43, 49, 61, 67, 68, 69, 76, 83, 86, 116, 124, 155, 162, 223, 266, 282, 287, 368, 418, 431, 445  
Writers War Board: 94, 95  
WVHA, Economic-Administrative Main Office: 52, 131, 135, 147, 191, 223, 225, 261, 327, 336, 412
- Y —
- Yad Vashem: 208, 291, 292  
Yadin, Yigael: 296  
Yalta conference: 37, 274  
Yemelyanov: 245  
Yiddish Scientific Institute, Yivo: 244, 245  
Yom Kippur War: 300  
Yugoslavia: 49, 111, 168, 265, 279, 283
- Z —
- Zagreb: 170, 172, 253, 255, 257  
Ziereis, Franz: 63, 325  
Zionism: 277, 280, 282, 300, 387, 393  
Zündel, Ernst: 426  
Zyklon B: 11, 21, 22, 37, 118, 132, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 147, 151, 156, 165, 212, 232, 290, 298, 314, 315, 367, 388, 401, 409, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 439, 447

HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 1: *Germar Rudolf (ed.)*

## Dissecting the Holocaust

### The Growing Critique of 'Truth' and 'Memory'

*"There is at present no other single volume that so provides a serious reader with a broad understanding of the contemporary state of historical issues that influential people would rather not have examined."* —Prof. Dr. A. R. Butz, Evanston, IL

*"There is much in the various contributions that strikes one as thoroughly convincing."*

—Historian Dr. Joachim Hoffmann, Expert Report


*"Read this book and you will know where revisionism is today. And the shock is that revisionism has done away with the exterminationist case."* —Andrew Gray, *The Barnes Review*

*"I envy the United States where such a book can be published without negative consequences. It will probably unleash a broad discussion."*

—Historian Prof. Dr. Ernst Nolte, Berlin, Germany

*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 of each ca. 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. This is *the* intellectual adventure of the 21st century. Be part of it!

**2<sup>nd</sup>, revised paperback edition! 616 pp. pb, 6"×9", b/w ill., bibl., index: \$/€30.-, £20.-**



HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 2:

*Germar Rudolf*

## The Rudolf Report

Expert Report on Chemical and Technical Aspects of the 'Gas Chambers' of Auschwitz

In the years after its first publication, the so-called *Leuchter Report* about the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz and Majdanek has been subject to massive, and partly justified, criticism. In 1993, Rudolf, a researcher from the prestigious German Max-Planck-Institute, published a thorough forensic study about the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz which irons out the deficiencies and discrepancies of the *Leuchter Report*.

*The Rudolf Report* is the first English edition of this sensational scientific work. It analyzes all existing evidence on the Auschwitz gas chambers and exposes the fallacies of various failed attempts to refute Rudolf's Report. The conclusions are quite clear: The alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz could not have existed.


In the appendix, Rudolf describes his unique persecution.

*"These scientific analyses are perfect."* H. Westra, Anne-Frank-Foundation,

*"[T]he report must be described as scientifically acceptable."*

Dr. Henri Ramuz, Professor of Chemistry

**455 pp. A5, b/w & color ill., bibl., index; pb: \$/€30.-/£20.-; hardcover: \$/€45.-/£30.-**



**HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 3:**

*Jürgen Graf*

# GIANT With Feet of Clay


**Raul Hilberg and his Standard Work on the "Holocaust"**

Raul Hilberg's major work "The Destruction of European Jewry" is generally considered the standard work on the Holocaust. The critical reader might ask: what evidence does Hilberg provide to back his thesis that there was a German plan to exterminate Jews, to be carried out in the legendary gas chambers? And what evidence supports his estimate of 5.1 million Jewish victims?

Jürgen Graf applies the methods of critical analysis to Hilberg's evidence and examines the results in the light of Revisionist historiography. The results of Graf's critical analysis are devastating for Hilberg.

Graf's *Giant With Feet of Clay* is the first comprehensive and systematic examination of the leading spokesperson for the orthodox version of the Jewish fate during the Third Reich.

**160 pp. pb, 6"×9", ill., bibl., index, \$/€ 9.95-; £7.-**



**HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 4:**

*Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno*

**Concentration Camp**

# Stutthof


**and its Function**

**in National Socialist Jewish Policy**

The concentration camp at Stutthof near Danzig in western Prussia is another camp which had never been scientifically investigated by Western historians. Officially sanctioned Polish authors long maintained that in 1944, Stutthof was converted to an "auxiliary extermination camp" with the mission of carrying out the lurid, so-called "Final Solution to the Jewish Problem." Now, Jürgen Graf and Carlo Mattogno have subjected this concept of Stutthof to rigorous critical investigation based on Polish literature and documents from various archives.

Their investigations lead to unambiguous conclusions about the camp which are radically different from the official theses. Again they have produced a standard and methodical investigative work which authentic historiography can not ignore.

**122 pp. pb, 6"×9", b/w & color ill., bibl., index, \$/€15.-/£10.-**



HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 5:

*Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno*

## Concentration Camp Majdanek


A Historical and Technical Study

Amazingly, little scientific investigation had been directed toward the concentration camp Lublin-Majdanek in central Poland, even though orthodox Holocaust sources claimed that between fifty thousand and over a million Jews were murdered there. The only information available from public libraries is thoroughly discredited Polish Communists propaganda.

This glaring research gap has finally been filled. After exhaustive research of primary sources, Mattogno and Graf created a monumental study which expertly dissects and repudiates the myth of homicidal gas chambers at Majdanek. They also investigated the legendary mass executions of Jews in tank trenches (“*Operation Harvest Festival*”) critically and prove them groundless.

The authors’ investigations lead to unambiguous conclusions about the camp which are radically different from the official theses. Again they have produced a standard and methodical investigative work which authentic historiography can not ignore.

320 pp pb, A5, 6"×9", b/w & color ill., bibl., index, \$/€25.-/£18.-



HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 6:

*Don Heddeshheimer*

## The First Holocaust

Jewish Fund Raising Campaigns  
With Holocaust Claims  
During And After World War I


We all know that the suffering and death of Six Million Jews during the second world war was an event unparalleled in world history. But do we really?

*The First Holocaust* is an extremely irritating book, because it proves us all wrong. Supported with many publications from mainstream US media, in particular *The New York Times*, Don Heddeshheimer provides the evidence to show that between 1916 and the late 1920s, mainly American Jewish organizations were claiming that up to *six million* Jews(!) would suffer terribly in poverty stricken Eastern Europe.

In this context, it was claimed that eastern European Jewry would face a Holocaust if they did not receive massive aid. With such claims, millions of dollars were raised in the United States, which at the end were probably used to finance the Bolshevich revolution in Russia.

This book is a key to understand the much more successful Holocaust propaganda which was unleashed during World War II.

ca. 140 pp. pb., 6"×9", ill., bibl., index, \$/€9.95-/£7.-



**HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 8:** (Spring 2004)

**Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf**

# Treblinka


## Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?

Holocaust historians 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 alleged to have been stationary and/or mobile gas chambers, poison gases of both fast acting and slow acting varieties, unslaked lime, superheated steam, electricity, diesel exhaust fumes, etc. Holocaust historians alleged that bodies were piled as high as multistoried buildings and burned without a trace, using little or no fuel. 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: it was a transit camp.

Even longtime Revisionism buffs will find a lot that is new in this book, while Graf's animated style guarantees a pleasant reading experience.

The original testimony of witnesses enlivens the reader, as does the skill with which the authors expose the absurdities of Holocaust historiography.

ca. 432 pp. pb, 6"×9", ill., bibl., index, \$/€25.-/£18.-



**HOLOCAUST Handbooks, Vol. 9:** (Summer 2004)

**Germar Rudolf, Jürgen Graf**

# Lectures on the Holocaust

## Controversial Issues Cross Examined

In 1992, German scholar Germar Rudolf held several lectures at various academic societies in Germany. His topic was very controversial: the Holocaust in the light of new forensic findings. Even though Rudolf presented nothing short of full-fledged Holocaust Revisionism to the mainstream audiences, his arguments fell on fertile soil, because they were presented in a very pedagogically sensitive and scholarly way. This book is an updated version of these lectures, enriched by contributions of Swiss scholar Jürgen Graf.

The book's style is unique: It is a dialogue between the two lecturers on the one hand who introduce the reader to the most important arguments and counter arguments of Holocaust Revisionism—backed up with sources and references to further reading—and the reactions of the audience to these presentations on the other hand: supportive, skeptical, and also hostile comments, questions and assertions. It reads like a vivid and exciting real-life exchange between persons of various points of view, a compendium of Frequently Asked Questions on the Holocaust and its critical re-examination.

There is no better way to introduce readers unfamiliar with revisionism to this highly controversial topic.

ca. 400 pp. pb, 6"×9", ill., bibl., index, \$/€25.-/£18.-

