

Fred Leuchter

The Fourth Leuchter Report

A Technical Evaluation of Jean-Claude Pressac's Book:

Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers

AAARGH

From the Publisher:

Copyright Samisdat Publishers Ltd. 1988.

Please note: Commercial use and/or exploitation is expressly prohibited by copyright.

Contact the Zundelsite:
www.zundelsite.org
irimland@zundelsite.org
3152 Parkway #13, PMB109,
Pigeon Forge, TN,
37863, USA.

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

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 0.000 Introduction
- 1.000 Purpose
- 2.000 Background
- 3.000 Scope
- 4.000 Synopsis and Findings
- 5.000 Methodology
- 6.000 Construction of the Document
- 7.000 Proofs
- 8.000 Categories
- 9.000 Review

Part One

- 10.000 Chapter 1
- 11.000 Chapter 2
- 12.000 Chapter 3
- 13.000 Chapter 4
- 14.000 Chapter 5
- 15.000 Chapter 6
- 16.000 Chapter 7

Part Two

- 17.000 Chapter 1
- 18.000 Chapter 2
- 19.000 Chapter 3 and 4
- 20.000 Chapter 5 and 6
- 21.000 Chapter 7
- 22.000 Chapter 8

Part Three

- 23.000 Chapter 1, 2, and 3

Part Four

- 24.000 Chapter 1
- 25.000 Chapter 2

Part Five

- 26.000 Chapter 1
- 27.000 Chapter 2
- 28.000 Postface
- 29.000 Conclusion

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Due to copyright infringement problems, we cannot reproduce Pressac's maps, technical drawings and photos.

1. Doc. B.W. 30 Pg. 97 of P.M.O. Request for parts p. 359
2. Doc. P.M.O. 030/27 Pg. Order for parts. p. 375
3. Doc. #25 Flue drawing p. 369
4. Doc. B.W. 30/28 Pg. 28 Daily Work Sheet entry. p. 446
5. Draw. # 4287b Crema I Plan p. 157
6. Draw. # 1300 Crema II Plan p. 297
7. Draw. # 933 DeJaco Draw p. 303
8. Photos Leichenkeller 2 Ceiling p. 353
9. Photos, 2 each #30 Shutters p. 427
10. Doc. # 14 Wire Mesh Introduction Service p. 487
11. Photos # 15, 16, 17. Air Grills p. 487
12. 2 each, Inventory Documents Crema II. p. 438
13. Draw. # 2036 p Crema IV Sewers. p. 399
14. Map of Birkenau p. 166
15. Map of Auschwitz p. 33

0.000 INTRODUCTION:

"Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers" was written by Jean-Claude Pressac in 1989 and was subsequently published by and distributed through the Beate Klarsfeld Foundation of Paris and New York. This document, in the opinion of this author, is a blatant attempt at furthering Exterminationist propaganda by a well-meaning, but incompetent author, who, although a first-rate researcher, is blinded by a belief, so strong, that he sets aside the fundamental laws of physics in which he, as a technician (pharmacist), definitely has been trained, and draws conclusions which certainly cannot logically result from the data he has massed.

0.001 Subsequent to the publication and distribution of "Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers", I was asked by Mr. Ernst Zundel to evaluate the content of the document from a scientific and engineering standpoint and render an opinion as to the value and efficacy of this presumed scholarly work. This document has been highly touted by Exterminationists and proponents of the Holocaust Gas Chamber Myth. It deals with, and purportedly proves, beyond any shadow of a doubt, the existence of alleged Nazi Gas Execution (extermination) facilities at Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps, in Poland. IT DOES NOT. It, in fact, proves the contrary: THERE WERE NO GAS EXECUTION CHAMBERS AT AUSCHWITZ AND BIRKENAU.

0.002 Ernst Zundel contacted me because of my background in the design and fabrication of execution equipment and my extensive prior experience and background with the facilities at Auschwitz and Birkenau.

0.003 The document in question was extremely difficult to obtain. Shelley Shapiro, who represents the Klarsfeld Foundation in the United States, refused to sell me a copy, even though it purportedly told the truth. After a long period the document was obtained by another and sent to me.

1.000 PURPOSE.

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the veracity of the alleged new evidence brought forth by Mr. Pressac and the validity of his arguments and final conclusions. In order to accomplish this end, the document was read, analyzed and evaluated in the light of other historical and scientific data. This purpose does not include a determination of any numbers of persons who died or were killed by means other than gassing or as to whether an actual Holocaust occurred. It, further, is not the intent of this author to re-define the Holocaust in historical terms, but simply to scientifically review Mr. Pressac's work and eliminate any misconceptions caused by his ineptness in evaluating the evidence and prove, without question, that there were no Gas Execution Facilities at the investigated and studied concentration camps.

1.001 The following evaluation is a result of these efforts.

2.000 BACKGROUND.

The principal investigator and author of this report is an Expert in Execution Technology and a specialist in the design and fabrication of execution hardware of all types. He has worked on, and designed hardware in the United States used in the execution of condemned persons by means of hydrogen cyanide gas. He has written an execution protocol which has been approved by the U.S. Courts for execution purposes. He is an approved expert in Execution Technology for the Federal Court System of the United States and has also testified as an expert on Gas Execution Technology and the facilities at Auschwitz and Birkenau, the very same facilities discussed in this evaluation.

2.001 This investigator has personally inspected the facilities at Auschwitz and Birkenau and is a specialist on the facilities there. Furthermore, this investigator conducted the only scientific study of these facilities and authored the only scientific report ever produced on these installations.

3.000 SCOPE.

The scope of this scientific review includes a detailed study of "Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers", a review of the historical and pseudo-technical data, as well as the application of the only scientific and technical analysis available to date: "An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek", written several years ago by this author. This review will deal with the technical and feasibility areas of the reviewed document, and facilities discussed in said document, and is not intended to address historical or ethical questions, except where necessary in dealing with technical considerations.

4.000 SYNOPSIS AND FINDINGS

After a detailed study of the document in question, a review of the historical and pseudo-technical documentation, the engineering report on the facilities in question and the application of the Principles of Execution Technology, this author finds that the reviewed document has veracity only in the capacity of a compendium of documents and blueprints, which are apparently real and authenticated. This is the only redeeming value contained within the document. The conclusions reached are fallacious, the translations are at times questionable and often taken out of context, and the opinions stated are clearly erroneous. Mr. Pressac shows at times that he is capable of clear, logical thought but, with a true 'doublethink' mentality, manages to destroy all his fine work while he 'undistributes his middle.' Clearly, the documents contained therein in no way suggest, or even hint, of the possibility of the existence of a gas chamber, anywhere.

5.000 METHODOLOGY:

The procedures utilized in this evaluation and analysis were as follows:

1. A general background study of available materials.
2. Data obtained in previous on-site inspections by this investigator which included physical data (measurements, photos and construction information) and chemical sample analysis as contained in the author's earlier report.
3. A consideration of recorded and visual (on-site) logistic data.
4. A comparison of the acquired data with the document under evaluation.
5. An analysis of acquired information and a comparison of this information with known and proven design, procedural and logistic information and requirements for the design, fabrication and operation of actual gas chambers and crematories.
6. Conclusions based upon the application of all of the above to the document under review.

6.000 CONSTRUCTION OF THE DOCUMENT.

"Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers" is organized into five parts with a Preface and a Postface written by Serge Klarsfeld and Jean-Claude Pressac, respectively. The parts will be discussed, as necessary, throughout this review. The parts are defined as follows:

1. Part One: Delousing gas chambers and other disinfestation installations. Seven Chapters
2. Part Two: The extermination instruments. Eight Chapters
3. Part Three: Testimonies. Three Chapters
4. Part Four: Auschwitz and the revisionists. Two Chapters
5. Part Five: The unrealized future of K.L. Auschwitz-Birkenau. Two Chapters

6.001 The document itself is a wealth of historical facts, some technical facts, photos, blueprints and drawings, and propaganda. Except for the clearly erroneous final conclusions and propaganda, the book is an excellent piece of work. Jean-Claude Pressac demonstrates himself as a fine researcher and archivist. Unfortunately, he fails in the technical department. I would have expected his background and training as a pharmacist to have acquitted him well in this area but, unfortunately, it does not. He demonstrates a complete lack of competence as a technician. His logic tends to be good until he reaches his final conclusion. His greatest error, where he lacks the technical competence, is his failure to consult with someone more competent than himself. Although this might be a problem in the area of Execution technology, it certainly is not in the area of heating, air handling, plumbing and construction. His failure to get help in these areas is inexcusable.

6.002 Mr. Pressac has chosen an approach which introduces the data and documents first, mixed with comments on his conclusions before he presents them, generating a history for the reader which ostensibly is unbiased, but grounding everything in exterminationist terms. He will say "they didn't intend to, but they really did." "They didn't start out to, but

they did later." The reader is repeatedly told that the original intent was not for gas chambers, but later it developed.

6.003 Mr. Pressac's THESIS: In the beginning the construction personnel at Auschwitz (the Bauleitung) began their work with good or neutral motives but, in the process of their work their motives became sinister, they decided to turn the facilities that they were designing and building into execution instruments. Thus Kremas I, II, and III were converted to gas chambers during construction, but Kremas IV and V were designed from the outset as gas chambers. The problem is that no evidence is available to support this. Further, Mr. Pressac even tells us what these construction engineers were thinking during the construction of these facilities. The problem still remains that none of these facilities had hardware which could support gas executions.

6.004 This review will begin with the specific items which Mr. Pressac puts forth to support his thesis and the reasons why they do not stand the test of logic. A subsequent consideration will be made of each chapter, in turn, discussing the documentation, its import and meaning.

7.000 PROOFS.

Part Two, Chapter 8 " 'One proof...one single proof': Thirty-nine criminal traces". Part of this title is a quotation from Dr. Robert Faurisson, of whom he is unduly critical. After some unsupported statements, Mr. Pressac proceeds to the evidence (?).

7.001 Mr. Pressac lists the criminal traces, and since #17 has three parts, I make the count 36. He has apparently lost three criminal traces since no more are listed, or simply cannot count.

7.002 Krema II is credited with Traces #1 through #9, and #30 through #34 (in common with Krema III). Krema III is credited with #10 through #16, and #30 through #34 (in common with Krema I). Kremas IV and V are credited with #17 through #29, #17 having three parts.

8.000 CATEGORIES.

There are three different categories of criminal traces. They are essentially all slips of the tongue or slips of the pen.

8.001 Category 1. Proofs dealing with documents concerning gas-tight doors, gas-tight windows (little doors), and hardware for these doors and windows, such as closures and anchors. Various hardware was ordered for the Kremas from DAW (the inmate metal and fabrication shop). On twenty-two different occasions hardware was ordered for doors with a distinction of being gas-tight (gasdichten Türen, Gastüren, and luftdicht). Also, on occasion, doors with peepholes were ordered, but not found installed, in photos.

8.002 First, it must be remembered that the doors in question were to be utilized in morgues (Leichenkeller) and as one might expect, the morgues are wont for some type of

minimal seal on the openings. Second, Leichenkeller #1 was to contain the decomposing older bodies, which might be even more of a problem.

8.003 There is a distinct translation problem relative to gas-tight or air-tight for *gasdicht* or *luftdicht*. It must be remembered that non-technical persons make no distinction between gas-tight and gas-proof (*gassicher*) which is what the architects of the *Bauleitung* would have ordered. They did not however order gas-proof doors and windows. This is obvious when we consider that these doors were "sealed" with weather-stripping of felt. If, in fact, these doors were gas-proof then everyone of us lives in a gas chamber since our storm doors are sealed with rubber, the modern replacement for felt, in construction.

The distinction is more than subtle but few non-technical people ever take the time to consider it. Consider this: We all speak of our water proof watch, but we really mean water-tight or water-resistant, since a diver's watch is really water-proof (*wassersicher*). It is standard construction to weather-strip all doors in Germany with felt (now rubber). Mr. Pressac should be more careful with his translation. Technical terms are technical terms in either English, French or German.

8.004 Proofs #3, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 17a, 17b, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32 and 34 fall into this category. Rooms with closures designated as such (gas-tight) were not gas-proof, and therefore unsafe and unusable for gas executions. It should be noted that gas-tight and weather-tight are being utilized synonymously, and do not indicate "hermetic" as Mr. Pressac says at one point.

8.005 Category 2. Proofs dealing with *Auskleideraum*, *Auskleidekeller* meaning undressing room and undressing cellar, respectively. These facilities were not for people about to be gassed to undress, but rather for bodies of people who had died of natural causes, to be undressed, before cremation. Most, if not all, mortuaries or crematories have such a room, why should we believe these are any different?

8.006 Proofs # 4, 5, 10, 12 and 32 fall into this category. Undressing rooms for those already dead by natural causes, not execution.

8.007 Category 3. Other proofs. Most of these are individual cases and will be addressed as such.

8.008 "Vergassungskeller" slip by S.S. Captain Bishoff. In a letter dated 29 January 1943, S.S. Captain Bishoff, then head of the *Auschwitz Bauleitung*, in a letter to headquarters discusses the construction progress of *Krema II*. It being winter, the cement work was delayed because of the cold and the concrete forms could not be removed from one of the *Leichenkeller* ceilings on schedule. He does not identify the *Leichenkeller*, but because of an additional construction report (29 January 1943) written by Kurt Prufer, engineer for *Topf and Son*, it is most likely that he (Bishoff) was talking about *Leichenkeller 2*. Bishoff says, "Because of the frost, it has not yet been possible to remove the formwork from the ceiling of the corpse cellar. This is of no consequence, however, as the 'Vergassungskeller' carburetion cellar can be used to this end" (morgue). Mr. Pressac,

again incorrectly translates the word "Vergassungskeller" (carburetion cellar) as gassing cellar, which Pressac assumes to be Leichenkeller 1, the alleged gas chamber. It is unclear by the text exactly what Bishoff is saying, but he most likely means the furnace room. In the furnace room are the five secondary blowers (pulsed air) which mix air with the combusted gasses in the furnace. This carburetion process controls the air/gas mix in the crematory furnaces. Since it is winter, Bishoff does not want the corpses to freeze and temporary placement in the furnace room, which is heating only to dry the brick and mortar, and not cremating corpses, will prevent this.

8.009 Proof #1. Again, a little thought in a technical translation will prevent major misconceptions.

8.010 10 Gasprüfer. On 26 February 1943 S.S. Lieutenant Pollok sent an urgent telegram to Topf and Son reading as follows: "Please send 10 gas testers ("Gasprüfer") that we spoke about before. Quote price later." Mr. Pressac translates "Gasprüfer" (again, a technical term, incorrectly as gas detectors. There is a major distinction. Gas Detectors are utilized for testing gas (leakage etc.). Gas testers are used to determine the amount (quantity) of gas present. The telegram would have read "Gasentdecker" if detectors were wanted.

8.011 Gas testers are utilized by every furnace installer and repairman for testing the proper carbon monoxide/air mixture to determine if the furnace is burning correctly. This MUST be done particularly when using pulsed air installations. This is something Mr. Pressac should have known, or should have found out. (Appendix II & III)

8.012 Proof #2. These gas testers have nothing to do with testing for hydrogen cyanide gas and do not imply the existence of gas chambers.

8.013 4 "Drahtnetzeinschiebvorrichtungen" and 4 "Holzblenden." These items were found on an inventory list for Leichenkeller 2, Krema II, dated 24 June, 1943, supplied with the construction deed for the structure. Again, Mr. Pressac incorrectly translates two technical terms incorrectly. 4 Wire net insertion contrivances and 4 wooden architectural facade dressings is the correct translation. Mr. Pressac translates as 4 wire mesh introduction devices and 4 wooden covers. Again, these are technical items and should be translated very precisely. In order to agree with the Pressac translation, it would have had to have said 4 "Drahtsiebeinführvorrichtungen" and 4 "Holzdeckel."

8.014 Mr. Pressac also claims, for no apparent reason, that the inventory was listed incorrectly for Leichenkeller 2 and should have been Leichenkeller 1. The only apparent reason for this, is to support the use of Leichenkeller 1 as a gas chamber, which it could not have been. (Illustration 12)

8.015 The use of architectural dressings to cover something on a building is very common. The wire net insertion contrivances may have been for handling and inserting an autopsied body (in parts) into the retort. Neither of these devices have anything to do with equipment for gas executions.

8.016 Proofs # 8 and 9 fall into this category, again showing no connection with execution gas chambers.

8.017 14 "Brausen" (shower heads). These appear on another inventory document for Krema II, Leichenkeller 1, dated 24 June 1943, supplied with the construction deed for the structure. Mr. Pressac incorrectly translates "Brausen" as dummy (phony) showers. He takes exceptional license with this translation, since "Scheinbrausen" is not the term used. The blueprints for Leichenkeller 1 show the water pipes coming into the room (and there were faucets there) but do not show the showers. Thus, they had to be dummy. (Illustration 12)

8.018 Mr. Pressac however, forgets the urgent telegram of 15 May 1943 from Bishoff to Topf requesting plans for a hot water heater which would be attached to the incinerator of Krema III with a capacity of about 100 showers. It should be obvious, even to Mr. Pressac, that the lack of a complete document file does not give him license to make foolish assumptions. It simply means that documentation showing the installation of the showers and the water heater in Krema II has been lost, or is not available to us at the present time.

8.019 Proof # 16 falls into this category, clearly showing no connection with execution gas chambers.

8.020 Heat in Leichenkeller 1. Proofs # 30 and 31 concern heat to be supplied in the basement of Krema II utilizing the excess heat from the motor rooms where the forced-draft blower system was installed. There are two documents that relate to this.

8.021 First, a letter from the Bauleitung (Bishoff) to Topf, dated 6 March 1943, discussing a prior letter (from Topf) in which a suggestion is made to PREHEAT cellar 1 with the exhaust air from the three forced draft installations on the main furnace. Second, an inspection record written by Prufer concerning a Topf inspection of Kremas II and III dated 25 March 1943. In this document he says that, since the failure and discontinuance of the forced-draft blower system on the cremation furnaces, the HOT AIR SUPPLY for Leichenkeller 1 likewise, must be discontinued. This is because the hot air was from the forced-draft blower system. It should be noted that the terminology is different. Bishoff talks of PREHEAT and Prufer (the designer) talks of hot air supply.

8.022 One must realize that a major mistake was made on the design of both Kremas II and III. Neither building had heat. The heat from the furnace would not be sufficient (if not ducted) to heat the rest of the building, especially the cellars, by convection. Some heat is necessary (even in the morgues) to prevent the pipes from freezing. Prufer came up with an excellent plan to take the chill out of the cellar areas. But, he talks of hot air supply (heating system) not preheat for cellar 1. There appears to be some confusion of terminology but it is most likely that the heat was for all cellar areas. It should be noted that with the distances that the air had to travel it would have been barely warm upon reaching the defined locations, supporting the fact that it was only to prevent the pipes from freezing.

8.023 Further, although Pressac misses it, on 3 February 1943, Messing, the Topf fitter, request parts for a heating and air handling system from Kirschneck of the Bauleitung. This is document B.W.30 page 97 of the P.M.O. (Pg. # 359). These are warm air heating system parts to be used (as per the document) for Leichenkeller 1 and 2, the Autopsy and Washroom areas and the furnace room. Kirschneck orders (document P.M.O. 030/27 page 55 dated 3 February 1943) (Pg. # 375) some (not all) of the parts (apparently because the heating decision is not yet finalized), eliminating the metal dampers but including a wooden blower (cannot be used for gas). We must note that all of the basement areas have common air handling (and perhaps heating) components. This is impossible if the intention is to use hydrogen cyanide gas. (Illustration 1 and 2)

8.024 At this point we must look at the overall ventilation plan, for which there is no existing documentation. On page 369 of the reviewed document, Pressac defines the ventilation system of Krema II with text and a chimney drawing. This is his second attempt, the first being for "Album d'Auschwitz", published by Editions du Seuil in November 1983. This new definition reverses one outlet, as can be seen on the same page. Again, Mr. Pressac is wrong. The approach he uses is contrary to all known laws of physics. Leichenkeller 2 and the other cellar rooms, exclusive of Leichenkeller 1, have no air intake. It is categorically impossible to extract air from an underground room (or any room for that matter) without an air intake. If the fans were heavy enough and could continue to draw without stalling, the unvented Leichenkeller 2 and the other rooms would implode and collapse under the suction. It is more likely that the fans could not sustain the load and would first stall, then overload and burn out. This apparently never happened. The German Engineers of the Bauleitung were not that stupid, nor was Pruffer. In truth, Mr. Pressac totally fails to understand the physics of the heating and air handling involved.

8.025 In reality, the system contained a common air intake for all underground areas and a common exhaust for the same. This means Leichenkellers 1 and 2, the Autopsy and all other underground rooms shared common air, thus demonstrating that Leichenkeller 1 could not have been used as a gas chamber. If one follows the chain of events, one can easily determine the evolution of the air system.

8.026 First, I will number the chimneys utilized for the air system. As per Pressac's drawing on page 369, we will assign numbers first to the large chimney with four flues. To the left of that is the single chimney of the air system and to the right (as per the photo) the main chimney for the furnaces. The four common flues will be #'s 1 through 4 from left to right (front of the Krema). The lone chimney to the extreme left will be # 5. This definition is based upon the size of the flues and the air requirements of the system and is supported by historical events in construction. Originally, when the facility still had the forced-draft blower system, there were the four common chimneys. Chimney 2 was the original furnace intake. Chimney three was the underground (cellar) intake. Chimney 1 was the underground exhaust. Chimney 4 was the furnace room exhaust. There was no Chimney 5. These assignments are based on a comparison of proportioned volumes. The Furnace Room received additional air through the open windows. This was necessary because of the pulsed air blowers on the furnace units. (Illustration 3)

8.027 With the elimination of the forced-draft blowers the main furnace flue needed help. Chimney 4 was added to compensate for the elimination of the forced-draft system and used in conjunction with Chimney 2. If we add the sizes of Chimney 2 and Chimney 4 we get 5000 centimeters squared (1500 plus 3500). Chimney 1 was taken for the exhaust. The exhaust Chimney 1 is only 4000 centimeters squared, giving us a difference of 1000 centimeters squared. This means that the volume of air entering the Furnace Room is now greater than that removed, the difference being utilized by the pulsed air blowers. The windows now would have to remain closed in order not to disturb the gravity-flow air chimney draft on the main furnaces. This required closure of the windows would have suffocated the furnaces without the increased air intake. Since the four unit chimney had already been built, a new chimney (# 5) had to be added to replace Chimney 1 taken for the Furnace Room intake. You will notice that intakes are always greater than exhausts to accommodate static pressure within the system (losses).

8.028 Thus we can readily see that the mechanics and engineering for the above configuration required a common ventilating system for all cellar areas. This is borne out by the testimony of Henryk Tauber before Judge Sehn of the Hitlerite Crimes Investigation as shown on page 484 of the reviewed document. This is apparently the only part of Tauber's testimony that Pressac rejects.

8.029 Proofs # 30 and 31 fall into this category and clearly demonstrate the impossibility of a gas chamber in Leichenkeller 1.

8.030 1 "Schlüssel, für Gaskammer" (Gas Chamber Key). Why is this included, since Mr. Pressac eliminates it himself, unless he just wants to have the reader exposed to the word GAS CHAMBER? It is most likely for the storage room for Zyklon B in Block 14. None of the alleged gas chambers in the Kremas had locks or required keys.

8.031 Proof # 33 falls into this category. It clearly does not show the existence of any alleged gas chamber.

8.032 Proof # 19 is a bit strange. It is an entry taken from a daily work report at a Krema. It is allegedly (by no means clear) for work in a room in Krema IV and made by a foreman for Riedel Company, a contractor. He says he tamped the ground and concreted the floor in the gas chamber: "betonieren in der Gaskammer". This entry # 5 on said work report is from file BW 30/28, page 28 (pg. #446) at the Auschwitz archives. (Illustration 4)

8.033 In the absence of other documentation it means nothing and will remain an enigma. It, however, may be a joke. This foreman and his crew had been working here for a number of days and perhaps he or someone in his crew was flatulent during that period. I'm sure these people were no different than most construction workers and he may have put this in the daily report as a joke. If he only knew that Pressac, some fifty years later, would try to hang his execution gas chamber theories on his words.

8.034 This is Proof # 19 and falls in to this category. I do not believe it merits any further comment.

8.035 All of these Alleged Criminal Traces are either not properly translated or not properly interpreted. Not one of these Alleged Criminal Traces is capable of supporting any Gas Chamber theory. In short, these are not proof of anything.

9.000 REVIEW.

The following is a review of the Sections and Chapters. The purpose of addressing the chapters individually is to ensure that the document was completely reviewed. Most issues were covered in the proofs but there are some items of note in the chapters themselves.

9.001 Preface by Serge Klarsfeld. The author has no comment beyond stating that this is propaganda.

9.002 Declaration by the Auschwitz Museum. This documents the fact that Mr. Pressac researched the document at the museum, and when.

PART ONE

Delousing gas chamber and other disinfestation installations.

10.000 Chapter 1.

Foreword on Zyklon B. This chapter is straightforward and informative except for Pressac injecting his erroneous opinions. He says that concentrations of gas in the alleged gas chambers were insufficient to cause an explosion. He is wrong. Although an air/gas mixture of 6% is needed to cause an explosion, it should be remembered that the concentration at the source is almost 100%. This concentration is highly explosive and, because of this, explosion proof equipment is used and the executee is restrained in the United States.

10.001 Carbon monoxide was not utilized at Treblinka (or anywhere else) as an execution gas. It will not work unless introduced into a pressurized vessel at approximately 2.5 atmospheres (40 psia) or better.

10.002 The facilities at Kremas II and III could not have operated with hydrogen cyanide gas since they were not heated, were not gas-proof, had common ventilation and sewers and had no means for introduction of the gas.

10.003 Pressac further says that in a room heated only by body heat, it took only five to ten minutes for the Zyklon B pellets, contained in a column of mesh (with a minimum surface area exposure), to sublime their gas and complete the execution. A further twenty minute wait occurred, to ensure all were dead, and the fans were turned on and the bodies removed, immediately. This is stated by alleged witnesses (who saw nothing), unsupported by fact and contrary to the physics that govern the operation of gas execution chambers. This would have killed the operators, as well. It, clearly, never happened.

10.004 A photo of a funnel and a valve appears on page # 115. It was allegedly used for the introduction of water to gas crystals in an alleged gas chamber at Struthof. Please note the direction of flow on the gate valve as designated by the arrow. The flow is backwards, the valve would leak and the operator would die.

11.000 Chapter 2.

The Stammlager delousing installations. This chapter deals with the delousing facilities at Auschwitz. It appears factual except for the following:

1. The door on the delousing facility in Block 26 was sealed with paper. This is insanity.
2. The account by Andreje Rablin are the ravings of a senile old man. He says he worked with Zyklon B naked and handled the pellets in his bare hands. HCN is absorbed through the skin. He must protect his body and wear rubber gloves.

12.000 Chapter 3.

The Prussic acid delousing installation in the reception building. This chapter is probably factual but contains many of Pressac's own conclusions, which may, or may not, be correct.

13.000 Chapter 4.

Kanada and its clothing delousing installation. This chapter on the whole seems factual. The following points are in question:

1. Homicidal gas chamber doors had a protection grid over the peephole, where delousing chamber doors did not. No doors with the grid were ever found installed, only in stock. Since there were no homicidal gas chambers, the protection grid was used on delousing chambers only.
2. Pressac speculates that the gas for the alleged homicidal chambers was stored in Kanada. There were no homicidal gas chambers.
3. Delousing chamber doors were made of wood and generally used outdoors or in protected areas. They would not use them in an underground Leichenkeller. They would use steel. Wooden doors leak.

14.000 Chapter 5.

The delousing and disinfection installations of BW 5a and 5b in KGL Birkenau. This chapter needs some clarification.

1. Hydrogen Cyanide will always leave blue stains if it is effectively used, unless the walls are painted steel or of some other inert, non-porous material and washed down with ammonia or bleach after every usage. The execution time may be only

five minutes but his is after the gas has sublimated, which requires heat, and the additional time of several hours for venting. In the United States it takes at least twenty minutes to ventilate a much smaller chamber (600 cf) and a much smaller dosage is used. The walls are then washed. As usual, Mr. Pressac is in error. His description is both impractical and impossible.

2. It should be noted that Pressac claims that an alleged gassing utilized 1% or 10,000 ppm of HCN in air. This being some forty times the lethal dosage. In U.S. gas chambers 0.320% or 3200 ppm of HCN in air is used as the dosage. This means that the Germans allegedly utilized some 3.125 times the overkill dosage used in the U.S. U.S. gas chambers contain all non-porous surfaces (painted steel) and must be washed with bleach after each execution. The normal exposure time is fifteen minutes to the HCN and all surfaces must be washed with bleach to prevent staining and corrosion. This is even with a preheated air intake to prevent condensation. It seems that the Nazis were able to suspend the laws of nature to prevent staining.
3. A photo #6 (page 59) has an erroneous explanation. Pressac claims that because of the short exposure time and low temperature the HCN would only have had time to leave traces on metal hardware and not the brick and mortar. This is incorrect. We know from experience that brick and mortar will pick up cyanide quicker than metal. Mr. Pressac seems to have his facts backward, again. I would suggest that he study the American Execution System to see what really occurs. The concept that delousing gassings leave blue stains and people gassings do not, is ludicrous.

15.000 Chapter 6.

The disinfestation installation of the Gypsy Camp in Sector B.IIe of Birkenau. This is a very brief chapter and adds nothing.

16.000 Chapter 7.

The Birkenau "Zentral Sauna" with its disinfection autoclaves and Topf disinfestation ovens. This chapter lends nothing except to define and describe the Central Sauna Building and the various procedures for delousing and disinfestation. Pressac seems to contradict himself, however, when he says an autoclave (a vessel for sterilizing by steam) is, and is not, a gas chamber. Photo #36 (pg. 83) shows bricked-up windows which contained exhaust fans at some point. Pressac erroneously describes the fans as ventilator fans.

PART TWO

The extermination instruments

Forward on the sources: Contains a listing on source documents.

17.000 Chapter 1.

History of Topf. Chapter 1 is a history of Topf and Son, the crematory retort manufacturers. It is interesting primarily for the historical background. The following items are questionable:

1. On page # 105 Pressac discusses a patent for a retort furnace that he thinks burns bones. This is impossible.
2. According to Pressac the crematory at Mauthausen had retorts which could burn two bodies per hour. He should know better since the best retorts today (some fifty years later) can only handle one body per retort per 1.25 hours and cannot burn continuously or the furnace will burn out.
3. He also says that Messing of Topf tested the alleged gas chamber at Krema II with hydrogen cyanide to see if the ventilation system worked. There is no evidence to support this at all.

18.000 Chapter 2.

Krematorium 1 or the "old crematorium" of the main camp (Auschwitz Stammlager). This is a history of Krema I at Auschwitz proper. It is interesting but of little value. Pressac feels that the alleged gas chamber was utilized only briefly as a learning instrument, the first alleged gassing occurring on 3 September 1941 in the basement of Block 11. Krema I was used as a crematory from November 1940 until July 1943 and allegedly used as a gas chamber, sporadically, from the end of 1941 to 1942. In 1943 it was completely abandoned and dismantled.

18.001 Krema I could never have been utilized as a gas chamber because it was too cold, contained the crematory, was never gas-proof and had no means for introducing or utilizing the gas. (See "An Engineering Report on the Alleged Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland." by this author, 1988.)

18.002 Pressac improperly claims that my Report (above) proves that this facility was used for gassings. Mr. Pressac knows better.

18.003 It should be noted that a recent study by the Polish Forensics Institute has confirmed my findings of no gas residue at the alleged Auschwitz Gas Chamber. (See Appendix I.)

18.004 It appears that a new crematory was planned for Auschwitz but was finally built at Birkenau as Kremas II and III. Krema I was subsequently used as a bomb shelter.

18.005 There is a wealth of documents and blueprints here and one, in particular, (Bauleitung drawing # 4287b) (pg. # 157) confirms the drains are commoned with those of the main camp sewer system. (Illustration 5)

19.000 Chapters 3 and 4.

Bunker 1 or the "Red House" Bunker 2 (V) or the "White House" These chapters deal with the "Red House, Bunker 1 and the "White House", Bunker 2 (aka Bunker V).

19.001 Bunker 1 is allegedly the location of the first experimental gassings at Birkenau and Bunker 2, aka V, allegedly took the execution overflow from Kremas II, III, IV and V. Everything here is hearsay (except a drawing of the sewage plant) and has no intrinsic value at all.

20.000 Chapters 5 and 6.

Krematorien II and III. The Ventilation systems of Krematorien II and III Chapters 5 and 6 are essentially a history of the design and construction of Kremas II and III. It is a treasure trove of documents and blueprints which can provide insight into the facilities themselves. There is no proof contained therein as to the existence of any gas chambers or occurrences of any gassings and, in fact, proves the contrary.

20.001 There are many misconceptions, errors and unsupported theories on the part of Mr. Pressac. All of these have been addressed in the discussion of the proofs. Anything not covered or of special interest, I will comment upon here.

1. Wooden ducts, blowers and valves are mentioned numerous times in reference to the ventilation of Leichenkeller 1. It is inconsistent to mix wood and hydrogen cyanide. Despite the shortage of materials, the Bauleitung would have used metal.
2. The fans of the forced-draft system probably failed ONLY because of the poor quality materials caused by the war effort and not because of the heat or Pruffer's error. The chimneys and flue linings failed likewise because of poor quality materials and not because of over use.
3. The use of the heat from the forced-draft system would have, at best, only served to "take the chill off" the basement area and prevent the water pipes from freezing. It was insufficient to raise the temperature to a level sufficient to sublimate HCN.
4. Despite what Pressac says, there are no aerial or ground photos shown (or in existence) showing gas introduction ports or vents on the roof of Leichenkeller 1.
5. Drawing # 1300 (page 297) clearly shows that the drains of Leichenkeller 1 are common with the other drains of Krema II and connected to the main drains of the camp. Pressac either cannot read blueprints or is misinterpreting them. (Illustration 6)

6. A wooden screen (called a wall) was built in front of the corpse chute in Krema II. Pressac claims that this was done because they no longer needed the chute because the people were walking in, alive. It makes more sense to assume that it was built as a cosmetic screen so inmates and others could not see the bodies come down the chute. Why, ALWAYS, an ulterior motive?
7. Much is made of DeJaco's drawing # 933 (page 303). Pressac says he eliminated the corpse chute, added cellar stairs to bring in executees and replaced the double door with a single one which could have been sealed. Perhaps the door replacement was to keep the stench of rotting cadavers in the decaying body morgue, and the stairs were needed to get in. The drawing was never used. Why make so much out of a simple architectural exercise? (Illustration 7)
8. Photos of the Leichenkeller 1 ceiling (page # 353) show no phony (dummy) wooden shower heads or holes for their mounting. (Illustration 8)
9. Kremas II and III were not built as, converted to, or utilized as gas execution facilities.

21.000 Chapter 7.

Krematorien IV and V. Plans, construction and general study. This chapter deals with the construction of Kremas IV and V. Until 1980, little was known about these facilities. This is a history of the construction of these buildings. The following points are of interest.

1. These facilities were not built as execution facilities, but as cheap crematories, the cost of Kremas II and III proving too high for a war poor Germany.
2. Stoves were not to sublimate gas but to heat the building.
3. The drains were connected into the main sewers. (Illustration 13)
4. Room layout prohibits use as gas execution facility. Since ventilation was by natural convection and outside air, any shift in wind direction could contaminate the staff areas. Only a fool would design or use this facility for HCN.
5. Alleged gas-port windows were for morgue ventilation.
6. Polish resistance photos show only cremations, no gassings.
7. In photo # 33 (page 427) Pressac talks of special SMOOTH HEAD bolts used on window shutters. These are carriage bolts, designed to be used on wood and utilized everywhere. Mr. Pressac is unfamiliar with simple woodworking hardware. (Illustration 9)

21.001 Kremas IV and V were not built for, nor were they used as, gas execution facilities.

22.000 Chapter 8.

"One proof...one single proof": Thirty-nine criminal traces. This was dealt with in the section under proofs. Suffice it to say that this chapter contains a listing of the alleged proofs and a rehash of the illogical reasoning that spawned them.

PART THREE

Testimonies

23.000 Chapters 1, 2, and 3: Critical Examination of the "War refugee Board"; Critical Examination of the testimonies of Doctors Bendel and Nyiszli; The deposition of Henryk Tauber

These three chapters, 1, 2, and 3 are a presentation of selected testimony from alleged survivors. The testimony is generally vague, sometimes incoherent, and for the most part, valueless. Pressac selectively believes and disbelieves those portions that will help his case.

23.001 Pressac disbelieves Sonderkommando Henryk Tauber when he states that the ventilation systems of both Leichenkellers 1 and 2 were common. Tauber was correct. They were the same system.

23.002 Document # 14 appears on page 487 and shows a drawing of the alleged wire mesh introduction device for Zyklon B based on a deposition of Michal Kula. As shown, this device will not fit together, and assuming it did, the Zyklon B would have been outside the chamber. Obviously it is something conjured up during those long, cold prison nights. (Illustration 10)

23.003 Page 487 shows photos (Documents # 15, 16 and 17) of alleged air inlet grills for Leichenkeller 1. Fabrication indicates that they would be very inefficient because of the small aperture area. Further, the boot in the rear would interfere with airflow in the duct. (Illustration 11)

23.004 It is also stated that the furnaces operated at a temperature of 1200 degrees Celsius (2217.6 degrees Fahrenheit), when in reality, the normal operating temperature of a coke crematory is 795.5 degrees Celsius (1400 degrees Fahrenheit). These temperatures are ridiculous considering that furnaces today operate at 2000 degrees Fahrenheit (1,093.3 degrees Celsius) with an afterburner temperature of 1600 degrees Fahrenheit (815.50 degrees Celsius). These furnaces were in no way comparable to our modern retorts.

23.005 Additionally, there are a number of propaganda drawings by former inmates.

PART FOUR

Auschwitz and the revisionists

24.000 Chapter 1.

Auschwitz explained by the revisionists. This chapter is an attack upon Dr. Robert Faurisson and A. R. Butz. I think it speaks for itself.

25.000 Chapter 2.

Auschwitz according to the revisionists. This chapter deals with the revisionist position and why it is incorrect. Except for some interesting photos, it has little to say.

PART FIVE

The unrealized future of K.L. Auschwitz-Birkenau

26.000 Chapter 1.

The aborted future of the Stammlager without extermination. This is an interesting, but tedious description of Germany's plans for the Auschwitz area. It has interesting maps, blueprints and architectural renderings, all of which are meaningless today.

27.000 Chapter 2.

Birkenau 1945: the extermination station. This is an hallucinated description of the future for Auschwitz. Completely useless.

28.000 Postface.

This, again, is interesting, but useless.

29.000 CONCLUSION.

After reviewing this document, "Auschwitz: Technique and operation of the gas chambers" by Jean-Claude Pressac, I have some observations to make in summary.

29.001 Mr. Pressac is, presumably, a man of science, but fails to show it. At times he reasons clearly, but in the final analysis, he tries to make the facts conform to his preconceived notion of the existence of the gas chambers. He fails.

29.002 Jean-Claude Pressac has given the world a great deal of evidence, all of which fails to prove the existence of the gas chambers. Perhaps this will be enough.

29.003 After seeing his technical documentation, it is my best engineering opinion that nothing in this documentation supports the existence of gas execution chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau. Further, based upon the detail design of the Kremas, so well documented here, I can unequivocally state that the Gas Chambers did not exist: Kremas I, II, III, IV and V could NOT EVER have supported a gas execution function and did not.

29.004 Kremas I, II, III, IV, and V were not, and did not contain Gas Execution facilities.

Prepared this 17th day of October 1991.

Fred A. Leuchter Jr.
Execution Technology Expert

Fred A. Leuchter Associates, Inc.