

CARLO MATTOGNO

The Myth of the Extermination of the Jews

AAARGH

Source: *The Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 261-302.

© The Institute of Historical Review (www.ihr.org)

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 Recits 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.

Part I

1. 'Not a document remains, or perhaps ever existed.'

What strikes one most in the voluminous literature dedicated to the "extermination" of the Jews is the disparity existing between so grave an accusation and the fragility of the evidence furnished for its support.

The elaboration and realization of so gigantic an "extermination plan" would have required a very complex organization, technically, economically, and administratively, as noted by Enzo Collotti:

It is easy to understand that so horrifying a tragedy could not physically be carried out by only a few hundred, or even by a few thousand, that it could not be accomplished without a very extensive organization, benefiting by the help and collaboration of the most diverse sectors of national life, practically all branches of government, in other words, without the collusion of millions of people who knew, who saw, who accepted, or who, in any case, even if they did not agree, kept silent and, most often, worked without reacting in making their contribution to the machinery of the persecution and the extermination.

[1]

Gerald Reitlinger underscores that:

Hitler Germany was a police state of the highest degree, that has left hundreds of tons of documents and thousands of precious pieces of evidence.

So that, finally,

... there is, in truth, nothing that this adversary has not confided to papers. [2]

At the end of the Second World War the Allies seized

... all the secret archives of the German government, including the documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Army and the Navy, of the National Socialist Party, and of the Secret State Police [Gestapo] of Heinrich Himmler.

[3]

Those archives were sided by the victorious powers with a view toward the Nuremberg trials:

Hundreds of thousands of seized German documents were assembled in all haste at Nuremberg in order to be used as evidence against the principal Nazi war criminals. [4]

The Americans alone examined 1,100 tons of documents [5] from which they selected 2,500 documents. [6]

One would expect, then, to be submerged by a flood of documents establishing the reality of the "extermination" of the Jews, but matters presented themselves in a very different manner, as is recognized by Léon Poliakov:

The archives torn from the bowels of the Third Reich, the depositions and accounts of its chiefs permit us to reconstruct in their least detail the birth and the development of its plans for aggression, its military campaigns, and the whole range of processes by which the Nazis intended to reshape the world to their pattern. Only the campaign to exterminate the Jews, as concerns its completion, as well as in many other essential aspects, remains steeped in fog. Psychological inferences and considerations, third- or fourth-hand accounts, allow us to reconstruct the developments with a considerable verisimilitude. Certain details, nevertheless, will remain unknown forever. As concerns the concept proper of the plan for total extermination, the three or four principal actors are dead. No document remains, and has perhaps never existed. That is the secret of the masters of the Third Reich. As boastful and cynical as they were on other occasions, they covered up their major crimes. [7]

Since the first version of Léon Poliakov's work [8] the situation has not changed:

Despite the great harvest of Nazi documents captured by the Allies at the end of the war, it is precisely the documents concerning the process of the formation of the idea of the final solution of the "Jewish question" that are missing, to the point that up until the present it is difficult to say how, when, and exactly by whom the order to exterminate the Jews was given. [9]

The "plan for total extermination" still remains a mystery, even from the technical, economic, and administrative viewpoint:

The technical genius of the Germans allowed them to mount, within a few months, an efficient, rationalized death industry. Like every industry it comprised research and development, and administrative services, accounting, and records. Many aspects of these activities remain unknown to us, and remain hidden by a secret incomparably more opaque than that of the German war industries. The German rocket and torpedo technicians, the economic planners of the Reich have survived, and have given up their plans and their processes to the victors; almost all the technicians of death have disappeared, after having destroyed their records.

Extermination camps had sprung up at first with rudimentary installations, which were then perfected; who perfected them? A veritable mastery of crowd psychology was manifested, to the end of assuring the perfect docility of the men intended for death who were the promoters? There are so many questions

to which, at the moment, [10] we can find only fragmentary, and sometimes hypothetical, replies. [11]

Fragmentary information allows us to have an imperfect notion of the part played by the technicians of euthanasia in the extermination of the Polish Jews. But many points still remain in darkness; in general the history of the Polish camps is very imperfectly known [12]

But a systematic "extermination plan" evidently presupposes a specific order that, by force of circumstance, can be imputed only to the Führer. Now one must set down that this phantom-like *Führerbefehl* (command of the Führer) is submerged in the most impenetrable blackness.

Walter Laqueur acknowledges:

To the present day a written order by Hitler regarding the destruction of the European Jewish community has not been found, and, in all probability, this order was never given. [13]

Colin Cross admits:

There does not exist then, anything like a written order signed by him for the extermination of the Jews in Europe. [14]

Christian Zentner acknowledges:

One cannot fix the exact moment when Hitler gave the order ... without doubt never drawn up in writing ... to exterminate the Jews. [15]

Saul Friedländer admits:

It is not known precisely when the idea of the physical extermination of the Jews imposed itself on Hitler's spirit. [16]

Joachim Fest acknowledged:

To the present day the question of knowing when Hitler made the decision for the Final Solution of the Jewish question is in abeyance, and for the simple reason that not a single document on the subject exists. [17]

The total absence of evidence permits the official historians to give free rein to the most diverse speculations.

After having insinuated that "it is Adolf Hider in person who undoubtedly signed the death sentence of the Jews of Europe," [18] Léon Poliakov continues:

All that we can affirm with certainty is that the genocidal decision was made by Hitler at a time that may be set between the end of the campaign in the west, in June 1940, and the aggression against Russia, a year later. Contrary to

the account of Dr. Kersten, it seems to us more probable to set it some months later [the autumn of 1940], that is to say, at the beginning of 1941.

Here we get into the game of psychological deductions, to which we are obliged to appeal in order to provide a response to the second and throbbing question: what could have been the factors that weighed in the Hitlerian resolution? [19]

Poliakov affirms, consequently, "with certainty" that the "extermination" decision was made in the space of a year (June 1940-June 1941)!

That he brings into play here largely "the game of psychological deductions is demonstrated by the fact that in another work, he moves forward imperturbably by a year and a half the fateful decision of the Führer (September 1939 instead of June 1941).

The program of the National Socialist Party called for the elimination of Jews from the German community; between 1933 and 1939 they were methodically bullied, plundered, forced to emigrate; the decision to kill them to the last man also dated from the beginning of the war. [20]

Arthur Eisenbach declares on this subject:

It is today verified that the plans for the massive extermination of the Jewish population of Europe had been prepared by the Nazi government before the outbreak of the Second World war, and were thereupon carried out gradually, according to the European political and military situations. [21]

According to Helmut Krausnick, Hitler gave the secret order to exterminate the Jews "at the latest in March 1941." [22]

Item 79 of the judgment in the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem, on the contrary, maintains that the extermination order "was given by Hitler himself shortly before the invasion of Russia," [23] while the judgment of the Nuremberg trial pronounces:

The plan for the extermination of the Jews was formulated immediately after the aggression against the Soviet Union. [24]

In a report drawn up in Bratislava November 18, 1944, Dieter Wisliceny, former Hauptsturmführer and Eichmann's representative in Slovakia, affirmed that to his knowledge "the decision of Hitler that ordered the biological extermination of European Judaism [*sic*]" must be dated back to "after the beginning of the war with the United States," [25] that is, it would have been after 11 December 1941.

This is why all that the official historians can affirm "with certainty," to use Poliakov's expression, is that the supposed "decision of the Führer and the alleged "extermination order" were given over a time lapse of nearly two years!

Just as fanciful is the sham order of Himmler that would have put an end to the extermination of the Jews.

Olga Wormser-Migot asserts on the subject:

No more than there exists a written order in clear text for extermination by gas at Auschwitz does there exist a written order to stop it in November 1944. [26]

She adds more precisely:

Last remark on the gas chambers: Neither at the Nuremberg trial, nor in the course of the different [occupation] zone trials, nor at the trial of Höss at Cracow, of Eichmann in Israel, nor at the trials of the camp commanders, nor from November 1964 to August 1965 at the Frankfurt trial [Auschwitz "second echelon" accused] was there ever produced the famous order signed by Himmler 22 November 1944 ending the extermination of the Jews by gas and putting a finish to the Final Solution. [27]

Kurt Becher, former SS Standartenführer, affirmed that Himmler gave this order "between mid-September and mid-October 1944," [28] which contradicts the testimony of Reszö Kastner, according to whom Kurt Becher had told him that Himmler on 25 [29] or on 26 [30] November 1944 had ordered the crematories and the "gas chambers" to be destroyed and to suspend the "extermination" of the Jews.

Strangely, this phantom order that even the *Auschwitz Kalendarium* puts at 26 November 1944 [31] is deemed to have gotten into the Auschwitz crematories on 17 November, or nine days before the order itself was delivered! [32]

According to other testimony reported in *Het doedenboek van Auschwitz*, the order came from Berlin even sooner, on 2 November 1944. [33]

At-Nuremberg Wisliceny declared that Himmler's counterorder was sent in October 1944. [34]

In conclusion there exists no document establishing the reality of the "plan to exterminate" the Jews, so that "it is difficult to say how, when, and exactly by whom the order to exterminate the Jews was given."

Such is the most recent conclusion of Exterminationist historiography.

From 29 June to 2 July 1982, the School of Higher Studies in Social Sciences and the Sorbonne organized, in Paris, an important international conference on the theme: "Nazi Germany and the Extermination of the Jews."

In the introductory report, titled "The historiographical debate on Nazi anti-Semitism and the extermination of the Jews," Saul Friedländer adduced in evidence the presence of two fundamental tendencies of the most recent historiography in regard to the genesis and development of the Extermination" of the Jews. [35]

The first is the thesis of the continuity "that established right from the start a cause-and-effect relationship between Nazi ideology since its origins, in particular, that of Hitler and the annihilation of the Jews." [36] The other is the idea of discontinuity that implies "a certain anarchy at the level of the decision-making centers, that restores to

certain responsible subalterns of the Nazi hierarchy their importance and eliminates, in part, the idea of one supremely responsible man, Hitler, in that which concerns the Jewish policy." [37] Not only are these two interpretations contradictory, but indeed both are without foundation. [36]

Neither the thesis of inexorable continuity and of planning the total extermination of the Jews before the attack on the USSR, nor that of discontinuity and improvisation can be demonstrated in reality, in view of the present state of the sources; such is the conclusion reached by Krausnick and Wilhelm at the end of their monumental study of the Einsatzgruppen. [39]

At the end of his report Saul Friedländer traces a "framework of the acquisitions of [Exterminationist] historiography" in which, regarding the extermination of the Jews, he admits:

The question of the date on which the total physical extermination of the Jews was decided, as well as the elaboration of the plan for the "final solution" remain unresolved. [40]

These "acquisitions" have been fully confirmed in the presentations of two other historians.

Uwe Dietrich Adam in his account "Nazi measures regarding the Jews from the start of the Second World War up to the German attack against the USSR," declared:

However, the precise date at which this "final solutions was ordained constitutes a problem not yet resolved for German and for world history. [41]

And again:

Insofar as no one has yet discovered a written trace of this order [to liquidate the Jews under German control] in the sources which have been exploited up to the present, and insofar as that seems unlikely, it is incumbent on the historian to date it as precisely as possible by appealing to interpretation. Since the methods and the hypotheses on this subject are very numerous, we find ourselves confronted with very diverse opinions. [42]

In his account "The decision concerning the final solutions" Christopher R. Browning spoke of "essential divergences" among Exterminationist historians:

The decision concerning the final solution has been the object of a large number of historical interpretations. The essential divergences seem to involve two connected questions: on the one hand, the nature of the decision process and, more particularly, the role of Hitler and his ideology; on the other hand, the moment when the decision was made. As Martin Broszat rightly remarked, so great a variety of interpretations warns us that every theory on the origin of the final solution is in the domain of probability rather than of certitude. [43]

Browning then presents a survey recapitulating these "essential divergences":

For Lucy Dawidowicz, the conception of the final solution preceded its accomplishment by twenty years; for Martin Broszat, the idea emerged from praxis – the sporadic murder of groups of Jews gave birth to the idea of killing the Jews systematically. Between these two polar extremes, one finds a large variety of interpretations. Thus Eberhard Jäckel maintains that the idea of killing the Jews formed in Hitler's mind around 1924. Stressing Hitler's threatening declarations at the end of the thirties, Karl Dietrich Bracher supposes that the intention existed from this period. Andreas Hillgruber and Klaus Hildebrand affirm the primacy of ideological factors but propose no precise date. Others, not all functionalists, place the turning point in 1941; however, several dates are proposed for that year. Léon Poliakov judges that the beginning of 1941 is the most likely date, and Robert Kempner and Helmut Krausnick maintain that Hitler made the decision in the spring, in connection with the preparations for the invasion of Russia. Raul Hilberg thinks that the decision was made during the summer, when the massacres carried out in Russia fostered the belief that this solution was possible for a victorious Germany throughout Europe. Uwe Dietrich Adam states that it was made in autumn, at the time when the military offensive faltered and a "Territorial solution" for a massive expulsion to Russia proved impossible. Finally Sebastian Haffner, who is certainly not a functionalist, defends a still later date, at the beginning of December, when first presentiment of defeat pushed Hitler to seek an irreversible victory over the Jews. [44]

At this point, Browning asks:

How to explain such a diversity of interpretations regarding the character and the date of the decision on the final solution?

This diversity is explained, according to Browning, by a subjective ground – the different vantage points occupied by the "intentionalists" and the "functionalists" – and an objective ground which is in reality the real reason, "by the lack of documentation." [45] Browning continues:

There are no written archives in which Hitler, Himmler, and Heydrich discuss the subject of the final solution, and none of the three survived to testify after the war. That is why the historian must himself reconstruct the decision process at the top by extrapolating from events, documents, and external testimony. Just like Plato's man in the cave, he only sees reflections and shadows, not reality. This risky process of extrapolation and reconstruction leads inevitably to a large variety of conclusions. [46]

Browning insists many times on the nearly total absence of documents concerning the "extermination plan" for the Jews:

Nevertheless, in spite of everything known about the German invasion of Russia, there is no specific documentation on the destiny reserved for the Russian Jews. In order to obtain an answer to this question it is necessary to have recourse to postwar testimony, to indirect proofs and to scattered references in the later documents. [47]

If the decision to kill the Jews in Russia indeed was taken before the invasion, on the other hand the circumstances and the exact moment of this decision remain obscure. It is impossible to determine if the initiative came from Hitler or from someone else, from Heydrich for example. Moreover, it is not known whether Hitler had already made his decision in March, when he announced clearly to the military that the Russian war would not be a conventional war, or if the complaisance of the military pushed them in the end to widen the circle of intended victims beyond the "Judeo-Bolshevik intelligentsia." Insufficient documentation does not permit a definite response to these questions, allowing only informed hypotheses. [48]

It is not known, and doubtless will never be known when and how Heydrich and his immediate superior, Himmler, became aware of their new mission. [49]

Finally:

There was no written order for the final solution, and we have not a single reference to a verbal order, outside of that furnished by Himmler and Heydrich, who stated they acted in accord with the Führer. [50]

To conclude, the "acquisitions" of Exterminationist historiography, up to the present, are still: "Not a document remains, or perhaps ever existed."

2. The National Socialist Policy for Jewish Emigration

The alleged "extermination plan" for the Jews, aside from not being corroborated by any document, is refuted decisively by National Socialist policy in the matter of Jewish emigration, a policy which we can trace here only in its essential lines.

In a letter to his friend Gemlich of 16 September 1919, considered to be "the first written document of Hitler's political career" [1] he states on the subject of the Jewish question:

Rational anti-Semitism must, however, lead to the struggle against the privileges of the Jew that he alone possesses, in contrast to the other foreigners who dwell among us (legislation relative to foreigners), and to their legal and systematic suppression. But its ultimate goal must be, immutably and above all else, the removal of the Jews. [2]

On 13 August 1920 in Munich Hitler gave a speech, "Why Are We Anti-Semites?," in which he repeated that a scientific knowledge of anti-Semitism must translate into action ending in "the removal of the Jews from among our people." [3]

The solution of the Jewish question became the principal inspiration of the National Socialist political program [4] and of the racial doctrine. Indeed, as Poliakov notes:

... that there had to be exterminations is not apparent, furthermore, from any of the National Socialist dogmas, or their principal writings. *Mein Kampf*, where

the word "Jew" appears on almost every page, is mute on the fate that will befall them in the National Socialist state.

The official party program declares that "a Jew cannot be a compatriot" nor, consequently, a citizen, while the commentaries on the program call more explicitly for "the expulsion of the Jews and undesirable foreigners." [5]

The removal of the Jews from the Reich was the focal point of Hitler's policy toward the Jews from his accession to power. On 28 August 1933 the Reich Economics Ministry and the Jewish Agency for Palestine agreed to what was called the *Haavara Abkommen*, which was an accord (*Abkommen*) to facilitate the transfer (*Haavara*) [6] of German Jews to Palestine. [7]

A note of the Foreign Affairs Ministry dated 19 March 1938 presaged the breaking of the accord because, as may be read in point 3, it was not in the interest of Germany to organize the emigration of rich Jews with their capital, which [German] interest rested rather "on a mass emigration of Jews." [8]

The Nuremberg laws of 15 September 1935 [9] reaffirmed, by legislation, Articles 4 and 5 of the party program formulated in Munich 24 February 1920. The goal of the law on Reich citizenship, and of that for the defense of German blood and honor, was to separate and isolate the Jewish foreign body from the German organism in view of the approaching expulsion, as underscored by Reitlinger:

In 1938, shortly before the Munich "agreement," when the Fifth Supplementary Decree had just finished ousting the Jews from the last of the free professions, Wilhelm Stuckart, who not only drafted, but was in large part the promoter of the Nuremberg laws, wrote that from here on the objective of the racial laws was attained. A great number of decisions carried out thanks to the Nuremberg laws "lose importance as one nears the final solution of the Jewish problem." The phrase, as is evident, was not yet a mask for the concept of the extermination of the race; on the contrary, it alluded clearly to the fact that the laws did not intend to perpetrate the Jewish problem, but rather to eliminate the reasons for it. The Jews had to leave the Reich, once and for all. [10]

In fact at the end of 1936 a service for Jewish questions was constituted as part of the SS Security Service. "The essential goal of the new agency was the study of all questions preparatory to a mass emigration of the Jews." [11]

In 1938 there was instituted in Vienna the Central Office for Jewish Emigration (*Zentralstelle für jüdische Auswanderung*), the direction of which was entrusted to Adolf Eichmann by Heydrich. [12]

On 12 November 1938, some days after what was called "Crystal Night" (the night of broken glass) Göring convened the Council of Ministers to face the difficult situation thereby created.

The attitude of the National Socialist chiefs appears unequivocally as one goes through the stenographic record of the meeting. Heydrich declared that the ejection of

the Jews from German economic life did not resolve "the fundamental problem of the end objective: the removal of the Jews from Germany." At Vienna, by order of the Reichskommissar, a central office for Jewish emigration had been set up, by whose intervention at least 50,000 Jews had left Austria, while in the same period only 19,000 had left the Old Reich. That is why he proposed to establish, in the Reich as well, a central service similar to that of Vienna, and to establish an emigration operation to be completed in 8 to 10 years. Finance Minister von Krosigk approved Heydrich's proposal: he agreed to make every effort toward the evacuation abroad of the Jews. Interior Minister Frick repeated that the objective had to be to make the largest possible number of Jews emigrate. [13]

In order to overcome the economic difficulties entailed by Jewish emigration, in December 1938 Hitler approved the Schacht plan.

The proposition discussed by Schacht with Lord Bearsted, Lord Winterton, and Mr. Rublee in London in December was, in large outline, the following: The German government would freeze the assets of the Jews to use them as a fund to guarantee an international loan amortizable in 20-25 years. Supposing that the Jewish assets were valued at 1.5 billion marks, there would have been a sufficient amount of foreign exchange to finance the emigration of Jews from the greater Reich over 3-5 years in the normal course of events.

After Schacht's return to Germany, he met with Hitler in Berchtesgaden on 2 January 1939 concerning the reception his proposals had received in London. Hitler seemed to be impressed, as three days later he named Schacht special delegate for the augmentation of Jewish emigration. [14]

In January 1939 Schacht and [George] Rublee, director of an "intergovernmental" committee for the emigration of German Jews, agreed in London to a basic plan foreseeing the emigration of about 400,000 Jews in the space of 3 years. [15]

Reitlinger attributes the failure of the Schacht plan to the reaction aroused in Hitler by Schacht's refusal to increase the circulation of paper money, following which, on 20 January 1939, Schacht was dismissed from the presidency of the Reichsbank. However, in an interview given Rolf Vogel in January 1970, Schacht declared that the plan was checkmated by the opposition of Chaim Weizmann. [16]

Meanwhile, National Socialist policy in the matter of Jewish emigration forged ahead.

On 24 January 1939 Göring promulgated a decree authorizing the establishment of a Reich Central [Office] for Jewish Emigration.

Göring summarized at the outset National Socialist policy toward the Jews in lapidary fashion:

The emigration of the Jews from Germany is to be furthered by all means [*Die Auswanderung der Juden aus Deutschland ist mit allen Mitteln zu fördern*].

It is precisely to that end that he established the Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration mentioned above, which had as its assignment "the adoption of all

measures to prepare for an intensified emigration of the Jews," and lastly to facilitate the bureaucratic procedures for the emigration of each individual.

The direction of the Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration Göring entrusted to Heydrich, Chief of the Security Police. [17]

In the course of the first meeting of the Committee of the Central Office for Jewish Emigration (11 February 1939), Heydrich discussed, above all, the Schacht-Rublec plan:

This plan evidently is destined to become the basis of a massive and organized Jewish emigration, but its implementation seems not yet to be ensured; it would be an error to count solely on it. We must therefore continue to encourage emigration by all the means at our disposal, leaving the plan aside. [18]

A Foreign Affairs Ministry report 25 January 1939 titled *The Jewish Question as a Factor of Foreign Policy* in 1938 unequivocally confirmed the animating principle of National Socialist Jewish policy:

The end objective of German policy in regard to the Jews is the emigration of all Jews living in the territory of the Reich [*Das letzte Ziel der deutschen Judenpolitik ist die Auswanderung aller im Reichsgebiet lebenden Juden*]. [19]

This report upheld "a radical solution of the Jewish question by emigration" such as has been pursued here for years [*eine radikale Lösung der Judenfrage durch die Auswanderung-wie sie hier schon seit Jahren verfolgt wird*]," according to the commentary of SS-Obersturmführer Ehrlinger of the Reich Central Security Department. [20]

After the creation of the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia, Eichmann received an order from Heydrich to establish "a central office for Jewish emigration" in Prague. [21] In the pertinent document, signed by Reich Protector von Neurath on 15 July 1939, one reads this:

In compliance with Reich regulations, to the end of obviating hindrances and delays it is necessary to group together the treatment of all questions relating to Jewish emigration. In view of the accelerated increase and regulation of the emigration of Jews from Bohemia-Moravia, the "Central Office for Jewish Emigration" of Prague is therefore created. [22]

Despite growing difficulties, National Socialist policy in the matter of Jewish emigration was pursued even during the war.

The major difficulty was undoubtedly the poorly dissimulated anti-Semitism of the democratic countries, which on the one hand made an outcry against the persecution of the Jews by the National Socialists, and on the other, refused to accept the persecuted Jews, as appeared clearly in the course of the Evian conference that unfolded from 6 to 15 June 1938.

This conference was organized at the initiative of President Roosevelt to the end of facilitating the emigration of the victims of National Socialist persecution and, first of all, the Jews. But the good intentions of the American president appeared suspect from the beginning. Michel Mazor writes:

At his Warm Springs press conference President Roosevelt limited the possibilities of Evian by saying that no revision or increase of immigration quotas into the United States was envisioned because of it. In his invitation to that conference, addressed to thirty three countries, Roosevelt emphasized that it was not expected of any country that it would consent to receive more immigrants than the norm stipulated by its legislation then in force.

On such a basis, the Evian conference, from its inception, was doomed to failure. In fact, its result was "that the free world abandoned the Jews of Germany and of Austria to their pitiless fate." [23]

For her part, Rita Thalmann recalls:

Drawing a lesson from the conference, the *Danziger Vorposten* notes that "one loves to pity the Jews as long as such pity heightens an evil intentioned agitation against Germany, but that no state was disposed to fight the culture damage to central Europe by taking some thousands of Jews. The conference," concluded the newspaper, "therefore is a vindication of German policy toward the Jews."

At all events, the German leaders had the evidence that the thirty-two states which took part in the Evian conference (the USSR and Czechoslovakia were not represented; Italy had declined the invitation; Hungary, Romania, and Poland had sent observers with the sole intent of asking that they be relieved of their own Jews) had no intention of taking charge of the persecutees, or indeed of concerning themselves seriously about their fate. [24]

Paradoxically, immediately after the Evian conference, beginning at the end of 1938, one notes a diminution in emigration from the Reich, "because other countries opposed themselves more and more to new immigrations of Jews." [25]

In March 1943 Goebbels could again remark sarcastically:

What will be the solution of the Jewish question, will a Jewish state be created one day anywhere whatsoever? We'll know that later. But it is curious to note that the countries whose public opinion is aroused in favor of the Jews still refuse to receive them. They say these are the pioneers of civilization, geniuses of philosophy and artistic creation, but when one wants them to accept these geniuses, they close their frontiers: "No no, we don't want them!" This is, it seems to me, a unique example in world history of one declining to welcome genius! [26]

The rapid defeat of Poland suggested a provisional solution to the National Socialist leaders. On 23 September 1939 Heydrich sent an express-letter [*Schnellbrief*] to all chiefs of the Einsatzgruppen of the Security Police. In that letter, which had as subject

"The Jewish Question in the Occupied Territory," he set forth the measures that were agreed on in Berlin at a meeting that same day, which were summarized in two points: the final goal [*Endziel*] and the stages of its achievement. In view of this final goal, the Jews were to be concentrated in towns after the campaign. [27]

Poliakov comments:

It is a question of a "final end." What was it? Not at all extermination, yet; we are only in 1939. A passage in the document gives us a key in the territory flying to the east of Cracow" the Jews are not to be touched; and if in other regions they are gathered together near the railroad stations, it is evidently so they may be evacuated more easily. To what destination? Very certainly to that "region to the east of Cracow." [28]

It is thus, always according to Poliakov, that there was designed:

The project to resolve the Jewish question by gathering all Jews under Nazi domination into the region of Lublin, at the frontier of the USSR The plan for the creation of a "Jewish reservation" was given a certain publicity in the columns of the German press of the period. A territory was chosen, delimited, it seems (the information is incomplete and contradictory) by the Vistula, the San, and the USSR border, within which the Jews were to devote themselves to works of colonization under surveillance of the SS. [29]

But, because of unfavorable circumstances the project was never completely realized.

During this period the German government continued its traditional emigration policy. In effect, as Poliakov remarks:

... parallel to these deportations to the east, the "Center [Central Office – Ed.] for Jewish Emigration" made efforts to expel the German Jews to other destinations. Legal emigration had become almost impossible: a thin stream of emigrants meanwhile continued to trickle out, from Austria in particular, via Italy toward overseas countries. Some clandestine convoys, formed with the cooperation of Eichmann, attempted to go down the Danube by boat, with Palestine as their destination but the British government refused to allow these travelers without visas to enter the Jewish national homeland. We shall later on meet again with this bitter paradox of the Gestapo pushing Jews to safety, while His Majesty's democratic government bans access to the future victims of the crematory ovens. [30]

The defeat of France furnished the occasion for carrying out the policy of Jewish emigration on a large scale:

When, after the collapse of France, enormous prospects opened before the eyes of the Nazis, a plan long cherished by certain persons among them returned to the agenda with new topicality. They believed, in short, to have in hand the key to "the definitive solution of the Jewish question." We have seen that in the course of the astonishing meeting of 12 November 1938, Göring had mentioned the "question of Madagascar." Himmler himself had dreamed

of that since 1934, a witness assures us. Park all the Jews on a big island, that, moreover, belongs to France – that must have satisfied their love of symbolism. Whatever the case, after the armistice of June 1940 the idea was propounded by the Foreign Affairs Ministry, taken up enthusiastically by the RSHA and approved by Himmler as well as by the Führer himself, it seems. [31]

During the meeting of 12 November 1938, Göring had in fact informed those present that the Führer, according to what he had told Göring personally three days before, was preparing a foreign policy gesture toward those powers which had raised the Jewish question, in order to arrive at a solution to the Madagascar question. "He will say to the other states: Why are you always talking about the Jews? Take them!" [32]

Himmler was equally favorable to a massive Jewish emigration, as is seen by the note "Some thoughts on the treatment of foreign population groups in the East" of May 1940, in which he wrote:

I expect to see the idea "Jew" effaced definitively, thanks to the emigration of all Jews to Africa, or to a colony. [33]

In the same note he rejected:

... the Bolshevik method of physically exterminating a people, with the innermost conviction that that is unGerman and impossible. [34]

On 24 June 1940 Heydrich informed Foreign Affairs Minister Ribbentrop that more than 200,000 Jews had emigrated from the territory of the Reich, but that ...

... the overall problem [*Gesamtproblem*] constituted by the 3,250,000 Jews who found themselves under German rule could no longer be resolved by emigration [*durch Auswanderung* - words underlined in the original]; which is why the necessity of a "final territorial solution [*eine territoriale Endlösung*] becomes apparent. [35]

Following that letter, the Foreign Affairs Ministry worked out the "Madagascar project."

On 3 July 1940 Franz Rademacher, responsible for Jewish affairs at the Foreign Affairs Ministry, drew up a report titled: "The Jewish Question in the Peace Treaty" which opens with the following declaration:

The imminent victory gives Germany the possibility and, in my opinion, also the duty, to resolve the Jewish question in Europe. The desirable solution is: all the Jews out of Europe.

After having set forth the responsibilities of the Foreign Affairs Ministry relative to that solution, Rademacher goes on "Section D II proposes as a solution to the Jewish question in the peace treaty France should make Madagascar available for the solution of the Jewish question and transfer and

indemnify the 25,000 French who live there. The island will come under German mandate." [36]

It is precisely in this, just as Joseph Billig discerned, that "the territorial solution of the Jewish question, as Heydrich designated it to Ribbentrop," consisted. [37]

Rademacher's report was approved by Ribbentrop and transmitted to the Reich Central Security Department, which "elaborated a detailed plan for the evacuation of the Jews to Madagascar and for their settlement there; this plan was approved by the Reichsführer-SS." [38]

On 12 July 1940, upon returning from Berlin, where he had been received by Hitler, Hans Frank, governor of Poland, made a speech in which he declared:

From the viewpoint of general policy, I would like to add that it was decided to deport all the Jewish communities of Germany, of the General Government [Poland], and of the Protectorate [Bohemia-Moravia] to an African or an American colony as soon as possible after having made peace: Madagascar, which France would have to abandon to that end, has been suggested. [39]

On 29 July Frank repeated that Hitler had decided that the Jews would be completely evacuated as soon as overseas transport permitted. [40]

Otto Abetz, former German ambassador to Paris, declared, in return, that the destination of the Jews would be the United States:

I have spoken just once, 3 August 1940, with the Führer about the Jewish question. He told me that he wanted to resolve the Jewish question for Europe in general, that is, by means of a clause in the peace treaty making it a condition that the vanquished countries transfer their Jewish nationals out of Europe. He wanted in the same way to influence the states with which he was allied. On that occasion he mentioned the United States of America as a country that had not long been overpopulated as was Europe, and therefore was able still to take in some millions of Jews. [41]

In October 1940 Alfred Rosenberg wrote an article titled: "Jews to Madagascar." As far back as 1927, he recalled, at the anti-Jewish congress in Budapest:

... the question of a future evacuation of Jews from Europe was taken up, and on that occasion appeared for the first time the proposal to promote precisely Madagascar as the future domicile of the Jews.

He reiterated that proposal, hoping that "the Jewish high finance" of the United States and of England [42] would collaborate in the installation of a Jewish reservation on Madagascar, a matter that he considered to be a "world problem."

According to a communication, dated 3 November 1940, from Bormann to Rosenberg, Hitler at that time opposed the publication of the article in question, while not ruling out its possible publication in the following months. [43]

This was because the Germans at the time were in contact with the Vichy government on the subject of the Madagascar project:

It was therefore natural that Hitler put off public notice of the project until later. In his speech of 30 January 1941 (anniversary of the assumption of power) he limited himself to proclaiming that "Judaism will cease to play its role in Europe." That also was in harmony with the Madagascar plan. [44]

It seems, nevertheless, that Hitler did not thereafter authorize Rosenberg to publicize the Madagascar project. In fact, at the conference on "The Jewish Question as a World Problem" held by Rosenberg 28 March 1941, he declared, in the name of all Europeans:

For Europe the Jewish question will not be resolved until the last Jew has left the continent for a Jewish reservation.

On the subject of that reservation, Rosenberg limited himself to declaring:

In regard to the practical realization and the place of transfer, or evacuation, many things naturally have been said over the years. It is not necessary at present to deal with that question. Its solution will be left to a future accord. [45]

Goebbels, in turn, according to the testimony of Morit von Schirmeister, a former Propaganda Ministry official, spoke publicly and repeatedly of the Madagascar project.

Dr. Fritz: Where were the Jews to be evacuated to according to the declarations of Dr. Goebbels?

Von Schirmeister: Up until the first year, including the Russian campaign, Dr. Goebbels mentioned several times the Madagascar plan at conferences at which he presided. Afterwards, he changed his mind and said it was necessary to set up a new Jewish state in the east, to which the Jews then would be sent. [46]

Interrogated at Nuremberg about a document of 24 September 1943, Ribbentrop responded:

The Führer then proposed the evacuation of the European Jews to North Africa – but Madagascar also came up. He ordered me to make contact with the various governments to induce emigration of Jews, and their exclusion from important organizations as far as possible. That order was then directed by me to the Foreign Affairs Ministry and, as far as I can remember, contacts were made repeatedly with several governments on the subject of emigration of Jews to North Africa, which was anticipated. [47]

In the note, "Madagascar Project", 30 August 1940, Rademacher declared that the establishment of the General Government of Poland and the annexation of the new eastern districts had put a very great number of Jews under German rule. That and

other difficulties, such as the hardening immigration legislation on the part of overseas countries, made it difficult to complete the "solution of the Jewish question in the territory of the Reich, and including the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia, by means of emigration," [48] on schedule, or for a date not too far distant, whence, precisely, the Madagascar project.

Eichmann went to work **with a will**

He surrounded himself with maritime experts, to work out a transport plan; this was to be carried out by a pool of the big German navigation companies. Embarkation would be at the principal North Sea and Mediterranean ports. At the same time, he strove to have all Jewish fortunes confiscated for the benefit of the "Central Fund." He sent emissaries to the occupied or controlled countries in order to gather statistics on the number, age, occupational distribution, etc., of the Jews. These detailed statistics, we shall see, will serve another end.

... Everything was in readiness so that the machinery could go into action when peace was concluded. [49]

Indeed, in the note quoted from above, Rademacher, reckoning that the transfer of four million Jews to Madagascar would take about four years, wrote:

After the conclusion of peace, the German merchant marine will no doubt be thoroughly occupied in another fashion. It is therefore necessary to include in the peace treaty that France and England put at our disposal the tonnage required for the solution of the Jewish problem. [50]

The paragraph "Financing" in the "Madagascar Project" note opens with the following phrase:

The realization of the proposed "final solution" requires considerable means. [51]

The infamous "final solution of the Jewish question," then, reduces simply to the transfer of the European Jews to Madagascar, as acknowledged in the judgment of the Eichmann trial:

Until it was abandoned, the "Madagascar Plan" was sometimes referred to by the German leaders as "the final solution of the Jewish question." [52]

As we know, that expression would later become, according to the official historians, synonymous with the "extermination" of the Jews:

Final Solution of the Jewish question was one of the conventional phrases to designate the Hitlerian plan to exterminate the European Jews. German functionaries employed it, beginning in the summer of 1941, in order to avoid having to admit to each other the existence of this plan; however, even before then, on diverse occasions, the expression had been used to designate, essentially, the emigration of the Jews. [53]

In reality, this assertion is arbitrary, and entirely without foundation, not only because no evidence supports it, but because existing documents refute it categorically.

Here we must limit ourselves to some brief considerations. The investigators at Nuremberg knew perfectly well that an "extermination plan" which, according to the prosecution, brought about the death of "more than four and a half million" [54] or of "six million" [55] Jews could not have been carried out without leaving the least trace in the Nazi archives and, from the juridical standpoint, they could not have recourse to the subterfuges of the official historians, according to whom all the compromising documents were destroyed.

Thus they worked out an audacious method of exegesis, allowing one to say whatever he wants, regardless of any document. The foundation of that exegetic method rests on an arbitrary speculation according to which the supreme National Socialist authorities adopted, even for their most private documents, a kind of code language, to which the Nuremberg investigators pretended, naturally, to have discovered the key. Whence the systematic distortion - to serve the extermination thesis - of completely harmless documents.

The most widely known example of this systematic travesty concerns precisely the interpretation of the term *Endlösung* (final solution), which has been made a synonym for "extermination of the Jews." [56] As we shall soon see, the "final solutions by the transfer of European Jews to Madagascar was succeeded - but only as an alternative - by "the final territorial solution" of deporting the European Jews to the eastern territories occupied by the Germans.

On 20 May 1941 Heydrich stopped Jewish emigration from France and from Belgium, and the immigration of Jews into the occupied territories, in order to reserve all emigration possibilities for the Jews of the Reich, and "in consideration of the no doubt early final solution of the Jewish question." [57]

Uwe Dietrich Adam comments:

This document was later often, due to its formulation, poorly interpreted. Göring ordered all authorities to facilitate the emigration of the Jews from the Reich and the areas under its protectorate, insofar as possible, even during the war. On the other hand, the emigration of Jews from France and from Belgium was to be forbidden due to "the final solution which, without a doubt, draws near." The deceptive term "final solution" was interpreted by generations of historians as designating a physical destruction, whereas at that time it signified only the emigration of the Jews to Madagascar. [57a]

In the event, by a letter of 31 July 1941 Göring entrusted to Heydrich the task of making all necessary preparations regarding the "final solution," that is, to organize the total and definitive emigration or evacuation of the Jews who found themselves under German rule. [57b] The letter declared, in effect:

Supplementing the task already assigned to you by decree of 24 January 1939, to find the most advantageous solution of the Jewish question, by means of emigration or evacuation, possible in the circumstances, I charge you herewith

to proceed with all preparations necessary on the organizational concrete, and material levels in order to arrive at a total solution [*Gesamtlösung*] of the Jewish question in the German sphere of influence in Europe. Insofar as the competent authorities of other branches may find themselves concerned here, they will have to participate. I charge you also to submit to me quickly a complete plan [*Gesamtentwurf*] showing the organizational, the concrete, and material preliminary measures to achieve the final solution of the Jewish question to which we all aspire. [58]

According to the method of interpretation mentioned above, that letter would constitute one of the fundamental documents of the history of the "extermination" [59]: the expression "final solution" appears indeed, to designate, as Reitlinger maintains, "the Hitlerian plan for the extermination of the Jews of Europe."

In reality, and the text shows it clearly, the desired "final solution of the Jewish question" is a solution by means of "emigration or evacuation."

Heydrich himself, writing 6 November 1941 that for years he had been charged with preparing the "final solution" in Europe, [60] made clear that this responsibility was derived from the decree 24 January 1939 and identified the "final solution" precisely as "the final solution by way of emigration or of evacuation."

That the official historians' interpretations are tendentious is evidenced by the fact that G. Reitlinger and W. Shirer, citing the letter in question, suppress precisely that part of the document that speaks of emigration and evacuation. [61]

Göring's letter of 31 July 1941 refers exclusively to Jewish emigration and evacuation, and that is confirmed by a very important document, the 21 August 1942 memorandum of Martin Luther.

In this document Martin Luther, chief of the department "Germany" in the Foreign Affairs Ministry, recapitulates the essential points of National Socialist policy in regard to the Jews. Luther goes on:

The principle of German policy on the Jewish question after the assumption of power was to promote Jewish emigration by every means. To accomplish this General Field Marshal Göring, in his capacity as chief of the Four Year Plan, established in 1939 a Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration, the direction of which was entrusted to Gruppenführer Heydrich in his role as chief of the security police.

After having referred to the Madagascar plan, which had at that time been by-passed by events, Luther went on to note that Göring's letter of 31 July 1941 followed up Heydrich's letter, which we have already cited, in which Heydrich informed Rademacher that:

The overall problem constituted by the 3,250,000 Jews who found themselves under German rule could no longer be resolved by emigration; which is why the necessity of a "final territorial solution" becomes apparent.

Luther went on to write:

Knowing that, Reich Marshal Göring on 31 July 1941 charged Gruppenführer Heydrich with making, in collaboration with all German central agencies interested, all necessary preparations for a total solution of the Jewish question in the German sphere of influence in Europe.

Luther continues:

In compliance with that order, Gruppenführer Heydrich called a meeting 20 January 1942 of all interested German agencies, a meeting at which the under secretaries of the other ministries, and I myself from the Foreign Ministry, were present.

At that meeting Gruppenführer Heydrich explained that the responsibility assigned him by Reich Marshal Göring had been given him by order of the Führer, and that the Führer from then on authorized the evacuation of the Jews to the east as a solution other than emigration.

In compliance with that order by the Führer, the evacuation of the German Jews was undertaken.

The destination consisted of the eastern territories, via the General Government:

Evacuation via the General Government is a provisional measure. The Jews ultimately will be transferred to the eastern occupied territories when the necessary conditions are created. [62]

In a note of 14 November 1942 headed "Financing the measures related to the solution of the Jewish problem," Ministerial Counselor Maedel confirmed:

It is some time ago that the Reichsmarschall charged the Reichsführer-SS and chief of the German police with preparing measures appropriate to assuring the final solution of the Jewish problem in Europe. The Reichsführer-SS has charged the Chief of the Security Police and the SD with the execution of that task. The latter has, first of an, expedited, by special measures, the legal emigration of the Jews to overseas countries. When the war made overseas emigration impossible he made preparations for the progressive clearance of the Reich territory of its Jews by their evacuation to the east. [63]

The difficulties of the war and the prospects opened by the Russian campaign had brought about the provisional abandonment of the policy of total emigration.

In consequence, emigration of Jews from Germany was suspended 23 October 1941 [64] for the duration of the war, but, it seems, the order was not executed because it was sent out again 3 January 1942 [65] and promulgated finally by Himmler 4 February 1942. On that date the "military commander" in France published the following ordinance:

The Reichsführer-SS and Chief of the German Police at RMdJ has ordered the general cessation of all Jewish emigration from Germany and from the occupied countries.

Himmler reserved to himself authorization of particular emigrations when the interests of Germany required. [66] Yet up until 31 March 1943, Jews of Italian, Finnish, Swiss, Spanish, Portuguese, Danish, and Swedish citizenship were permitted to return to their countries. [67]

Heydrich's conference mentioned by Luther was held 20 January 1942 in Berlin at Gross Wannsee 56/58. The "minutes" relating to that conference open with a summary of National Socialist policy regarding the Jews:

The Chief of Security Police and of the Security Service, SS Gruppenführer Heydrich, opened the meeting by announcing his appointment to responsibility for the preparation of the final solution of the European Jewish question [*Endlösung der europäischen Judenfrage*], and indicated that the object of the meeting was to clear up questions of principle. To respond to the wish of the Reichsmarschall to see a plan for organizational measures, and on concrete and material questions posed by the final solution of the Jewish question in Europe, all central agencies directly interested must agree first of all to coordinate their efforts.

It is the Reichsführer-SS and Chief of the German Police (and of the security police and of the security service) who will be responsible for the totality of the measure necessary for the solution of the Jewish question regardless of geographical boundaries.

The Chief of the Security Police and of the Security Service thereupon gave a brief insight into the fight against this adversary up to the present time. Its essential phases are:

- a) Forcing the Jews out of the vital spheres of the German people
- b) Driving the Jews out of the living space of the German people.

To arrive at these goals, the only possibility of provisional solution has been to accelerate and to undertake in systematic fashion the emigration of the Jews out of the territory of the Reich

In January 1939, at the order of the Reichsmarschall there was created a Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration, at the head of which was placed the Chief of the Security Police and of the Security Service. This service had as its mission, in particular:

- a) to take all measures for the *preparation* of an intensified emigration of the Jews;
- b) to *orient* the course of emigration;

c) to hasten emigration in *particular cases*.

The object was to cleanse the German living space of its Jews by legal means.

In consequence of that policy, up to 31 October 1941, and this despite manifold difficulties, about 537,000 Jews emigrated from the old Reich, from Austria, and from the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia.

The minutes continue:

Meanwhile, the Reichsführer-SS and Chief of the German Police [Himmler], in view of the dangers of emigration in wartime, and in view of the possibilities offered in the east, has forbidden the emigration of Jews.

From that time on, with the prior authorization of the Führer, emigration gave way to another possible solution, evacuation of the Jews to the east

Although one will not fail to recognize these actions as merely alternative possibilities [*Ausweichsmöglichkeiten*], the practical experience already gathered in this field is of – signal importance for the final solution of the Jewish question." [68]

By order of the Führer the final solution, i.e., the total emigration of the European Jews, thus was replaced by evacuation to the occupied territories of the east, but only as a palliative, until taking up the question again after the end of the war. In the event, by a memorandum dated Berlin August 1940, Luther had communicated to Rademacher the following:

On the occasion of a conference with Ambassador Abetz in Paris, he informed me that when he reported to the Führer on France about two weeks ago, the Führer told him that he intended to evacuate all the Jews from Europe after the war. [69]

This is not the only document in which Hitler manifests this intention regarding the European Jews. Indeed, according to a Reich Chancellery note of March-April 1942, Hitler intended to take up the Jewish question after the war, [70] and on 24 July 1942 he himself affirmed that after the end of the war he "would strike town after town if the Jews did not move out and did not emigrate to Madagascar or to another Jewish national state." [71]

Some months earlier, on March 7, 1942, Goebbels had written in his diary:

The Jewish question will have to be written up in a plan on a pan-European scale. There remain more than eleven million Jews in Europe. In the first place it is necessary to concentrate them all in the east. After the war we will be able eventually to assign them an island, perhaps Madagascar. In any case, there will be no peace in Europe as long as the Jews on the Continent are not totally excluded. [73]

The intention of the Nazis to resolve the Jewish question after the end of the war appears also in the so-called "Brown File," which goes back to the summer of 1941.

The paragraph "Directive for the solution of the Jewish question" of this document, which B. Nellessen says "sanctioned severe measures, but not extermination," [73] opens with the following phrase:

All measures concerning the Jewish question in the occupied territories of the east must be taken with the thought that after the war the Jewish question in Europe will find a general solution. [74]

A note by Luther of 17 October 1941 likewise mentions, in reference to Jews interned in France, "the measures to be taken after the war toward fundamental solution of the Jewish question." [74a]

In compliance with Hitler's directives the Madagascar project was then provisionally abandoned. An informative letter of 10 February 1942 by Rademacher gives the reason for this:

In August 1940, I sent you, for your files, the plan for the final solution of the Jewish question [*zur Endlösung der Judenfrage*] formulated by my office, according to which in the peace treaty the island of Madagascar was to be required of France but the practical execution of that task was to be entrusted to the Reich Central Security Agency. In conformance with that plan, Gruppenführer Heydrich has been charged by the Führer with solving the Jewish question in Europe.

Meanwhile, the war against the Soviet Union has put more territory for the final solution [*für die Endlösung*] at our disposal. Consequently, the Führer has decided to expel the Jews not to Madagascar, but to the east. Therefore it is no longer necessary to look to Madagascar for the final solution. [*Madagaskar braucht mithin nicht mehr für die Endlösung vorgesehen zu werden*]. [75]

Some weeks before then, on 27 January 1942, the Führer had declared:

The Jews must leave Europe. The best thing is that they go to Russia. [76]

A "notice" of 9 October 1942 captioned, "preparatory measures for the solution of the Jewish problem in Europe. Rumors about the condition of the Jews in the east" summarizes the stages and explains clearly the meaning of "final solution":

For almost 2,000 years a struggle, until now in vain has been carried on against Jewry. It is only since 1933 that the ways and means have been found to separate Jewry completely from the German masses.

The task, with a view to a solution, accomplished up until the present, may be summarized, *grosso modo*, as follows:

I. Exclusion of the Jews from the private spheres of the German people Laws will guarantee to future generations protection against a new influx of the enemy.

II. The attempt to drive the enemy completely out of the Reich territory. By reason of the very limited living space at the disposal of the German people, it is expected that this problem can be resolved principally by an accelerated Jewish emigration.

After the declaration of war, in 1939, the possibilities for emigration diminished more and more. On the other hand, as distinct from the living space of the German people, its economic space grew rapidly, although, by reason of the great number of Jews living in those territories, a total evacuation of the Jews by emigration is no longer possible.

Since the next generation itself will no longer feel the problem so intimately and will no longer understand it as clearly as in the light of past experience, and since this question, once put, demands a definitive answer, the problem must be solved by the present generation.

The removal or the total withdrawal of the millions of Jews living in the European economic space [*Lebensraum*] constitutes an urgent need for the vital security of the German people.

Beginning with the territory of the Reich, continuing with the other European territories comprehended in the definitive plan, the Jews will be deported progressively to large camps already established, or in course of being established, where they will have to work and from whence they will be deported farther to the east.

The accomplishment of these tasks calls for a "merciless strictness," [77] which is to say that the deportation of the Jews to the east must be total and inflexible.

Final solution of the Jewish question, then, never meant "Hitlerian plan for the extermination of the European Jews." [78]

At the Nuremberg trial Hans Lammers, former chief of the Führer's chancellery, interrogated by Dr. Thoma, affirmed he knew many things on the subject of the "final solution."

In 1942 he learned that the Führer had entrusted to Heydrich – through the intermediation of Göring – the task of solving the Jewish question. In order to know more, he contacted Himmler and asked him "What exactly was meant by the final solution of the Jewish question?" Himmler answered that he had received from the Führer the assignment to bring about the final solution of the Jewish question and that "this task consisted essentially of the fact that the Jews had to be evacuated from Germany." Subsequently this explanation was confirmed to him by the Führer personally.

In 1943 rumors, according to which the Jews were killed, circulated. Lammers tried to get at the source of these rumors, but without results, as they were founded always on other rumors, so he came to the conclusion that they were the product of enemy radio propaganda.

Nevertheless, to clarify the matter, Lammers again turned to Himmler, who denied that Jews might be killed legally: they were simply evacuated to the east, and that was the task that Hitler had entrusted to him. In the course of these evacuations aged or sick persons could have died, of course, and there could have been accidents, air attacks, and revolts that Himmler had been constrained to repress bloodily, to set an example, but that was all.

Lammers then went once more to the Führer who gave him the same reply as Himmler:

He told me: I shall decide later where the Jews will go; at the moment they are being put there.

Dr. Thoma then asked Lammers:

Himmler never told you that the final solution for the Jews consisted in their extermination?

Lammers: There was never a question of that. He spoke only of executions.

Dr. Thoma When did you learn that five million Jews had been exterminated?

Lammers: I learned it here, some time ago. [79]

So it is only at Nuremberg that the chief of the Reich Chancellery received knowledge of the alleged "extermination" of the Jews!

The statistical report "The Final Solution of the European Jewish Question" [*Die Endlösung der europäischen Judenfrage*] by Richard Korherr summarizes numerically the results of National Socialist policy in the matter of Jewish emigration until 31 December 1941. 557,357~ Jews had emigrated from the Old Reich, from the Sudetenland, from the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia, and from Austria. At least an equal number had emigrated from the eastern territories and from the Central Government, as the figure reproduced by Korherr, 762,593 Jews, combines emigrations and the excess of natural mortality. [80]

In conclusion, Adolf Hitler, from 1933 to 1942, had authorized the emigration of at least a million Jews who found themselves under his control.

As to the others, why exterminate them? Poliakov himself remarks on this subject:

From a more down-to-earth viewpoint, to what good? It is so much more economical to put them to work at the hardest tasks, parking them on a reservation, for example. [81]

This is precisely what Hitler did.

As the war went on, the concentration camps and the ghettos became indeed important centers for the German war economy, and this is why "the exploitation of Jewish manpower was another source of substantial revenue for the Third Reich and its men." [82]

The concentration camp at Auschwitz, for example, the territory of which comprised a "sphere of interest" of about 40 square kilometers, was the center of gravity of a vast industrial zone. It furnished manpower to numerous German industries, among which were Farbenindustrie, Berghütte, Vereinigte Oberschlesische Hüttenwerke AG, Hermann Göringwerke, Siemens-Schuckertwerke, Energie Versorgung Oberschlesien AG, Oberschlesische Hydrierwerke, Oberschlesische Gerätebau G.m.b.h., Deutsche Gas u. Russgesellschaft, Deutsche Reichsbahn, Heeresbauverwaltung, Schlesische Feinweberei, Union-Werke, Golleschauer Portland-Zement AG.

In the course of the years 1942-1944 the central Auschwitz camp counted 39 outside camps, of which 31 were for detainees used as manpower, 19 among them employing mainly Jewish detainees. [63]

At Monowitz 16 Farbenindustrie factories employed 25,000 Auschwitz detainees, about 100,000 civilian workers, and about 1,000 English POWs. [84]

Even the ghettos were transformed into economic centers of great importance. With the revolt of the Warsaw ghetto "the German war industry in the east lost one of its important supply centers." [85]

The second ghetto in economic importance after that of Warsaw was the Lodz ghetto: "Its manufactures of all kinds, and in particular, its textile industries, constituted support of great value to the German economy." [86]

On 19 January 1942 there was created the SS Economic Management Head Office [SS-Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungshauptamt SS-WVHA], [87] the aim of which was precisely "to utilize on a large scale the detainee manpower." [88] On 3 March Himmler ordered the inspectorate of the concentration camps to be transferred from the SS Main Directorate [SS-Führungshauptamt] to the SS-WVHA in order to centralize in Agency Group D [Amtsgruppe D] the direction of the war effort in relation to manpower. [89] An important modification was thus made in the function of internment in concentration camps, as is underscored by SS-Obergruppenführer Pohl, Chief of the SS-WVHA, in a letter of 30 April 1942 to the Reichsführer SS:

The war evidently has made necessary a change in the structure of the concentration camps, and to radically modify their functions in regard to the employment of detainees. The increase in the number of detainees solely for reasons of security, of re-education, or of prevention, is no longer of primary concern. The main emphasis is placed on the economic aspect. The mobilization of all work capacity for war purposes increase of armament) first of all and later for construction in peacetime, must be given higher priority with each day. [90]

These dispositions were equally valid for the Jews. As early as 25 January 1942 Himmler had sent the following order to SS-Brigadeführer Glücks, Inspector-General of Concentration Camps:

Inasmuch as soon we shall not be able to reckon with Russian prisoners of war, I shall send a great number of Jews and Jewesses expelled from Germany into the camps. Prepare to receive, in the course of the next four weeks, 100,000 Jews and up to 50,000 Jewesses in the concentration camps. Important economic tasks will be entrusted to the concentration camps in the coming weeks. SS Gruppenführer Pohl will inform you about this in detail. [91]

At the beginning of 1943, about 185,000 Jews were employed in war industry on territory under the control of the Reich. [92]

On 7 September 1943 all the Jewish work camps in the General Government – 10 in the district of Lublin alone – were released by the SS-WVHA and became auxiliary camps of Lublin. [93]

On 5 April 1944 in the territories under Reich jurisdiction there were 20 concentration camps and 105 work camps. [94]

In May 1944 Hitler ordered the employment of 200,000 Jews as manpower in the Jager construction program of ministerial director Dorsch. The order concerning guard personnel was issued by Himmler on May 11:

The Führer has ordered that 10,000 Waffen-SS, including officers and non-commissioned officers, be assigned to the surveillance of 200,000 Jews that the Reichsführer-SS is sending into the concentration camps of the Reich in order to employ them on the great construction projects of the Organization Todt and on other important military works. [95]

The former Hungarian Interior Minister, Gabor Wajna, reported a declaration by Himmler according to which: "Since the Jews have been employed on the Jager program, production has increased 40%." [96]

According to an SS-WVHA letter dated "Oranienburg, 15 August 1944" it appeared that the internment of 612,000 persons – among whom were 50,000 Jews of the Hungary program – in concentration camps was imminent. [97]

The importance of the work potential represented by the Jews appears even more plainly when the pressing need of the German war industry for manpower is considered.

On 21 March 1942 Hitler named Fritz Sauckel general plenipotentiary for the employment of manpower with the assignment of providing for that need. [98] According to a report sent by Sauckel to Hitler and Göring 27 July 1942, 5,124,000 foreign workers were employed in the Reich. Despite that, the need for manpower was so great that in January 1943 Sauckel ordered the total mobilization of all

Germans for the war economy. On 5 February 1943 at the Gauleiter Congress held in Posen, Sauckel declared:

The extraordinary harshness of the war has constrained me, in the name of the Führer, to mobilize several million foreigners for employment in the German war economy, in order to assure maximum output.

But at the beginning of 1944 Hitler called for 4,000,000 additional workers. [99] At the same time living conditions in the concentration camps were made easier in order to get higher production from the detainee labor force.

On 20 January 1943 SS-Brigadeführer Glücks, Chief of Agency Group D of the SS-WVHA, transmitted to the concentration camp commanders Himmler's order of 20 December 1942 [100] to reduce the death rate in the camps by every means, and holding them "personally responsible for exhausting every possibility to preserve the physical strength of the detainees." [101]

Following that order – as is noted by SS-Obergruppenführer Pohl on 30 September 1943 in a statistical report to the Reichsführer-SS – thanks to the amelioration of hygienic conditions, nourishment, and clothing, the mortality in the concentration camps was in constant decline, having fallen from 10% in December 1943 to 2.09% in August 1943. [102]

An SS-WVHA order of 18 November 1943 to the Auschwitz command recommended giving a bonus to the detainees – even to the Jews – who distinguished themselves by their work. [103]

The "extermination" of the Jews therefore was an economic absurdity, as Poliakov himself recognized, [104] the more so as, according to Colloti:

... it was, among other reasons, the economic necessity of making use of their labor that prevented the massive extermination of Soviet war prisoners wanted by Hitler. [105]

But if the economic need of the Germans was so pressing in regard to the Russians, why was it not equally so in regard to the Jews?

The official historians reply by maintaining that the "extermination" of the Jews, corresponding to the fundamental objective of the Führer, took precedence over no matter what economic exigency, even at the risk of assuming a clearly counter-economic character. Hannah Arendt formulated this thesis in admirable fashion:

The incredible character of these horrors is closely tied to their uselessness on the economic plan. The Nazis stubbornly pushed the useless to the injurious when, in the midst of war, despite their shortage of construction materials and of rolling stock, they erected enormous and costly enterprises of extermination, and organized the transport of millions of people. From the viewpoint of a strictly utilitarian world the contradiction manifest between that manner of behavior and the military imperatives lends the whole undertaking a crazy and chimerical air. [106]

It is only too easy to object that if the "extermination" of the Jews was so important to Hitler to the point of allowing the imperative needs of the German war economy to take second place, and even harm it, he certainly would not have permitted – up through the first two years of the war – the emigration of at least a million Jews!

In reality, the "Europa Plan," on which talks began in official form in the spring of 1944, shows to what extent the Nazis were utilitarian in that which concerned the Jews. Himmler proposed to exchange one million Jews (children, women, old people) for "10,000 trucks, a thousand tons of coffee, and a bit of soap." [107]

Joel Brand, who conducted the negotiations for the Jewish side, went to Istanbul and from there to Cairo:

In truth, it was the Allies who raised obstacles. Joel Brand was interned by the British authorities without having had the possibility of accomplishing his mission; and the State Department forbade Dr. Schwarz, the director of the American Jewish Joint [Committee] to deal with enemy subjects. [108]

Joel Brand succeeded in transmitting the German proposal to Lord Moyne, then British Minister of State for the Middle East, who answered him.

And what am I supposed to do with a million Jews? Where shall I put them? [109]

The fragility of the abovementioned thesis is linked closely to the fragility of the reasons that are supposed to explain "the extermination of the Jews." Almost all the official historians are certain that it is necessary to investigate those reasons in the presumed National Socialist concept according to which the Jews "as an inferior race" were to be exterminated "for the sole fact of being Jewish." That thesis is rejected categorically by the reality of the policy in the matter of Jewish emigration-which became even forced emigration – pursued by the government of the Reich up through the first two years of the war.

Poliakov himself acknowledges, without quibbles, the lack of foundation for that thesis. After having asked himself the throbbing question of why the decision for "extermination" was made, he goes on:

"Hatred of the Jews," "Hitler's madness," are the more general terms, which, at the same time, say nothing; and Hitler – at least as long as the fate of the Reich had not been sealed – was a calculating and informed politician. For the rest, we have seen the extermination of the Jews has no part in Nazi aims. Why, then, was that decision, of which we have seen all the irrationality it comprised, taken, and why just at that given time?

Let us try then to look further ahead, always remaining fully aware of what such deductions, in the absence of all testimony, all minutes of proceedings, all irrefutable documents, can offer in the way of speculation and fragility. [110]

In other words, not only *when*, and by *whom*, but even *why* the decision to exterminate the Jews would have been taken, is unknown.

On the subject of the reasons for that presumed decision, in fact, the official historiography is able to supply nothing but "deductions" that are "speculative and "fragile" and beyond that are in manifest contradiction with the **REALITY** of National Socialist policy in the matter of Jewish emigration, as Christopher Browning recognizes:

The assumption that Nazi Jewish policy was the premeditated and logical consequence of Hitler's anti-Semitism cannot be easily reconciled with his actual behavior in the years before 1941. For example, Hitler's view of the Jews as the "November criminals" who caused Germans defeat in World War I was as fervently held as any of his anti-Jewish allegations. Indeed, the oft-cited passage from *Mein Kampf* lamenting that twelve or fifteen thousand Jews had not been gassed during the war makes far more sense in the context of the stab- in-the-back legend than as a prophecy or intimation of the Final Solution. The "logical" consequence of the thesis of the Jew as wartime traitor should have been a "preventive" massacre of German Jewry before the western offensive or at least before the attack on Russia

In actual practice Nazi Jewish policy sought a *judenrein* Germany by facilitating and often coercing Jewish emigration. In order to reserve the limited emigration opportunities for German Jews, the Nazis opposed Jewish emigration from elsewhere on the continent. This policy continued until the fall of 1941, when the Nazis prohibited Jewish emigration from Germany and for the first time justified the blocking of Jewish emigration from other countries in terms of preventing their escape from the German grasp. The efforts of the Nazi Jewish experts to facilitate Jewish emigration both before and during the war, as well as their plans for massive expulsions (what the Nazis euphemistically called "resettlement" or *Umsiedlung*) were not merely tolerated but encouraged by Hitler. It is difficult to reconcile the assumption of a long-held intention to murder the Jews of Europe with this behavior. If Hitler knew he was going to murder the Jews, then he was supporting a policy that "favored" German Jews over other European Jews and "rescued" from death many of those he held most responsible for Germany's earlier defeat.

It has been argued that Hitler was merely awaiting the opportune moment to realize his murderous intentions. Not only does that not explain the pursuit of a contradictory policy of emigration in the meantime. it also does not explain the long delay. If Hitler was merely awaiting the outbreak of conflict to pursue his "war against the Jews," why were the millions of Polish Jews in his hands since the fall of 1939 granted a thirty-month "stay of execution"? [111]

That this is true almost to the letter is shown by the following judgment of Robert Cecil, deputy director of the school specializing in contemporary European studies of the University of Reading in England, and since 1968 professor of history at that university:

The massacre of the Slavs, like that of the Jews, was a ritual homicide, that not only contributed nothing to the military victory, but, as we shall soon see, considerably impeded the Wehrmacht in its task. [112]

[Like that of the Jews, the "massacre of the Slavs" is without foundation, of course. – Ed]

Notes

Part I

- [1] Enzo Collotti, *La Germania nazista* (Nazi Germany), Turin, 1973, p. 146.
- [2] Gerald Reitlinger, *La soluzione finale: Il tentativo di sterminio degli ebrei d'Europa 1939-1945* (The Final Solution: The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe 1939- 1945), Milan, 1965 p. 593.
- [3] William L. Shirer, *Storia del Terzo Reich*, Turin, 1971, p. xiii.
- [4] *Idem*, p. xv.
- [5] Werner Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial*, New York, 1979, p.305.
- [6] *The Trial of the Major War Criminals by the International Military Tribunal*, Nuremberg 14 November 1945-1 October 1946. Published in Nuremberg, Germany 1947. (Here after IMT, Vol. II, p. 169.)
- [7] Léon Poliakov. *Bréviaire de la haine* [Breviary of Hate], Paris, 1979, p. 134.
- [8] See note 10.
- [9] Liliano Picciotto Fargion, "La congiura del silenzio" (The Conspiracy of Silence), *La Rassegna mensile d'Israël*, May-August 1984, p. 226.
- [10] The first edition of Poliakov's book is 1951. In the 1979 edition, here is what one can read in the preface: "This complete edition of *Bréviaire de la haine* conforms to the original 1951-1960 edition. There is no place to introduce important changes or supplements into it. Indeed the knowledge we have of the 'racial' policy of the Third Reich, which sought to exterminate the Jews, and with the help of sometimes similar processes, to reduce the number of Slavs, has not been enriched perceptibly since 1951." p. xiii.
- [11] Léon Poliakov, *Bréviaire ... , op. cit.*, p. 208.
- [12] *Idem*, p. 218.
- [13] Walter Laqueur *Was niemand wissen wollte: Die Unterdrückung der Nachrichten über Hitlers Endlösung* (What Nobody Wanted to Know: The Suppression of News About Hitler's "Final Solution", Frankfurt/M-Berlin-Vienna, 1981, p. 190.
- [14] Colin Cross, *Adolf Hitler*, Milan, 1977, p. 313.
- [15] Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*. An edition with commentary by Christian Zentner, Munich, 1974, p. 168.
- [16] Saul Friedländer, *Kurt Gerstein ou l'ambiguïté du bien* (Kurt Gerstein or the Ambiguity of Good), Casterman, 1967, p. 92.
- [17] Joachim Fest, *Hitler*, 1974, p. 631.
- [18] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ... , op. cit.*, p. 124.
- [19] *Idem*, p. 126.
- [20] Léon Poliakov, *Auschwitz*, Paris (1964), 1973, p. 12.
- [21] Arthur Eisenbach, "Operation Reinhard, Mass Extermination of Jewish Population in Poland," in *Polish Western Affairs*, 1962, Vol III, No. 1, p. 80.
- [22] Broszat, Jacobsen, Krausnick, *Anatomie des SS-Staates* (Anatomy of the SS-State), Munich 1962, Vol 2, p. 297.
- [23] Bernd Nellessen, *The Jerusalem Trial*, Dusseldorf-Vienna, 1964, p.201.
- [24] IMT, Vol 1, p. 280.
- [25] Document XXXVIII47 of the Jewish Contemporary Documentation Center, Paris, (hereafter CDJC), cited by Poliakov & Wulf, *The Third Reich and the Jews*, Berlin, 1955, p. 94.

- [26] Olga Wormser-Migot, *Le Système concentrationnaire nazi (1933-1945)*, (The Nazi Concentration [Camp] System, 1933-1945), Presses Universitaires de France, 1968, p. 544.
- [27] *Idem*, p. 13.
- [28] PS-3762.
- [29] PS-2605.
- [30] *Der Kastner-Bericht über Eichmanns Menschenhandel in Ungarn*, (The Kastner Report on Eichmann's trading in human beings in Hungary), Preface by Prof. Carlo Schmidt, Munich, 1961, p. 242.
- [31] *Hefte von Auschwitz* (Auschwitz Notebooks), Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 8, 1964, p. 89, note 130.
- [32] Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, trans. Tibere Kremer and Richard Seaver, New York, 1961, p. 139.
- [33] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 374, p. 328.
- [34] IMT, Vol. IV, p. 398.
- [35] Saul Friedländer, "Il dibattito storiografico sull'antisemitismo nazista e lo sterminio degli ebrei d'Europa," (The historiographical debate on Nazi anti-semitism and the extermination of the European Jews), in *Storia Contemporanea*, a XIV, n. 3, June 1983, p. 399-422.
- [36] *Idem*, p. 413. This thesis is called "intentionalism."
- [37] *Idem*, p. 417. This thesis is known as "functionalism."
- [38] See on this subject Martin Broszat, "Hitler und die Genesis der 'Endlösung.' Aus Anlass der Thesen von David Irving." (Hitler and the Genesis of the 'Final solution.' Prompted by the Theses of David Irving), in *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (hereafter *VfZ*), 1977, p 739-775, and Christopher R Browning, "Zur Genesis der 'Endlösung.' Ein Antwort auf Martin Broszat" (On the Genesis of the 'Final Solution.' A reply to Martin Broszat), in the same review, 1981, p. 97-109.
- [39] Saul Friedländer, "Il dibattito ...," *art. cit.*, p. 419. See the last pages titled "On the role of the Einsatzgruppen in the framework of the genesis of the 'Final Solution' of the Jewish question" in Helmut Krausnick's and Hans-Heinrich Wilhelm's *Die Truppe des Weltanschauungskrieges. Die Einsatzgruppen der Sicherheitspolizei und des SD, 1938- 1942* (The Soldiers of the Ideological War. The Einsatzgruppen of the Security Police and of the SD-Security Service 1936-1942), Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart, 1981, p. 622- 636.
- [40] Saul Friedländer, *art. cit.*, p. 420. The article by Saul Friedländer which appears in the proceedings of the 1982 Paris conference has been profoundly reshaped there the author has quite simply passed over in silence "the acquisitions of [Exterminationist] historiography" that we have cited. Colloquium of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, *L'Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif* Gallimard, Le Seuil, 1985, pp. 13-38.
- [41] *L'Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif Op. cit.*, p. 177.
- [42] *Ibid.*, pp. 177-178.
- [43] *Ibid.*, pp. 190.
- [44] *Ibid*, pp. 192.
- [45] *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193.
- [46] *Ibid.*, pp. 193.
- [47] *Ibid*, pp. 196.
- [48] *Ibid.*, pp. 197.
- [49] *Ibid.*, pp. 200.
- [50] *Ibid*, pp. 211.

Footnotes-Part 2

- [1] Eberhard Jäckel, *La concezione del mondo in Hitler* (Hitler's World Concept), Milan, 1972, p. 66.
- [2] Ernst Deuerlein, "Hitlers Eintritt in die Politik und die Reichswehr" (Hitler's Entry Into Politics and the Reichswehr) in *VfZ*, 1959, p. 204.
- [3] Reginald H. Phelps, "Hitlers 'grundlegende' Rede über den Antisemitismus" (Hitler's 'ground-laying' speech on antisemitism), in *VfZ*, 1968, p. 417.
- [4] PS-1708.
- [5] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire*, Paris, 1979, p. 2.
- [6] Hebrew term meaning precisely "transfer." Properly transliterated, it reads "ha'abhârâh."
- [7] Broszat, Jacobsen, Krausnick *Anatomie des SS Staates* (Anatomy of the SS-State), Munich 1982, VoL 2, p. 263. Joseph Walk (editor), *Das Sonderrecht für die Juden im NS-Staat*, (The special legislation for the Jews in the NS-state), Heidelberg-Karlsruhe, 1981, p. 48.
- [8] NG-1889.
- [9] PS-1417.
- [10] Gerald Reitlinger, *La soluzione finale ...* (The Final Solution), Milan, 1965, p. 23.
- [11] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
- [12] *Idem*, p. 30. IMT, VoL XXI, p. 586.
- [13] PS-1816, pp. 47, 55, and 56.
- [14] Gerald Reitlinger, *La soluzione finale* (The Final Solution), *op. cit.*, p. 36. At Nuremberg Schacht declared that if his plan had been carried out Not even a single German Jew would have perished." IMT, VoL XX, p. 442.
- [15] *Les Archives secrètes de la Wilhelmstrasse* (The Secret Archives of the Wilhelmstrasse), V, book II, Paris, 1954, p. 135.
- [16] Erich Kern, *Die Trägödie der Juden* (The Tragedy of the Jews), Verlag KW. Schütz KG, Preussisch Oldendorf, 1979, p. 73.
- [17] NG2586-A.
- [18] *Les Archives secrètes* . V, book II. *op. cit.*, p. 122.
- [19] PS-3358.
- [20] Reichsführer-SS to SD Führer of the SS-O.A. Re: "The Jewish question as a factor in foreign policy in 1938," 13 March 1939 in: *Brown Book: War Criminals and Nazis in West Germany*, Verlag Zeit im Bild, Dresden, n d., Document 35 (photocopy without text translation on p. 383).
- [21] *Ich, Adolf Eichmann. Ein historischer Zeugenbericht*, (I Adolf Eichmann A Historical Testimony), published by Dr. Rudolf Aschenauer, Druffel-Verlag, Léoni am Starnberger See, 1980, p. 99.
- [22] H.G. Adler, *Der Kampf gegen die "Endlösung der Judenfrage"* (The Struggle against the "Final Solution" of the Jewish Question), published by the Bundeszentrale für Heimatdienst, Bonn, 1958, p. 8.
- [23] Mr. Mazor, "Il y a trente ans: la conférence d'Evian" (Thirty Years Ago: The Evian Conference), in *Le Monde Juif*, April-June 1968, No. 50, pp. 23 and 25.
- [24] *Dix leçons sur le nazisme* (Ten Lessons On Nazism), under the direction of Alfred Grosser, Paris, 1976, pp. 215-216.
- [25] Heinz Boberach (Editor), *Meldungen aus dem Reich: Die geheimen Lageberichte des Sicherheitsdienstes der SS 1938-1945* (Reports from the Reich The

- Secret Situation Reports of the SS Security Service 1938-1945), Pawlak Verlag, Herrsching 1984, Vol 2, p. 7. Compare pp. 22 and 223.
- [26] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op cit.*, p.302.
- [27] PS-3363.
- [28] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire. ...*, *op cit.*, p.41
- [29] *Ibidem.*
- [30] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire...* , *op cit.*, p.44
- [31] *Idem*, pp. 50-51.
- [32] PS-1816, p. 56.
- [33] "Denkschrift Himmlers über die Behandlung der Fremdvölkischen im Osten (Mai 1940)" (Himmler's memorandum on the treatment of foreign population groups in the East [May 1940], VfZ, 1957, p. 197.
- [34] *Ibidem.*
- [35] T-464.
- [36] NG-2586-B. Compare *Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945*, Series D, Vol X, London, 1957, pp. 111-113.
- [37] Joseph Billig, *La solution finale de la question juive* (The Final Solution of the Jewish Question), Paris, 1977, p. 58.
- [38] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
- [39] PS-2233, IMT, VoL XXIX. H. Monneray, *La Persécution des Juifs dans les pays de l'Est présentée d'Nuremberg* (The Persecution of the Jews in the Eastern Countries Presented at Nuremberg), Paris, 1949, p. 202.
- [40] PS-2233, IMG, VoL XXIX, p. 405.
- [41] NG-1838, p. 5.
- [42] CDJC Documents CXLVI-51 and CXLIII-229. Compare J. Billig, *Alfred Rosenberg dans Faction idéologique, politique et administrative du Reich hitlérien* (Alfred Rosenberg in the Ideological, Political, and Administrative Activity of the Hitlerian Reich), CDJC 1963, p. 196, notes 632 and 636.
- [43] CDJC Doc. CXLIII-229. Compare J. Billig, *ibidem*, p. 196.
- [44] *Idem*, p. 193.
- [45] CDJC Doc. CXLVI-23, pp. 83, then 67
- [46] IMT, Vol. XVII, p. 275-276.
- [47] IMT, Vol. X, p. 449.
- [48] NG-2586-C. Compare Rolf Vogel, *Ein Stempel hat gefehlt. Dokumente zur Emigration deutscher Juden* (A [rubber] stamp was missing documents on the emigration of German Jews), Munich-Zurich, 1977, p. 324. :
- [49] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- [50] NG-2586-C. Compare Rolf Vogel *Ein Stempel . . op. cit.*, p. 324.
- [51] NG-2586-C. Compare Rolf Vogel *Ein Stempel . . op. cit.*, p. 330.
- [52] L. Poliakov, *Le Procès de Jérusalem* (The Trial in Jerusalem), Paris, 1963, p. 152.
- [53] Gerald Reitlinger, *La soluzione finale ...* (The Final Solution ...), *op. cit.*, p. 19.
- [54] IMT, Vol. II, p. 140.
- [55] IMT, Vol. I, p. 283; Vol. III, p. 635; Vol. XXII, p. 289.
- [56] IMT, Vol. I, p. 280. Another well-known example of this systematic travesty concerns the interpretation of the term "Sonderbehandlung" (special treatment) which is considered by the official historians to be a simple synonym for "execution, putting to death, or assassination (a)." In reality, as Robert Faurisson points out "Sonderbehandlung" can have a whole series of meanings, from the gravest to the most benign," and it is only in context that the precise meaning can be determined (b).

At Nuremberg Kaltenbrunner explained that the "special treatment to which political personalities of rank, such as François-Poncet and Edouard Herriot, were subjected consisted in being put up in hotels under the most privileged conditions (c).

Another case where "Sonderbehandlung" indicated privileged treatment appears in Document PS-660(d). In the paragraph "Sonderbehandlung rassisch wertvoller Kinder" (special treatment of racially valuable children) it is affirmed that these children must be excluded from evacuation measures and sent into the Old Reich to be educated as Germans(e).

On p. 24, in the paragraph "special treatment of non-Polish minorities," it says that some ethnic minorities in Poland have not adopted, on the whole, Polish chauvinism, but, on the contrary, have often placed themselves on the German side politically.. "The members of the minorities who have acted according to Polish [nationalist] thought are to be treated like Polish nationalists and deported, but the great mass of these minority populations must be left in their homeland, and not be subjected to particular restrictions." In both cases, consequently, "special treatment" means favorable treatment.

(a) Georges Wellers, *Les Chambres à gaz ont existé* (The Gas Chambers Existed), *op. cit.*, p. 36.

(b) Robert Faurisson, *Réponse à Pierre Vidal-Naquet* (Reply to Pierre Vidal-Naquet), *op. cit.*, p. 23.

(c) IMT, VoL XI, pp. 374-375.

(d) *Die Frage der Behandlung der Bevölkerung der ehemaligen polnischen Gebiete nach rassenpolitischen Gesichtspunkten* (The question of the treatment of the population of the former Polish territories from racial-political viewpoints), report by Dr. E. Wetzel, Berlin, 25 November, 1939.

(e) PS-660, pp. 18-19.

[57] NG-3104.

[57a] *L'Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif*, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[57b] Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts, Inland II A/B, A2 83-25 Sdh. 4, Bd. 5913.

[58] NG 2586-E, P-710.

[59] L. Poliakov, *Le Procés. . .* (The Trial _), *op. cit.*, p. 158.

[60] Henri Monneray, *La Persécution des Juifs en France et dans les autres pays de l'Ouest présentée par la France à Nuremberg* (The persecution of the Jews in France and in the other countries of the West, presented by France at Nuremberg), CDJC, 1947, p. 358.

[61] William L. Shirer, *Storia del Terzo Reich* (History of the Third Reich), Turin, 1971, p. 1464; Gerald Reitlinger, *La soluzione finale* (The Final Solution), *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[62] NG-2586-J.

[63] NG-4583. Cf. *Le Monde Juif*, January 1952, p. 9.

[64] T-1209.

[65] *Das Sonderrecht ...* (The Special Legislation . . .), *op. cit.*, p. 361.

[66] NG-1970.

[67] NG-2586-P

[68] NG-2586-G. As is known, even what is called the "Wannsee Protocol" is interpreted in the sense of "extermination" of the Jews by the official historians. We shall limit ourselves here to pointing out that if evacuations to the east really had meant the deportation of the Jews to "extermination camps" in the east, they [evacuations-Ed.] certainly would not have been described as "palliatives." For a

deeper examination of the question, v. Wilhelm Stäglich, *Le Mythe d'Auschwitz: Etude critique* (The Auschwitz Mythos: A Critical Study), La Vieille Taupe, Paris, 1986, pp. 42-62.

[69] *Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945*, Series D, Vol. X, *op. cit.*, p. 484.

[70] P-4025.

[71] Henry Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespräche im Führerhauptquartier* (Hitler's Table Conversations at the Führer's Headquarters), Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, Munich, 1981, p. 456.

[72] Wilhelm Stäglich, *Der Auschwitz Mythos*, Grabert-Verlag, Tübingen, 1979, p. 116-118.

[73] Bernd Nellessen, *Der Prozess von Jerusalem* (The Jerusalem Trial), *op. cit.*, p. 29.

[74] PS-702. H. Monneray, *La Persécution des Juifs en France et dans les autres pays de l'Est présentée par la France à Nuremberg* (The Persecution of the Jews ... in the East), CDJC, 1949, p. 78. The document, undated, goes back probably, to soon after the nomination of Rosenberg as Minister of the Eastern Occupied Territories (17 July 1941).

[74a] Politische Archiv des Auswärtigen Amts, Politische Abteilung III 245, AZ Po 36, BdI.

[75] NG-5770.

[76] Adolf Hitler, *Monologe im Führerhauptquartier 1941-1944* (Monologues in the Führer's Headquarters 1941-1944), annotated by Heinrich Heims, published by Werner Jochmann, Albrecht Knaus Verlag, Hamburg, 1980, p. 241.

[77] PS-3244. H. Monneray, *La Persécution ... dans ... l'Est ...* (The persecution ... in the ... East), *op. cit.*, pp. 91-92.

[78] Given the great importance attached to Göring's letter of 31 July 1941 by Exterminationist historiography, it may be permitted us to return to this point in order to refute one of the rare attempts of explanation that it offers on this subject. George Wellers, in his polemic against Robert Faurisson, interprets the letter in question in the sense that "the task assigned on 24 January 1939, that is *the emigration and the evacuation of the Jews*, was superseded, if not closed," and that "it must thereafter have been completed, if not replaced by another, *the total or final solution of the Jewish question*" in a manner that, in conclusion, "the *total or final solution* is thus neither emigration or evacuation, *nor the Nisko plan nor the Madagascar plan*" (a) and, in consequence, cannot be but "extermination." This interpretation is without foundation.

First of all, "extermination," being something radically different from emigration or evacuation, cannot be reasonably considered as a "complement"(b) to "the task" consistent with solving the Jewish question "by way of emigration and of evacuation." In the second place, Jewish emigration was not officially "superseded" and "closed" until the Wannsee Conference, as is seen clearly in the "minutes" referring to it "With the prior authorization of the Führer, emigration from now on has given place to another solution the evacuation of the Jews to the east."

In his memorandum 21 August 1942, Luther, referring to the Wannsee conference, confirms: "At that meeting Gruppenführer Heydrich explained that his assignment by Reichsmarschall Göring had been given him by order of the Führer, and that the Führer thereupon had authorized the evacuation of the Jews to the east, instead of emigration."

It is evident that, on July 31, 1941, at least two months before the Führer authorized

evacuation to the east, "instead" of emigration it was precisely emigration that was being practiced.

This point is confirmed further by Luther's memorandum of August 21, 1942, in which is stated that it is precisely that fact of having recognized the impossibility of resolving by emigration (legal to other countries) the overall problem of some 3,250,000 Jews from the territories occupied by the Germans, and consequently of having recognized the necessity of a "final territorial solution," that had led Göring to draw up his letter of July 31, 1941. Rademacher's informational note of 10 February 1942 explains still more clearly that Heydrich had been charged by the Führer to bring about the solution of the Jewish question in Europe conforming to the 'plan for the 'final solution' of the Jewish question," that is, conforming to the "Madagascar plan" that subsequently had been abandoned, and consequently no longer could be looked to for the "final solution," as in the meantime the war against the Soviet Union had offered the possibility of disposing of "other territories for the final solution."

The 31 July 1941 letter was thus plainly in conformity with the Madagascar plan, and this is why, in conclusion, Görings "complement" consisted simply of the replacement of the emigration/evacuation solution -- ie., legal emigration to other countries -- or deportation to the east (Poland, October 1939-March 1940) or to the west (non-occupied France: October 1940) of the Reich Jews only, according to the decree of 24 January 1939, by the final territorial solution through the emigration or the evacuation to Madagascar of all Jews from the European territories occupied by the Germans, a solution which, precisely for that reason, was called the "total" solution.(d)

(a) Georges Wellers, *Les Chambres... op. cit.*, pp. 33-34.

(b) *Idem*, p. 31 (Translation of Görings's letter 31 July 1941. The German word is "Ergänzung" (which can be either "complement" or "supplement.)

(c) The Wannsee conference had been scheduled originally for December 1941 (PS-709; NG-2586-F). The Führer decision goes back probably to the month of October, as on 23 October 1941 Jewish emigration from Germany was stopped (T-1209), and, on the following day, the evacuation of 50,000 Jews from the old Reich, from Austria, and from Bohemia-Moravia to the east was ordered (PS-3921).

(d) The term 'Gesamtlösung' thus was not originally a simple synonym for "Endlösung." At the time, it had, in effect, a purely quantitative sense in that it meant that the solution of the Jewish question limited previously to the territory of the Reich was now extended to the occupied European territories.

[79] IMT, Vol. XI, pp. 61-63.

[80] NO-5193.

[81] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ... op. cit.*, p. 3.

[82] *Idem*, p. 83. In this regard see the documentation -- from the Exterminationist angle -- of Joseph Billig in *Les Camps de concentration dans l'économie du reich hitlérien* (The Concentration Camps in the Economy of the Hitlerian Reich), Presses Universitaires de France, 1973.

[83] *Contribution à l'histoire du KL Auschwitz* (Contribution to the History of the Auschwitz Concentration Camp), State Museum at Oswiecim, n.d., pp. 44-57.

[84] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, *German Crimes in Poland*, Warsaw, 1946, Vol I, p. 37.

[85] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ... op. cit.*, p. 270.

[86] *Idem*, p. 120.

[87] NO-495; NO-719.

[88] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ... op. cit.*, p. 84.

[89] PS-1063.

- [90] R-129.
- [91] NO-500.
- [92] NO-5194.
- [93] NO-599.
- [94] NO-020-a.
- [95] NO-5689.
- [96] NO-1874.
- [97] NO-1990.
- [98] Enzo Collotti, *La Germania nazista* (Nazi Germany), Turin, 1973, p. 266.
- [99] *Idem*, p. 267.
- [100] G. Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale* (The Final Solution), *op. cit.* p. 149.
- [101] NO-1523.
- [102] PS-1469.
- [103] *Hefte von Auschwitz* (Auschwitz Notebooks), Auschwitz Museum, 6, 1962, p. 78.
- [104] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- [105] Enzo Collotti, *La Germania nazista* (Nazi Germany), *op. cit.* p. 267.
- [106] Hannah Arendt, *Le Système totalitaire* (The Totalitarian System), Paris 1972, p. 182.
- [107] G. Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale* (The Final Solution), *op. cit.*, p. 544.
- [108] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 296.
- [109] G. Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale*, (The Final Solution), *op. cit.*, p. 545.
- [110] L. Poliakov, *Bréviaire ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 126.
- [111] C. Browning, *Fateful Months*, Holmes & Meier, New York and London, 1985, pp. 14-15.
- [112] Robert Cecil, *Il mito della razza nella Germania nazista: Vita di Alfred Rosenberg*, (The Myth of Race in Nazi Germany: The Life of Alfred Rosenberg), Milan, 1973, p. 199. Jt

Part II

1. Birth and Development of Revisionism

National Socialist policy in the matter of Jewish emigration, pursued officially until the beginning of February 1942, thus posed a question that really was "throbbing," to use again the adjective employed by Poliakov.

If it was true that *exterminating* the Jews "conformed to the fundamental objective of National Socialism" [1]; if it was true that it was not "the coming to a head of an unforeseeable explosion of violence, or of a betrayal of trust by subordinates, but the fruit of an ideology of death and of an organic design" [2]; if it was true that "according to Hitler, among the ends that had to be achieved thanks to the war, the general extermination of the Jews had a very important place, to the realization of which the German government would devote a large part of its forces," [3] for what mysterious reason did Adolf Hitler deprive himself of at least a million victims by allowing them to emigrate?

It was thus inevitable that so atrocious an accusation, based essentially on "third and fourth hand accounts," on "the game of psychological deductions," knowing that "all these could offer was fragile and speculative," and on "fragmentary and sometimes hypothetical answers," be placed in doubt.

In the immediate post-war period and in the following years severe criticisms were formulated in regard to the trials of those who were called "Nazi war criminals" -- in particular, the Nuremberg trials [4] -- and concerning the behavior of the Allies during the war. [5]

The first to raise doubt about the reality of the "extermination" of the Jews was the Frenchman, Paul Rassinier, [6] who is justly considered to be the precursor of present-day Revisionism. His work was taken up and carried on by other researchers who have produced a rich Revisionist literature, the most important works of which are:

- *Auschwitz ou le grand alibi* (Auschwitz or the Great Alibi), *Le Prolétaire*, bimonthly of the Communist Party International, 1960.
- *Geschichte der Verfehlung Deutschlands* (History of the Outlawing of Germany) by Franz Scheidl, Vienna, published by the author, 1967.
- *The Myth of the Six Million*, Anonymous, The Noontide Press, Costa Mesa, California 1969.
- *The Big Lie: Six Million Murdered Jews*, by The Historical Research Unity, Fyshwick ACT Unity Printers and Publishers, 1970.
- *Die Auschwitz-Lüge* (The Auschwitz Lie), by Thies Christophersen, Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch, West Germany, 1973.
- *The Six Million Swindle*, by Austin J. App, Boniface Press, Takoma Park, Maryland, 1973.
- *Hexen Ein-Mal-Eins einer Lüge* (Witches' Multiplication Table of a Lie), by Emil Aretz, Verlag Hohe Warte -- Franz von Bebenburg, 1973.

- *Did Six Million Really Die?*, by Richard Harwood, Historical Review Press, Brighton, Sussex, England, 1974.
- *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, by Arthur R. Butz, The Noontide Press, Costa Mesa, California, 1977.
- Robert Faurisson wrote his article "The Problem of the Gas Chambers" (*Défense de Occident*, No. 158, June 1978) and in *Le Monde* (29 December 1978) published "The Problem of the Gas Chambers, or the Rumor of Auschwitz," followed by a text, making use of the right to reply, 16 January 1979.
- The excellent study *Der Auschwitz Mythos: Legende oder Wirklichkeit?* (The Auschwitz Myth: Legend or Reality?), by Wilhelm Stäglich, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, California, 1986.
- *The Six Million Reconsidered*, by the Committee for Truth in History, The Noontide Press, Costa Mesa, California, 1977.
- *El Mito de los 6 Millones: El Fraude de los Judios Asesinados por Hitler* (The Myth of the Six Million: The Fraud of the Jews Murdered by Hitler), by J. Bochaca, Ediciones BAU, S.P. Barcelona, 1974.
- *Anne Frank's Diary: A Hoax* by Ditlieb Felderer, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, California, 1979.
- *Holocaust, hoe tang nog?* (Holocaust, How Much Longer?) Haro Boekdienst, Antwerpen. [7]

In 1979, at Northrup University in Los Angeles, the first Revisionist Conference was held, organized by the Institute for Historical Review, which, since spring 1980, has published the important quarterly *The Journal of Historical Review* with the collaboration of the most significant Revisionist historians around the World. This has contributed further to making Historical Revisionism an irrefutable reality, and an unstoppable intellectual movement. Indeed the Revisionist theses are attracting ever more defenders.

Since 1980, and up to the present, several works have been published, notably in France, in the wake of the Faurisson affair. Besides numerous articles appearing in *The Journal of Historical Review*, we draw attention to:

- *Auschwitz Exit* (Vol. I), by Ditlieb Felderer, Täby, Sweden; 1980.
- *1981 Revisionist Bibliography: A Select Bibliography of Revisionist Books Dealing with the Two World Wars and Their Aftermaths*, compiled and annotated by Keith Stimely, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, California, 1980.
- *Vor dem Tribunal der Sieger: Gesetzlose Justiz in Nürnberg* (Before the Victors' Tribunal: Lawless Justice in Nuremberg), by Hildegard Fritzsche, K. W. Schütz Kg, Preussisch-Oldendorf, West Germany, 1981.
- *Auschwitz im IG-Farben Prozess: Holocaustdokumente?* (Auschwitz in the IG Farben Trial: Holocaust Documents?), edited by Udo Walendy, Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho/Weser, West Germany, 1981.
- *Holocaust nun unterirdisch?* (Holocaust Now Subterranean?), Historische Tatsachen (Historical Facts), No. 9, Vlotho/Weser, 1981.
- *Kenntnismängel der Alliierten* (The Allies' Defective Knowledge), Historische Tatsachen No. 11, 1982.

- *Adolf Eichmann und die "Skelettsammlung des Ahnenerbe e.V."* (Adolf Eichmann and the "Skeleton Collection of the Ancestral Heritage Association") Historische Tatsachen No. 16, 1983.
- *Einsatzgruppen im Verbands des Heeres* (Operations Groups in the Structure of the Army), Historische Tatsachen No. 16 and No. 17, 1983.
- *Alliierte Kriegspropaganda 1914-1919* (Allied War Propaganda, 1914-1919), Hist. Tatsachen No. 22, 1985.
- *Ich suchte-und fand die Wahrheit* (I Sought-and Found the Truth), Robert Faurisson. *Kritik*, No. 58, Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch. 1982
- *The 'Holocaust': 120 Questions and Answers*, Charles E. Weber, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, 1983.
- *Nazi Gassing a Myth?* IHR Special Report, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, 1983.
- *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, Walter N. Sanning, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, 1983.
- *Les grands truquages de l'histoire* (The Great Frauds of History), by Hervé Le Goff, Editions Jacques Grancher, Paris, 1983. Includes a study of the Anne Frank diary imposture. [8]
- *The Man Who Invented "Genocide"*, James J. Martin, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, 1984.
- *"Massentötungen" oder Desinformation?* ("Mass Killings" or Disinformation?), by Ingrid Weckert, Historische Tatsachen No. 24, 1985.
- *Macht + Prozesse = "Wahrheit"?* (Power + Trial = "Truth"?), Historische Tatsachen No. 25, 1985.
- *Amtliche Lügen strafrei, Bürgerzweifel kriminell* (Official Lies Unpenalized, Citizens' Doubts Criminal), Historische Tatsachen No. 29, 1985.
- *Die Befreiung von Auschwitz 1945* (The Liberation of Auschwitz 1945), Historische Tatsachen No. 31, 1987.
- *Die Farce des sowjetischen Kommissionsberichtes vom 7. Mai 1945* (The Farce of the Soviet Commission Report of 7 May 1945), Historische Tatsachen No. 33, 1988. All the Historische Tatsachen cited, except for No. 24, are by Udo Walendy.
- *Dachau ... Buchenwald ... Belsen, etc.* Z. L. Smith, Antwerp, Vrij Historisch Onderzoek (Free Historical Research), 1984.
- *Het Dagboek van Anne Frank: een Vervalsing* (The Diary of Anne Frank A Falsification), Robert Faurisson, Antwerp: Vrij Historisch Onderzoek 1985.
- *Worldwide Growth and Impact of "Holocaust" Revisionism*. IHR Special Report, Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, 1985.
- *L'onestà polemica del Signor Vidal-Naquet. A proposito dell'edizione italiana di un suo libro* (The Honest Polemic of Mr. Vidal-Naquet, on the Italian edition of one of his books), Cesare Saletta, Sala Bolognese, 1985.
- *Droit et Histoire* (Law and History), Pierre Guillaume, La Vieille Taupe, Paris, 1986.

We add the most significant works on the Faurisson affair

- *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire*. La question des chambres à gaz (Defense Memorandum against Those Who Accuse Me of Falsifying History. The Question of the Gas Chambers), Robert Faurisson, La Vieille Taupe, 1980. A work of exceptional value.

- *Vérité historique ou vérité politique ? Le dossier de l'affaire Faurisson. La question des chambres à gaz* (Historical Truth or Political Truth? The Faurisson Affair File: The Question of the Gas Chambers) Serge Thion, La Vieille Taupe, 1980.
- *L'Affaire Faurisson* (The Faurisson Affair), Le Lutteur de classe, November 1961.
- *Intolérable Intolérance* (Intolerable Intolerance). Jean-Gabriel Cohn-Bendit, Eric Delcroix, Claude Karnoouh, Vincent Monteil and Jean-Louis Tristani. Editions de la Différence, 1981.
- *L'Incroyable Affaire Faurisson* (The Incredible Faurisson Affair), Les petits suppléments au Guide des droits des victimes, No. 1, La Vieille Taupe, 1982.
- *Réponse à Pierre Vidal-Naquet* (Reply to Pierre Vidal-Naquet), Robert Faurisson. Second enlarged edition, 1962, published by the author. La Vieille Taupe, 1982.
- *L'Affaire Faurisson* (The Faurisson Affair), by Marie-Paule Mémy. Memorandum of D.U.T., University of Bordeaux III, Option Journalisme 1982-1983.
- *Epilogue judiciaire de l'Affaire Faurisson* (Judiciary Epilogue to the Faurisson Affair), La Vieille Taupe, 1983.
- *Il caso Faurisson* (The Faurisson Case), Andrea Chersi, Castenedolo, 1983. Published by the author. [9]

In January 1985 the first number of the Spanish Revisionist review, *Revision* was published in Alicante.

Since the spring of 1987 the important review *Annales d'histoire révisionniste* has been published in France.

We call attention also to the Revisionist journal *Taboe. Revisionistisch tijdschrift voor kritisch en wetenschappelijk onderzoek* (Tabu, Revisionist periodical for critical and scientific research), Antwerp, Belgium.

Lastly, may we be permitted to mention our own studies:

Published by Sentinella d'Italia, Monfalcone:

- *Il rapporto Gerstein. Anatomia di un falso* (The Gerstein Report Anatomy of a Fraud), 1982.
- *La Risiera di San Sabba: un falso grossolano* (The ricery of San Sabba: A Gross Hoax), 1985. Published by La Sfinge, Parma
- *Wellers e i "gasati" di Auschwitz* (Wellers and the "Gassed" of Auschwitz), 1987.
- *Auschwitz: due false testimonianze* (Auschwitz: Two False Testimonies), 1986.
- *Auschwitz: un caso di plagio* (Auschwitz: A Case of Plagiarism), 1986.

Further:

- *Auschwitz: le confessioni di Rudolf Höss* (Auschwitz: The False Confessions of Rudolf Höss), 1987.

- *Come si falsifica la storia: Georges Wellers e le "camere a gas" di Belzec* (How History is Falsified: Georges Wellers and the "Gas Chambers" at Belzec). To be published.
- *Medico ad Auschwitz. Anatomia di un falso. La balsa testimonianza di Miklos Nyiszli* (Doctor in Auschwitz: Anatomy of a Fraud: The False Testimony of Miklos Nyiszli). To be published. [10]

This vast literature is of unequal value and ranges from superficial and often inexact declarations -- rightly criticized by the Exterminationist historians, as Revisionists call those who maintain the reality of the "Extermination" of the Jews -- to methodical and profound research.

This literature has aroused reactions of diverse types. [11]

On the literary plane, a number of highly passionate writings seek to discredit the Revisionists, be it by personal defamation, be it by distorting their theses in order to hold them up to ridicule, be it by trying to make Revisionism appear as an integral part of "an international neo-Nazi movement," that is to say, of a resurgence of Nazi anti-Semitism, as is implied expressly by Robert Kempner. [12]

This attempt appears clearly in the titles that occur most frequently in this literature:

- "Criticism of the Publicity of the Anti-Semitic Extreme Right"; [13]
- "A Look at Neo-Nazi Literature"; [14]
- "The Final Solution and Neo-Nazi Mythomania"; [15]
- "The Final Solution of the Jewish Question in the Recent Neo-Nazi literature." [16]

Among the most virulent articles, we point out

- "La politica dello struzzo" (Ostrich Politics), Augusto Segre, *La Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, January-March 1979.
- "La distruzione della ragione" (The Destruction of Reason), Giuseppe Laras, *La Rassegna Mensile di Israel*, August- September 1973.
- "Le camere a gas sono esistite!" (The Gas Chambers Existed!), reply by Enzo Collotti to Robert Faurisson. *Storia Illustrata* No. 262, September 1979. (See on this subject Faurisson Replies to Collotti, *Storia Illustrata* No. 263, October 1979).

Stefano Levi della Torre dedicated a paragraph to Revisionism in the article "New Forms of Jew-phobia" that is included in the section "Anti-Semitism Today." [17]

In reality, the accusation is baseless, and is clearly intended as propaganda. The credentials of the man who is considered to be the founder of Revisionism, Paul Rassinier, leave no doubt in that regard: socialist, resistant, arrested by the Gestapo in October 1943, tortured for eleven days, deported to Buchenwald, then to Dora, in which camps he spent 19 months, 95 per cent invalided as a result of his deportation, bearer of the Vermilion Medal of French Gratitude (Médaille Vermeil de la Réaonnaissance Française) and of the Rosette de la Résistance." In France, the legacy

of Rassinier has been assumed by elements of the Left, beginning with the group that manages the publishing house La Vieille Taupe (The Old Mole). [18]

Other Exterminationist writers, while displaying all the emotion invariably engendered by an expression of doubt in regard to the "extermination" of the Jews, try to place themselves on the plane of objective criticism. Among the most significant, we call attention to:

- "Lies About the Holocaust," Lucy Dawidowicz, *Commentary*, December, 1980.
- "Les redresseurs de morts." [Translator's note: Here the Exterminationist indulges herself archly in a "*Jeu de mots*" or, more simply, a pun on "redresseurs de torts" --"righters of wrongs") *Chambres à gas: la bonne nouvelle. Comment on révisé l'histoire.* (The Redressers of the Dead. Gas Chambers: The Good News: How History is Revised) by Nadine Fresco. *Les Temps Modernes*, No. 707, June 1980. The author undertakes to show the historiographic methods of Revisionism.
- *Les chambres à gaz ont existé. Des documents, des témoignages, des chiffres* (The Gas Chambers Did Exist Documents, Testimonies, Numbers), Georges Wellers. Editions Gallimard, 1981. A work directed against Robert Faurisson.
- *La Solution Finale et la mythomanie néo-nazie* (The Final Solution and Neo-Nazi Mythomania), Georges Wellers. Published by Beate and Serge Klarsfeld, 1979. A work directed against Paul Rassinier.
- *Six Million Did Die*, Arthur Suzman and Denis Diamond. Johannesburg, 1978. A work directed against Richard Harwood and Arthur Butz.
- "Un Eichmann de papier: Anatomie d'un mensonge" (A Paper Eichmann: Anatomy of a Lie), Pierre Vidal-Naquet in *Les Juifs, la mémoire et le présent* (Jews, Memory, and the Present), Paris, 1981. Study directed against Robert Faurisson.
- "Tesi sul revisionismo" (Theses on Revisionism), Pierre Vidal-Naquet. *Rivista di Storia Contemporanea*, Loescher, Turin, January, 1983. A general article against Revisionism.
- *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas* (National Socialist Mass Killings by Poison Gas), by Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl and others. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1983. A collective work of 24 historians aimed at refuting, indirectly, the whole of Revisionist historiography.
- "A propos d'une thèse de doctorat 'explosive' sur le rapport Gerstein" (An "Explosive" Doctoral Thesis on the Gerstein Report), Georges Wellers. *Le Monde Juif*, No. 121, January- March 1986. An article directed against Henri Roques. [19]

Some attempts to affirm the Exterminationist "truth" have had the opposite effect. Particularly interesting in this respect are:

- *The Holocaust Revisited: A Retrospective Analysis of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Extermination Complex*, Dino A. Brugioni and Robert G. Poirier. Central Intelligence Agency, Washington D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, February 1979. A work in which aerial photographs of Auschwitz-Birkenau taken by the U.S. Air Force in

1944, are published, these demolish the myth of the immense exterminations that were supposed to have been perpetrated in these camps in 1944.

- *"Les Krematorien IV et V de Birkenau et leurs chambres à gaz"* (Crematories IV and V of Birkenau and Their Gas Chambers), Jean-Claude Pressac, *Le Monde Juif* No. 107, July-September 1982. See the account given by Robert Faurisson *"Le mythe des chambres à gaz entre en agonie,"* (The Myth of the Gas Chambers Enters its Death-Phase), reply to Pierre Vidal-Naquet, second enlarged edition, La Vieille Taupe, 1982.
- *The Auschwitz Album*. After an album discovered by Lili Meier, survivor of the concentration camp. Text by Peter Hellman. See the analysis by Robert Faurisson, *"Les Tricheries de l'Album d'Auschwitz"* (The Trickeries of The Auschwitz Album), typed text, unpublished, 1983.

But the reactions of the opponents of Revisionism are not restricted to the literary plane. The lawsuits brought against Revisionists -- to the end of obtaining official condemnation by the courts of the adversary theses -- attest to the inability of the official historians to refute the Revisionist arguments seriously and convincingly.

Certain affairs, such as those of Christophersen, of Faurisson, and of Felderer have become unhappily celebrated. [20]

Of doleful renown, too, is the Bundesprüfstelle für jugendgefährdende Schriften, a national agency for the examination and censoring of texts held to "put youth in jeopardy" in the Federal Republic of Germany, a simple method for the exercise of legal control over Revisionist literature, whose works are put on this index regularly! (Index für jugendgefährdende Schriften). [21]

The case of Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich attests to the blind intolerance practiced against those who, relying on sober documentation, deny the "extermination of the Jews." In November 1982, the Council of Deans of the Georg-August University of Göttingen, where he had obtained his Doctorate in Law in 1951, proceeded to revoke his doctor's title for having written the excellent *Der Auschwitz Mythos* which, in the opinion of this not exactly objective Council, made Wilhelm Stäglich "unworthy of the title of Doctor." [22]

Recently, Henri Roques -- the case is unique in French university history -- has seen the confirmation of his doctoral thesis on the confessions of Kurt Gerstein, [23] which unleashed an entire polemic [24] but remains unchallenged by any serious refutation, annulled because of presumed administrative irregularities. [25]

2. Revisionist Criticism

It would be difficult to summarize the results of Revisionist criticism in a few pages. Besides, we are concerned here not so much with presenting the results of Revisionist research than Revisionism's reason for being, and its methodology, and that is why we devote this chapter to explaining the reasons why, in our opinion, it is necessary to doubt the reality of the "extermination" of the Jews:

At the time of the Nuremberg trial, the English public prosecutor, Sir Hartley Shawcross, in his speech for the prosecution of 26 July 1946, accused the Germans of

having killed more than six million Jews "in the gas chambers and ovens of Auschwitz, Dachau, Treblinka, Buchenwald, Mauthausen, and Oranienburg." [1]

Each one of these "gas chambers," naturally, had its "eye-witnesses."

Abbé Georges Hénocque described that of Buchenwald as follows:

I felt reassured and, opening the iron door, I found myself in the famous gas chamber.

The room could have been about five meters square, with a height of three and a half meters. Seventeen sprinkler heads fastened and placed at regular intervals in the ceiling. Looking at them revealed nothing of their murderous function. They resembled harmless water dispensers. The deportees employed in the crematorium forewarned me: in a touch of irony, each victim, on entering this room, was given a towel, and a minuscule bit of soap. These unfortunates believed they were going into the shower. Then the heavy iron door, bordered with a kind of rubber seal a half-centimeter thick, designed to prevent the entry of the least bit of air, was closed on them.

On the inside, the walls were smooth, without fissures, as though varnished. On the outside, one noticed, on the side of the door lintel, four buttons, placed one under the other; one red, one yellow, one green, one white.

Yet, one detail worried me: I could not understand how the gas could descend from the sprinkler outlets to the floor. The room in which I found myself was skirted by a corridor. I went into it and there I saw an enormous pipe that my two arms could not encompass completely, which was covered with rubber to a thickness of about one centimeter.

On the side, a handle that one turned from left to right released the gas. Under strong pressure, it descended to the floor, so that none of the victims could escape what the Germans called "the slow and sweet death."

Below the spot where the pipe formed an elbow to enter the asphyxiation chamber, there were the same buttons as on the outside door red, green, yellow, and white, which served evidently to measure the descent of the gas. Everything was really put together and organized scientifically. The evil genius could not have done better. I went back into the gas chamber to try to find the crematory room. [2]

SS-Obersturmbannführer Kaindl, former commandant of the Oranienburgdachsenhausen camp, declared before a Soviet military tribunal:

Toward mid-March 1943, I installed a gas chamber as a means for mass extermination.

Public Prosecutor On your own initiative?

Kaindl: Partly, yes, the existing installations no longer sufficed for the projected extermination. I held a conference in which the head doctor, Baumkötter, took part. He told me that the use of a poison gas, such as prussic acid, in rooms prepared for that purpose produced instant death.

That is why I considered the installation of gas chambers to be in order, and also because it was more humane, for mass killings. [3]

On the subject of the Dachau camp, Dr. Franz Blaha, in a sworn statement, affirmed:

There were numerous executions by gas, executions by firearms, and by injections, in the camp. The gas chamber was finished in 1944, and I called Dr. Rascher to examine the first victim. Of the eight or nine persons in the chamber, three were still alive; the others seemed to be dead. Their eyes were red and their faces bloated. Numerous detainees were subsequently killed in the same manner. [4]

On 19 August 1960, the German newspaper *Die Zeit*, under the headline "No Gassings in Dachau," published a letter by Dr. Martin Broszat of the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich, in which he declared:

Neither at Dachau, nor at Bergen-Belsen, nor at Buchenwald, were Jews or other detainees gassed. The gas chamber at Dachau was never completely finished, nor put "into service."

And further:

The mass extermination of Jews by gassing began in 1941-1942, and took place exclusively in a few locations chosen for that purpose and provided with corresponding technical installations, above all in the occupied Polish territories (but nowhere in the Old Reich): at Auschwitz-Birkenau, at Sobibor on the Bug, at Treblinka, Chelmno, and Belzec. [5]

The reservations expressed in this letter were made explicit by Dr. Broszat in the "Preliminary Note" to the article by Ino Arndt and Wolfgang Scheffler in *Organisierter Massenmord an Juden in national-sozialistischen Vernichtungslagern* (Organized Mass Murder of Jews in National Socialist Extermination Camps):

As we have pointed out already, the extermination of Jews in the institutional sense (accomplishment of the program of the "final solution") by means of gassing installations took place exclusively in the aforementioned camps in the occupied Polish territories [6]. In turn, in the concentration camps generally, there were indeed crematories (for the cremation of the detainees who died en masse or were killed during the war) but no gassing installations. However, where that was the case [the alleged presence of gas chambers] (Ravensbrück, Natzweiler, Mauthausen) they did not serve for the extermination of Jews in the sense of the "final solution" program. They served rather to ease the "work" of the execution commandos, which until now consisted in shooting the detainees, killing them by injections of phenol, and by other methods. [7]

Simon Wiesenthal confirms that "there were no extermination camps on German soil." [8]

In conclusion, neither at Buchenwald, nor at Oranienburg-Sachsenhausen, were there "gas chambers," while the alleged "gas chamber" at Dachau was never used, [9] as can be read also in the official publication on this camp:

The "gas chamber" at Dachau was never put into service. Only the dead were put into the crematory for cremation, never any living being for "gassing." [10]

Or further:

As we have said already, Dachau in the last year had its own gas chamber. But its "showers" were never used. [11]

Consequently, the "eyewitness testimonies" of those who pretended to have seen "gas chambers" in these camps, or to have taken part in the "gassings" there, are false.

That state of affairs should have moved any serious historian to undertake a critical review of *all* sources concerning the "extermination" of the Jews, but nothing of the kind happened. [12]

The question that Robert Faurisson asks is more than legitimate:

Why are the "proofs," the "certainties," and "testimonies" gathered about the camps that, geographically, are close to us, suddenly without value, while the "proofs," "certainties," and the "testimonies" collected about the camps in Poland remain true? [13]

The question appears yet more legitimate when one considers what Gerald Reitlinger, who is an Exterminationist, writes about the evidence relating to the Polish "extermination camps":

The greater part of the documentation on the death camps in Poland, for example, has been gathered by commissions of inquiry of the Polish government, and by the Central Commission for Jewish History in Poland, by interrogating the physically able survivors who rarely were educated men.

Moreover, the Eastern European Jew is by nature a rhetorician, he loves to express himself in florid comparisons. While one witness declared that the victims coming from the far west arrived at the death camp in sleeping cars, he probably wanted to say they came in passenger coaches, not in cattle cars. At times their imagination went beyond all credibility, as when the food smugglers of the ghetto were described as men of gigantic stature, with pockets that went from the neck to the ankles. Even readers who do not suffer from racial prejudices may find it a bit too thick to be able to digest the details of the monstrous assassinations and are led to cry "credat Judaeus Apella [Translator's note: "Let the Jew Apella believe it,"] and to relegate these recitals among the fables. Basically, the readers have the right to think that it is

a case of "Oriental" witnesses, for whom numbers are nothing but rhetorical elements. Even their names, Sunschein, Zylberdukaten, (silver ducats), Rothbalsam (red balsam), Salamander -- seem drawn from the imagination. [14]

In regard to the working method of the inquiry commissions and to the Testimonies" they gathered, Reitlinger states explicitly:

One cannot but agree with R.T. Paget, K.C., member of the House of Commons, when he says that the researches undertaken by the Polish Government commission after the war are of mediocre probatory value. They consist, in effect, essentially of detached descriptions, by isolated persons, very rarely confirmed by other sources. [15]

The "proof" of the existence of the "gas chambers" in the so-called "extermination camps" in the East thus consist almost exclusively of extremely suspect "eyewitness testimonies" whose truthfulness is upheld *a priori* by the historians who maintain the reality of the "extermination" of the Jews, and the intentional lack of critical spirit is the essential characteristic of their historiographic method.

The analysis of such "proofs" and their mutual contradictions, however, should lead Exterminationist historians to employ greater prudence.

The study of the genesis of the myth of the "extermination" of the Jews, at Treblinka, at Sobibor, and at Belzec, for example, is very revealing in this regard. One of the first "eyewitness testimonies" about Treblinka -- the report sent 15 November 1942 by the clandestine organization of the Warsaw ghetto to the Polish government-in-exile in London -- describes the "extermination" of the Jews in the camp as being carried out by water vapor (steam)!

In March 1942 -- this report reads -- the Germans began the construction of the new camp of Treblinka B -- on the edge of Treblinka A - which was finished at the end of April 1942. Toward the first half of September it comprised two "death houses." The "house of death No. 2" was of masonry, about 40 meters long and 15 meters wide. According to the story of one eyewitness, it contained ten rooms arranged along the two sides of a corridor that traversed the whole building. Pipes through which the steam passed were installed in these rooms. The "house of death No. 1" consisted of three rooms and one boiler. The report continues:

Inside the furnace-room is a large boiler for the production of steam, and with the help of pipes that run through the death rooms, which are provided with an appropriate number of holes, the superheated steam is injected into the interior of the rooms.

The "victims" were put into the rooms mentioned above, and killed by the steam:

In that manner the execution rooms are filled completely, then the doors are closed hermetically, and the long asphyxiation of the victims, by the steam coming out of the numerous holes in the pipes, begins. At the start, screams

come from inside; they die down slowly, after 15 minutes the execution is completed. [16]

This story was taken up and raised to the rank of official truth by the Central Commission for Investigation of German crimes in Poland, which accused the former governor, Hans Frank, of having ordered the installation of an "extermination camp" at Treblinka for the massive elimination of the Jews "in steam-filled rooms." [17]

The myth of the "carbon monoxide gas chambers" [18] was later imposed and still constitutes the official truth in regard to the three "extermination camps" of the East.

What happened is simple: the "steam chambers" of the 15 November 1942 report were simply turned into "gas chambers"!

Thus the "eyewitness" Yankel Wiernik wrote that at Treblinka Jews were killed in two buildings, one large, with ten "gas chambers," the other small, with three "gas chambers," [19] exactly as in the two "death houses" with ten and three "steam rooms" of the report cited above. The very arrangement of the rooms in the new buildings is drawn entirely from the report of 15 November 1942: ten chambers arranged along the two sides of a corridor that traversed the whole building. [20]

That this "eyewitness" may be little worthy of credence can already be deduced from what he affirms: in each "gas chamber," measuring about "150 square feet" (i.e., about 14 square meters), about 1,000 to 1,200 persons were packed, [21] i.e., to a density of 71 to 85 persons per square meter!

We are, then, in the presence of one of those "eyewitnesses" for whom, as Gerald Reitlinger, put it, "numbers are merely rhetorical devices."

In 1946 the "gas chambers" of Sobibor were described thus:

At first glance, one had the impression of entering a bathroom like any other faucets for hot and cold water, wash basins . . . once everyone had entered, the doors close heavily. A black heavy substance issues in spirals from the holes made in the ceiling. One hears horrible shrieks that, however, do not last long, as they are transformed into smothered and suffocated breathing, then into final convulsions. It is related that mothers covered their babies' corpses with their bodies.

The warden of the "bathroom" observed the whole train of events through a hole in the ceiling. Everything is over in a quarter of an hour. The floor opens, and the cadavers fall into carts waiting below which, when they are full, quickly depart. All is organized according to the most modern German technology. Outside, the bodies are laid out in a certain order and sprayed with gasoline, then set on fire. [22]

The "eyewitness" Zelda Metz furnished the following description:

Thereupon they went into the barracks where they cut the women's hair, then into the bathroom, that is to say, the gas chamber. They were asphyxiated by

chlorine. After 15 minutes they were all asphyxiated. Through a skylight it was verified that all were dead. Then the floor opened automatically. The cadavers fell into a railroad car that ran through the gas chamber and carried the cadavers to the ovens. [23]

But, from 1947 the Central Commission for the Investigation of German Crimes in Poland opted for murder "by combustion gas produced by motors: in the ceiling were openings connected by pipes with openings situated in adjoining buildings, which produced the CO gas with which the victims were suffocated," [24] thus recognizing that the "testimonies" mentioned above were false. But that did not keep Zelda Metz from presenting herself as a prosecution witness at the trial of the former Sobibor guards Hubert Gomerski and Johan Klier [25] on 23 August 1950, in the course of which the public prosecutor declared specifically that "executions by motor-exhaust gas had taken place." [26]

The "eyewitness testimonies" about Belzec are even more instructive.

The first myth about the "extermination of the Jews" was born 8 April 1942, only three weeks after the opening of the camp: "The victims were assembled in a shack that had a metallic plate as its floor through which was passed an electric current that killed the Jews instantly." [27]

A similar story appeared in the *Kronika oswiecimska nieznanego autora* (Auschwitz Chronicle by an Unknown Author) that was supposed to have been dug up on the grounds of the old Auschwitz camp: "At Belzec the Jews were electrocuted." [28]

A report dated 10 July 1942 arrived in London in November of that year. [29] Published December 1st in the *Polish Fortnightly Review*, it describes the "extermination of the Jews" at Belzec in this way:

After unloading, the men go to a barracks on the right, the women to a barracks situated on the left, where they strip, ostensibly in readiness for a bath. After they have undressed both groups go to a third barracks where there is an electrified plate, where the executions are carried out. [30]

A variant of the myth substitutes water for the metallic plate: "The Jews were killed by passing an electric current through the water in which they were immersed." [31]

The version of execution on a metallic plate reappeared in a report of November 1942:

The victims are ordered to strip naked -- to have a bath, ostensibly -- and are then led to a barrack with a metal plate for flooring. The door is then locked, electric current passes through the victims and their death is almost instantaneous. [32]

In the report of the Polish government in exile in London, dated 10 December 1942, one reads, among other things:

At first, the executions were carried out by means of shooting; subsequently, however, it is reported that the Germans applied new methods, such as poison gas, by means of which the Jewish population was exterminated in Chelm, or electrocution, for which a camp was organized in Belzec, where, in the course of March and April 1942, the Jews from the provinces of Lublin, Lwow and Kielce to the number of tens of thousands were exterminated. [33]

The story was repeated 19 December 1942 in a declaration by the "Inter-Allied Information Committee":

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 Chelm and Belzec, where those who survive shootings are murdered en masse by means of electrocution and lethal gas. [34]

A report 1 November 1943 thus described the "Hell of Belzec":

The Jews who were sent to Belzec were ordered to undress as though to take a bath. They were in fact led into a bathing facility that could hold several hundred people. But there they were killed en masse by electric current. [35]

In 1944 the myth was enriched: a new version bringing together the metallic plate and the water themes was elaborated. On 12 February 1944 the *New York Times* published the following recital of "a young Polish Jew" on the "extermination factory" at Beljec (the *New York Times*' spelling):

The Jews were forced naked on to a metallic platform operated like a hydraulic elevator, which lowered them into a huge vat filled with water to the victims' necks, he declared. They were electrocuted by current through the water. The elevator then lifted the bodies to a crematorium above, the youth said. The source of this narrative is "individuals who escaped after actually being taken inside the factory." [36]

It came, therefore, from "eyewitnesses."

This new form of the myth was taken up in 1945 by Stefan Szende. The transports of Jews "entered by a tunnel into the underground spaces of the execution place." The "extermination technique" described by Szende is lifted, at the least, from science fiction.

When trainloads of naked Jews arrived they were herded into a great hall capable of holding several thousand people. This hall has no windows and its flooring was of metal. Once the Jews were all inside, the floor of this hall sank like a lift into a great tank of water which lay below it until the Jews were up to their waists in water. Then a powerful electric current was sent into the metal flooring and within a few seconds all the Jews, thousands at a time, were dead.

The metal flooring then rose again and the water drained away. The corpses of the slaughtered Jews were now heaped all over the floor. A different current was then switched on and the metal flooring rapidly became red hot, so that the corpses were incinerated as in a crematorium and only ash was left.

The floor was then tipped up and the ashes slid out into prepared receptacles. The smoke of the process was carried away by great factory chimneys. That was the whole procedure. [37]

Another version of the myth mentions an "electric oven" (!) as the instrument of execution:

Then they went into a third barrack that held an electric oven. It is in that barrack that the executions took place. [38]

In 1945 the first version of the myth was raised to the rank of official truth as far as the Belzec "extermination camp" was concerned. It was accepted in the report of the Polish government and read by the Soviet representative of the prosecution, L.N. Smirnov, at the 19 December 1945 hearing of the Nuremberg trial:

In the same report, in the last chapter, on page 136 of the book of documents we find a declaration on the fact that the camp at Beldjitz [39] was constructed in 1940; however, the special electrical equipment for mass extermination of people was installed in 1942. Under the pretext of having them take a bath the people were constrained to undress completely, and pushed into a building the floor of which was electrified; there they were killed. [40]

The myth of the "extermination" of Jews at Belzec by electricity was not the only one [regarding Belzec] to circulate in the course of the Second World War.

The "eyewitness" Jan Karski, who claims to have visited this camp in the uniform of the Estonian Guard, describes a somewhat singular "extermination" procedure:

The Jews were loaded in boxcars the floors of which were covered with quicklime. When the loading was complete, the train departed for an uninhabited area 80 miles from Belzec, where it remained unopened until all the Jews were dead through the corrosive action of the lime and suffocation. [41]

Despite the detailed "eyewitness testimonies" to which we are referred, the myth of the carbon monoxide "gas chamber" has also been imposed definitively as official truth about Belzec. This myth, which has received the official sanction of the Commission for the Investigation of German Crimes in Poland [42] appeared suddenly in 1946, in the collection *Dokumenty i Materialy*. [43]

The new version is based on the "eyewitness testimony" of Rudolf Reder, [44] testimony that is in large part a plagiarism of the famous Gerstein Report. [45]

The "eyewitness testimony" of Kurt Gerstein, SS-Obersturmführer, on the "extermination camp" of Belzec is a typical instance of the absence of a critical spirit, and of the bad faith of official historians when they choose their "evidence."

In our study *The Gerstein Report: Anatomy of a Fraud*, we pointed out 103 absurdities, internal and external contradictions, historical falsifications, contradictions of the official historiography, hyperbolic exaggerations, and improbabilities, so that one cannot accord the least credibility to this "eyewitness testimony."

But that does not trouble in any way the official historians, who declared almost unanimously:

The veracity of the Gerstein Report is in no doubt today. [46]

The objective plausibility of all the essential details of the report is not in question. [47]

The official historians justify the false testimonies -- that they themselves recognize as such--about Treblinka, Sobibor, and Belzec, in maintaining that during the war there was precise knowledge only of the existence of "extermination," but not of its concrete modalities and techniques. Pierre Vidal-Naquet writes on this subject:

In the flood of information that came out of the occupied territories, there was the true, the less true, and the false. Of the general sense of what was happening, there was no doubt. In regard to the methods, there was often cause to hesitate between the one and the other.

He admits also that there were "fantasies and myths" but declares that these did not exist by themselves, but rather as "a shadow cast by reality, as an extension of reality." [48]

This argumentation is an excellent application of the methodological principle "the conclusion precedes the proofs," which Pierre Vidal-Naquet attributes to the Revisionist historians. [49]

Indeed we encounter again, *mutatis mutandis*, Robert Faurisson's question as to why the "eyewitness testimonies" to the "steam rooms" of Treblinka, to the "chlorine gas," and to the "cellars" of Sobibor, and to the "extermination" of the Jews by electricity or by death-trains at Belzec, suddenly are held to be false, while the "eyewitness testimonies" to the "gas chambers" are considered true?

It is important to emphasize that we are dealing here with "eyewitness testimonies" strictly equivalent in their credibility (or, more exactly, in their "incredibility") and completely contradictory as to their content, so that it is only when the existence of the "gas chambers" is postulated *a priori* -- the conclusion precedes the proof -- that one can speak of "fantasies" and "myths" that are "like a shadow cast by reality."

For the rest, to touch again on the measure of that "reality," it is enough to study the genesis of the myth of the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz.

That myth was imposed very late in the day, and that is surprising, since the largest of all the places of execution, *the death-factory of Auschwitz-Birkenau*, succeeded in keeping its secret until the summer of 1944. [50]

The reports of the Slovakian Jews (Alfred Wetzler and Rudolf Vrba) who escaped from Auschwitz 7 April [51] circulated in July 1944, reports that were published in the United States by the War Refugee Board in November of the same year, with two other reports, [52] one by two Jews who escaped from Auschwitz on 27 May (Czeslaw Mordowicz and Arnost Rosin), the other by a "Polish commander" who is not otherwise identified.

The most important of these so-called "official reports of Auschwitz," that of Alfred Wetzler, is visibly false: this one presents a plan and a description of Crematoria I and II (II and III, according to the official numerical designation) that are in fact completely invented, as is seen by a simple comparison with the original plan. He states that in the "oven room" there were "nine ovens, each with four openings" placed around a high smokestack, which also is false in regard to the number as well as to the arrangement of the ovens; since in Crematoria II and III there were in fact five ovens each, having three openings, arranged lengthwise, one beside the other. [53]

The "gas chamber," according to Wetzler, was on the surface, since Wetzler tells us that the SS whose job it was to introduce the gas, clamber onto the roof, which, too, is wholly false, as the mortuary chamber I, the so-called "gas chamber" was, in fact, underground. [54]

Besides, again according to Wetzler, a track led from the 'gas chamber' to the oven room," [55] which also is false, in view of the fact that the oven room was on the ground level. [56]

But none of this hinders the official historians in presenting this report as though it were true. The case of Georges Wellers is typical, since he uses, stupidly, Alfred Wetzler's false description in two works in which the correct original plan of Crematorium II in Birkenau is reproduced. [57] But that is not all. He tries painfully to minimize the very grave contradictions in the "eyewitness report" of Alfred Wetzler, writing:

That some witnesses have committed errors of detail in their various descriptions is understandable. It is thus that Wetzler speaks of three openings in the ceiling of the gas chamber; in fact it had four. [58]

And that is all. It can thus be deduced that certain Exterminationist historians are not guilty of an excess of zeal in their reading of the texts.

Before receiving its official codification in the "confessions" of Rudolf Höss, the myth of the "gas chambers" at Auschwitz had known other vicissitudes as to the locale, the technique, and the period of the "extermination."

At the Nuremberg trial, in the course of the hearing on 8 August 1946, Sturmabführer Georg Konrad Morgen described, in abundant detail, "the installations of the 'extermination camp' of Monowitz":

Then the trucks left. They did not go to the Auschwitz concentration camp, but in another direction, to the Monowitz extermination camp, which was some kilometers distant. This extermination camp consisted of a series of crematoria not recognizable as such from the outside. They could be mistaken for large bath installations. Even the detainees knew it. These crematoria were surrounded by barbed wire and were tended on the inside by the Jewish working groups already mentioned.

And further:

The Monowitz extermination camp was set apart from the concentration camp. It was situated in a vast industrial zone and was not recognizable as such. Chimneys smoked all across the horizon. The camp itself was guarded on the outside by a detachment of Balts, Estonians, Lithuanians, and by Ukrainians. The entire procedure was almost entirely in the hands of the detainees themselves, who were supervised only from time to time by a subordinate officer (*Unterführer*). The execution itself was carried out by another *Unterführer* who released the gas into that place. [59]

In reality, Monowitz, like the thirty-nine Auschwitz subcamps, never had a "gas chamber." [60]

As concerns the technique of "extermination," a report dated 8 April 1943 listed the following methods of murder, in addition to "gas chambers" and execution by weapons.

[...]

(b) Electric chambers: these rooms had metallic wall linings; the victims were led inside, then the hightension was switched on;

(c) the system of the so-called pneumatic hammer; this was a system of special rooms in which the "hammer" came down from the ceiling, and the victims were killed by means of a special installation under high pneumatic pressure. [61]

As Martin Gilbert comments, these two methods were "pure fantasy." [62] On 2 February 1945 *Pravda* published an article on Auschwitz in which the following method of "extermination" was described:

The most elaborate apparatus was an electric conveyor belt on which hundreds of persons could be electrocuted simultaneously, then moved on into furnaces. [62a]

In 1945, the version of "gassing" by sham shower baths was affirmed by the most ingenious perjurers, who echoed this story. At the Belsen trial, Dr. Ada Bimko

described the sprinklers, the two "pipes," and the "huge metal containers containing gas" of the Birkenau "gas chambers" that this "eyewitness" professed to have visited personally. [63]

How these false witnesses imagined that the "gassings" had taken place can be seen clearly in the following recital by Sofia Schafranov to whom a *Sonderkommando* (special command) detainee is supposed to have recounted the following:

A shower bath was simulated to the victims, and although they knew beforehand what kind of shower it was, they were given towels and a bit of soap; after that they were made to undress, and were pushed into low cement rooms, hermetically sealed. From faucets set in the ceiling there came a poison gas instead of water. [64]

That story was repeated at the 1949 Degesch trial: one witness had heard talk that "at Birkenau the gas was introduced by fake showers." But just as Dr. Heli, inventor of Zyklon B. as well as Dr. Ra, [65] a physician, declared that the "gassing" technique described by the witness was impossible, so the court rejected as false the story in question

The court does not doubt the inexactness of the hypothesis according to which the gas was drawn from the can of Zyklon by means of a small tube and introduced into the gas chambers so that it is no longer necessary to do the experiment asked for by one of the accused. [66]

But that did not prevent Vincenzo and Luigi Pappalettera from making the following commentary -- evidently inspired by what had been maintained at Nuremberg [67] - on the photograph of the "gas chamber" at Mauthausen:

In the showers the prisoners were drenched, not with water, but with murderous gas that spurted from little holes. [68]

Mixing these myths with those relating to Sobibor and to Belzec, Leo Laptos, who had worked as a pharmacist in Birkenau, recounted that:

The gas chambers were equipped like bathrooms where people went under pretext of taking a shower, but instead of water, it was gas that came from the conduits, and the floor tipped so that the cadavers fell on to a conveyer belt that transported them into the crematory. [69]

No less fanciful was the recital of a female detainee at Auschwitz at the Degesch trial, according to which a gas, called "rotten gas" by the detainees was gathered by a "rotten gas group" in the swampy areas and was used at Birkenau for "exterminating." [70]

Lastly, on the subject of the time-period of the "extermination," Dr. Reszö Kastner reported a message from Bratislava, according to which the "SS were on the point of repairing and refurbishing the gas chambers at the crematories of Auschwitz, which were out of use since autumn of 1943." [71] In a declaration made under oath in 1945, he stated precisely:

A communique stated that at Auschwitz they were working feverishly on the restoration of the gas chambers and the crematories, which had not been in use for months. [72]

while the official historiography indicated no halt in the activity of the "gas chambers" and the crematory ovens [73] during the period in question, which is why in the 1961 edition of the Kastner report the aforementioned passage has been suppressed. [74]

Even more instructive is the study of the development of the myth of the "gas chambers" at Auschwitz, the present form of which derives from the "technical survey" of the "extermination camp" made by the Soviets in February-March 1945.

The Extraordinary Commission of Inquiry into German Crimes at Auschwitz "established" that more than four million persons were murdered in this camp, [75] a number that "makes one laugh," according to Reitlinger. [76] The fashion in which the Soviet Commission arrived at that figure makes one laugh even more! It declares:

In Crematorium No. I, which existed for 24 months, one could burn 9,000 cadavers per month, which give a total of 216,000 for the whole duration of its existence. The numbers corresponding to the other crematoria are:

- Crematorium No. II, 19 months, 90,000 cadavers per month, total: 1,710,000
- Crematorium No. III, 18 months, 90,000 cadavers per month, total: 1,620,000
- Crematorium No. IV, 17 months, 45,000 cadavers per month, total: 765,000
- Crematorium No. V, 18 months, 45,000 cadavers per month, total: 810,000

The total capacity of the five crematoria was 279,000 cadavers per month, for a total of 5,121,000 cadavers for the whole duration of their existence. Given, on the one hand, that the Germans burned a great number of cadavers on wood pyres, and, on the other, that the crematoria did not always work at full capacity, the Soviet "technical commission" "established" at just four million the number of the "murdered"! [77]

This calculation is false, if only for the reason that the maximum capacity of 270,000 cremations per month for the four Birkenau crematoria, or 9,000 per day, is about nine times greater than the actual capacity! [78] The Soviet "technical commission," moreover, "established" that in the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz the gas Zyklon A had been employed, although this had not been used since the 1920s. [79]

The case of Katyn shows clearly the value that can be given the conclusions of the various Soviet "Commissions of Inquiry": the Soviet commission that investigated the Katyn massacre-committed by the Russians, as everyone knows -- "established" on the basis of "more than a hundred witnesses," "medico-legal surveys," and "documents and elements of proof," that those responsible for the butchery were the Germans. [80]

The Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland "established" at first, as we have shown, that the Jews in Treblinka were killed in "steam chambers," and in Belzec by "electricity"; then it "established" that they were poisoned by carbon monoxide gas in "gas chambers" which is amply sufficient to demonstrate the reliability of that commission.

In regard to the Auschwitz camp, it "established" the incineration capacity of the four Birkenau crematoria as 12,000 cadavers in 24 hours.[81] That is impossible.

Jan Sehn, examining magistrate and member of the General Commission of Inquiry into the Hitlerian Crimes in Poland, reduces that to 8,000.[82] That figure has been taken up by a 1979 publication of the Auschwitz Museum, [83] even though a 1961 publication of the same museum alludes to a German document that would make 4,416 cadavers appear to be a maximum capacity. [84]

Topping off the speculation about the numbers, Jan Sehn does not fear to assert:

The very detailed documents gathered by the Extraordinary Soviet State Commission, as well as by the General Commission of Inquiry into Hitlerian Crimes in Poland, prove that the Outputs of the Birkenau gas chambers was close to 60,000 persons in 24 hours. [85]

Eugen Kogon more modestly contents himself with a maximum daily production of 34,000. [86]

Beginning in 1945, there is a proliferation of "eyewitnesses" to the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz; what Georges Wellers calls "an abundance of proofs." [87]

Let us examine briefly the value of these "proofs." In regard to the activity of the crematoria at Birkenau -- five, according to Ada Bimko, [88] six, according to Robert Lévy, [89] eight, according to Marie-Claude Vaillant-Couturier [90] -- here is what appears in the notes Rudolf Höss is supposed to have set down in Cracow:

After a very short time, Crematorium III (IV) was out of commission and it never was used again. [91]

Pery Broad stated exactly the contrary:

The four crematoria worked at full steam. But soon, after continuous overloading, the ovens broke down, and only Crematorium III (IV) continued to smoke. [92]

Dov Paisikovic, who affirmed he was a member of the *Sonderkommando* from "May 1944 until the evacuation in January 1945" contradicts them both:

The crematories were so solidly constructed that throughout this whole time I had no knowledge of any failure either of the ovens or of the crematories as a whole. [93]

These "eyewitnesses," in turn, are contradicted by the Polish Commission for the Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, which declared that in August 1944:

The crematoria were closed, and thenceforward the corpses were burnt only in pits. [94]

Contradicting all these testimonies, the *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau* (Chronicle of Events in the Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp) does not show the least mishap in the functioning of the four crematories in Birkenau until 7 October 1944 when, because of the revolt of the Sonderkommando, Crematorium IV was burned. [95]

In regard to the Crematoria II and III at Birkenau, Alfred Wetzler declares they had 36 ovens which each "could take three normal corpses at once," which took "an hour and a half" to be "completely burned." That represented "a daily capacity of about 2,000 bodies" for each crematorium. [96]

For Dov Paisikovic the ovens were 15 in number and the cadavers took about "four minutes [!] to be consumed," so that there was a cremation capacity of 6,000 cadavers in 24 hours. [97]

Miklos Nyiszli affirms that the cadavers were put "by threes" into each of the 15 ovens and "cremated in twenty minutes" which meant "several thousand people could be cremated in a single day." [98]

Dr. Bendel maintains there were 16 ovens, "but with a cremation capacity of about two thousand cadavers in 24 hours." [99]

Rudolf Höss was initially made to confess that the crematories in question had 10 ovens that could incinerate 4,000 cadavers in 24 hours. [100]

The "gas chambers" of Crematoria II and III -- which Alfred Wetzler places on the ground level, the others underground -- were 10 meters long for Dr. Bendel, [101] and 200 meters long for Nyiszli. [102]

As to the number of Auschwitz victims proffered by the diverse "witnesses," Georges Wellers writes that they vary between 8 million and 11/2 million, i.e., in the proportion of 5.3 to 1. [103]

As will already have been seen in this necessary summary examination, there is well and truly "an abundance of proofs," but it turns out that these proofs are false and contradictory.

There are also objective proofs that are no less embarrassing to the official historiography.

The "Auschwitz Protocols" (see above) reached the War Refugee Board in June 1944. [104]

Since 4 April, American planes had overflown and photographed Auschwitz. In the course of the mission of 26 June, the IG-Farben industrial complex, Auschwitz, and Birkenau were photographed. On the 25 August 1944 mission, photographs were taken that clearly showed the Auschwitz camp and the Birkenau Crematoria II and III.

Thus, when on 13 September 1944 the Americans staged an air raid against the IG-Farben complex, they knew the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp well;

On that occasion, two bombs fell on Birkenau, accidentally; one of them hit the railway spur that led to the crematoria. [105]

What better occasion to destroy the sadly notorious "death factory" of Birkenau?

Yet nothing of the kind was done. Why, then was Auschwitz not bombed? [106] The only answer to that "disquieting questions" can be the following:

Analyses of the aerial photographs of Auschwitz-Birkenau showed that this camp was not concealing any horrible "secret" and, consequently, the crematoria were judged not to be worth a single bomb.

It is not by chance that the abovementioned photographs [107] were not published until 1979 (!) with explanatory texts by the CIA *ad usum Delphini*. (Translator's note: "in Delphic style," i.e. obscurely formulated.)

Not only did these photographs show nothing of the existence of "extermination" processes at Auschwitz, but they gave the lie categorically to an essential aspect, that of the cremation pits. The origin of this myth, taken up ultimately by diverse "eyewitnesses," with contradictions that are not without importance, can be attributed directly to the "Auschwitz Protocols."

One reads, in particular, in the report drawn up by Mordowicz and Rosin, that in May 1944, during the influx of Hungarian Jews, that the crematories could not manage the incineration of the cadavers of those who had been gassed, large pits, 30 meters long by 15 meters wide, were dug in the Birkenwald ("birch forest") adjoining Birkenau ("birch meadow") where the bodies were burned day and night. [108]

According to the "eyewitness" Miklos Nyiszli, from the two crematory pits, each 50 meters long and 6 meters wide, located in a birch forest 500-600 meters from Crematory V, there rose a "thick twisting spiral of smoke" that was "visible from any point in the KZ" and "at every hour of the day and night." Nyiszli declared that "by day it covered the sky above Birkenau with a thick cloud." [109]

Even more emphatically, Pery Broad asserts that:

In the environs of Birkenau there were about ten large incineration centers in which 200 to 1,000 persons at a time were burned on wood pyres. The light of these fires was still visible at a radius of at least 30 kilometers. [110]

The cremation pits, at first placed exclusively in the "birch forest" by the "eyewitnesses," thereafter moved mysteriously into the courtyard of Crematorium V.

The Commission for the Investigation of German Crimes in Poland "established" that between May and August 1944:

Six huge pits were dug beside Crematorium V, and old pits were opened near the gas plant in the wood, and corpses burnt in them continuously. When operations were in full swing in August, 1944, the number of corpses burnt daily rose to 24,000. [111]

Pery Broad, according to whom, during that period, "only Crematorium III (IV) still smoked," locates the cremation pits exactly "in the rear courtyard of Crematorium IV." [112]

To sum up, between May and August 1944, Birkenau was claimed to be a fiery hell whose flames devoured up to 25,000 cadavers a day, and whose smoke covered the sky of Auschwitz-Birkenau in thick clouds.

Now, the aerial photographs of June 26th and of August 25th, 1944, reveal absolutely nothing of the presence of these enormous cremation pits; moreover, they show not the slightest trace of smoke, not from the phantom wood pyres, and not from the crematory smokestacks.

The most important source of the official "truth" on Auschwitz is notoriously the "confessions" of Rudolf Höss, the veracity of which are accepted uncritically and dogmatically by the official historians.

In his "autobiography" Höss writes of his first interrogation by the English:

At my first interrogation, evidence was obtained by beating me. I do not know what is in the record, although I signed it. Alcohol and the whip were too much for me. [113]

Martin Broszat remarks in a note:

This refers to a police report of 8 typed pages that Höss signed on 14, March 1946 at 2:30 (Nuremberg Document No. 1210). As far as the content is concerned, it does not differ notably on any point from what Höss declared or wrote at Nuremberg or at Cracow. [114]

Rudolf Höss's first confession, which served as a model for all the others, therefore, was invented by the English interrogators. To be convinced of that, without a shadow of a doubt, a quick glance of the document in question will suffice. Höss "confesses" to have been called to Berlin in June 1941 by Himmler, who let him know that the Führer had ordered "the final solution of the Jewish question in Europe," that is to say, "the total extermination of all the Jews in Europe," as he had been made to "acknowledge" in the declaration made under oath on 5 April 1946. [115] This is false not only because, as we have shown, the "final solution" meant at that time the deportation of the Jews to Madagascar, but also contradicts chronologically a cardinal element of the official historiography, as Gerald Reitlinger revealed with great embarrassment. Reitlinger eliminated the contradiction by dating the alleged summons of Höss to Berlin, and the supposed order by the Führer, a year later. [116]

In June 1941, Höss's "confession" continues, there were three *extermination camps* in the General Government Wolzek, Belzec, and Tublinka (*sic*). But the first never existed, while the second, and the third (Treblinka) became operational - according to the official historiography in March and in July 1942, respectively. [117] Höss confesses also to having visited the camp at Treblinka in the spring of 1942 and to have been present there at a gassing procedure, which is altogether impossible, since

the construction of the camp began on June 1st, while the first gassing there was supposed to have been carried out on 23 July 1942. [118]

In the sworn statement of 5 April 1946 that supposed visit took place in 1941, when the Treblinka camp was not yet in existence. But this is not all. The camp commandant reported to Höss that in the course of the preceding six months he had "gassed" 80,000 persons, which meant that the "gassings" had begun in the autumn of 1941, i.e., several months before the camp had been built!

According to PS-3868, the commandant of Treblinka "had principally to occupy himself with the liquidation of all the Jews from the Warsaw ghetto"; but the deportation of these Jews to Treblinka did not begin until 22 July 1942.

The English investigators, who had a very approximate knowledge even in regard to Auschwitz, made Höss "confess" that the first two crematoria of Birkenau were finished in 1942, which is false, [119] each one having five double ovens, which is equally false, [120] which could incinerate 2,000 cadavers in 12 hours, just as false, [121] that the two other crematoria were finished six months later, which is false, [122] each with four ovens, which is yet again false. [123] Höss was forced to say three million persons were murdered at Auschwitz, two and half million of them in the "gas chambers." [124] But in his "autobiography" in Cracow, Rudolf Höss "confesses":

I consider in any case that the number of two and a half million is excessive. Even at Auschwitz the possibilities for extermination were limited. [125]

Subsequently, before the Polish Supreme Court, he reduced the number to 1,135,000. [126] In his sworn declaration of 5 April 1946 and of 20 May 1946, [127] Höss repeats the "confession" of Document NO-1210 in stating that a half-million persons died of hunger and sickness, a number that surpassed greatly the number of the registered detainees. [128]

The English investigators finally shifted to May 1945 the chimerical order by Himmler, which is supposed to have ended the "gassings," [129] thereby contradicting the similarly contradictory notion of the official historiography. Extradited to Poland, Rudolf Höss continued to make the same kind of "confessions."

The Poles (on the basis of the documents seized at Auschwitz) revised and corrected the 14 March 1946 "confession" drawn up by the English interrogators, developing it into the "autobiography" proper, and into the appendix captioned "Final solution [...]" that constitutes the official "truth" about Auschwitz.

It is only too easy to imagine by what means these "confessions" were extracted from Rudolf Höss: it is enough to recall the methods of the great Moscow trials that forced the accused to make the desired "confessions."

The climate of the cold war set in; the Poles permitted Höss to describe the treatment he had suffered under "bourgeois" justice:

After several days, I was led to Minden-on-Weser, the "British Zone" interrogation center. There I suffered even more brutal treatment at the hands of the military prosecutor, an English major. The regime of the prison in which I was locked up corresponded to his attitude. After three weeks I was suddenly taken to the barber who shaved me and cut my hair. I was permitted also to wash myself; this was the first time since my arrest that my handcuffs were taken off.

From Minden Höss was taken to Nuremberg:

The conditions of my stay were excellent in every respect. We had a large library at our disposal, and I could employ all my time in reading. But the interrogations ready were very painful. I was not tortured physically, but the moral pressure was very hard to endure. I can hold no grudge against my judges: they all were Jews. They were the kind of Jews who wanted to know everything that had torn me psychologically. They let no doubt remain about the fate that awaited us. [130]

It is easy to imagine of what the psychological pressures on Rudolf Höss consisted. Here is an example drawn from the vast repertory of the great Moscow trials:

The hostages provide the essential ingredient of the moral tortures. Here is one, for instance, very simple, and which will remain invisible to the foreign journalists admitted to the courtroom: the accused is shown a film depicting refined tortures; it is murmured to him that such will be the fate of his wife, or of his granddaughter, if ... [131]

Let us not believe that the "civilized" Occident has recoiled from similar methods. The American Investigation Commission, composed of Judges van Roden and Simpson, who were sent to Germany in 1948 to investigate the irregularities committed by the American Military Tribunal at Dachau -- which had tried 1,500 Germans and condemned 420 to death [132] ascertained that the accused had been subjected to physical and psychological tortures of all kinds, to force them to make the desired "confessions."

Thus, in 137 of the 139 cases examined, the accused, in the course of their interrogation, had been kicked in the testicles, and left with incurable injuries. [133]

But there is no reason to be surprised by this: it is part of the logic of the trials of those who are called "Nazi War Criminals." The guiding principle was set forth frankly by the U.S. Attorney General, Robert H. Jackson, at the Nuremberg trial session of 26 July 1946:

The Allies are technically still in a state of war with Germany even though the political and the military institutions of the enemy have collapsed. As a military tribunal this court represents a continuation of the war effort of the allied nations. [134]

In conclusion, to doubt the historic reality of the "extermination" of the Jews not only is legitimate, it is a duty, because it is a duty to seek historical truth

by submitting testimonies, documents, and data systematically to examination by critical methods that no one would dream of challenging if they were applied to no matter what other historical problem, because it is on these methods, and on nothing else, that historical research bases its scientific character. [135]

... not by accepting any document or "eye witness testimony" whatsoever uncritically and with preconceived notions, as the official historians do regularly.

Notes

- [1] Ernst Nolte, *I tre volti del fascismo*, Milan, 1971, p. 559.
- [2] Vittorio E. Giuntella, *Il nazismo e i Lager*, Roma, 1980, p. 46.
- [3] Elia S. Artom, *Storia d'Israele*, Rome, 1965, vol. III, p. 227.
- [4] Among the most significant Revisionist works on the trials of the Nazi "war criminals," let us mention:
Anonymous, *The Nuremberg "Trial," 1946* [republished by Sons of Liberty, c.1978].
Montgomery Belgion, *Epitaph on Nuremberg*, London, 1946.
Maurice Bardèche, *Nuremberg ou la terre promise*, Les Sept Couleurs, 1948.
Maurice Bardèche, *Nuremberg II ou les faux monnayeurs*, Les Sept Couleurs, 1950.
F.J.P. Veale, *Advance to Barbarism*, London, 1948.
F.J.P. Veale, *Crimes Discreetly Veiled*, London, 1958 (both republished by the Institute for Historical Review, California, 1979).
G.A. Amaudruz, *Ubu justicier au premier procès de Nuremberg*, Paris, 1949.
Reginald T. Paget, *Manstein: His Campaigns and his Trial*, London, 1951.
Freda Utley, *The High Cost of Vengeance*, Regnery, Chicago, 1949.
August von Knierlein, *The Nuremberg Trials*, Regnery, Chicago, 1959.
Gerhard Brennecke, *Die Nürnberger Geschichtsentstellung*, Tübingen, 1970.
Jose A. Llorens Borràs, *Crimenes de guerra*, Barcelona, 1973.
La vérité sur l'affaire de Malmédy et sur le colonel SS Jochen Peiper, Editions du Baucens, 1976.
Werner Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial*, New York, 1979.
David Irving, *Der Nurnberger Prozess*, Munich, 1980.
Dietrich Ziemssen, *The Malmedy Trial*, Institute for Historical Review, California, 1981.
Léon de Poncins, "Le Procès de Nuremberg," in *Top secret*, Chiré-en-Montreuil, 1972, p. 91-126.
Piero Sella, "Occupazione della Germania e repressione politicogiudiziaria Norimberga," *L'Occidente contra l'Europa*, Milan, 1984, p. 155-184.
- [5] Among the most important Revisionist works on the war crimes of the Allies:
Erich Kern, *Verbrechen am deutschen Volk: Dokumente alliierter Grausamkeiten 1939- 1949*, Verlag K.W. Schutz KG, Pr. Oldendorf, 1964
Erich Kern & Karl Balzer, *Alliierte Verbrechen an Deutschen*, Verlag K.W. Schütz KG, Pr. Oldendorf, 1980.
Wilhelm Anders, *Verbrechen der Sieger*, Druffel-Verlag, Leoni am Starnberger See, 1975.
"Crimes de guerre des alliés?," *Défense de l'Occident*, special number 39-40, 1965.
Alliierten Kriegsverbrechen und Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto 1977.
J. Bochaca, *Los crímenes de los "buenos,"* Barcelona, 1982.
Rudolf Trenkel, *Polens Kriegsschuld: Der Bromberger Blutsonntag*, April 1981 (Nordland-Verlag).
David Irving, *The Destruction of Dresden*, London, 1963.
The Crime of Moscow in Vynnytsia, New York 1951 (republished by Institute for Historical Review, California, n.d.)
Louis FitzGibbon, *Katyn*, Institute for Historical Review, California, 1979.
Friedwald Kumpf, *Die Verbrechen an Deutschen*, Mannheim, 1954.

Rudolf Aschenauer, *Krieg ohne Grenzen: Der Partisanenkampf gegen Deutschland 1939-1945*, Druffel-Verlag, Leoni am Starnberger See, 1982.

[6] Principle works of Paul Rassinier:
Le Mensonge d' Ulysse, La Vieille Taupe, 1979.
Ulysse trahi par les siens, La Vieille Taupe, 1980.
Le Véritable Procès Eichmann ou les vainqueurs incorribibles, La Vieille Taupe, 1983.
Le Drame des juifs européens, La Vieille Taupe, 1985.
L'Opération "Vicaire": Le rôle de Pie XII devant l'histoire, La Table ronde, 1965.
Les Responsables de la seconde guerre mondiale, Nouvelles éditions latines, 1967 (ch. IV: "La question juive").

[7] Other works up to 1979:
Heinrich Härtle, *Freispruch für Deutschland: Unsere Soldaten vor dem Nürnberger Tribunal*, Verlag K.W. Schutz, Göttingen, 1965.
J. P. Bermont (Paul Rassinier), "La verità sul processo di Auschwitz," *Quaderni di Ordine Nuovo*, Rome, 1965.
Léon de Poncins, "Six million innocent victims," in: *Judaism and the Vatican*, Liberty Bell Publications, 1967, p. 178-190.
François Duprat, "Le Mystère des chambres à gaz," *Défense de l'Occident*, no. 63, June 1967, p. 30-33.
Heinz Roth, *Was hätten wir Väter wissen müssen?*, 1970.
Heinz Roth, *Was geschah nach 1945?*, 1972.
Heinz Roth, "... der makaberste Betrug aller Zeiten ...", 1974 (these three works were published by the author).
Heinz Roth, *Warum werden wir Deutschen belogen?*, Refo Druck + Verlag H.F. Kathagen, 1973.
James J. Martin, *Revisionist Viewpoints*, Colorado Springs, 1971.
Erich Kern, *Die Trägödie der Juden: Schicksal zwischen Wahrheit und Propaganda*, Verlag K.W. Schutz KG., Preuss. Oldendorf, 1979.
Udo Walendy, *Europa in Flammen 1939-1945*, Verlag für Volksstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho/Weser 1966, vol. I.
Udo Walendy, *Bild "Dokumente" für die Geschichtsschreibung?* Vlotho/Weser, 1973.
Udo Walendy, *Die Methoden der Umerziehung*, Historische Tatsachen no. 2, Vlotho/Weser, 1976.
Wolf Dieter Rothe, *Die Endlösung der Judenfrage*, Frankfurt-am-Main, 1974.
Richard Harwood, *Der Nurnberger Prozess: Methoden und Bedeutung*, Historical Review Press, 1977.
Richard Harwood, *Nuremberg and Other War Crimes Trials*, Historical Review Press, 1978.
Alexander Scronn, *General Psychologus*, Kritik no. 42, February 1978 (Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch).
Horst Mattern, *Jesus, die Bibel und die 6.000.000 Lüge*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto, 1979.
Friedrich Schlegel, *Das Unrecht am deutschen Volk*, W. P. Publications, Liverpool, West Virginia, 1978.
Friedrich Schlegel, *Die Befreiung nach 1945*, W. P. Publications, Liverpool, West Virginia, 1978.
Friedrich Schlegel, *Wir werden niemals schweigen*, W.P. Publications, Liverpool, West Virginia, 1978.
Friedrich Schlegel, *Verschwiegene Wahrheiten*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto, n. d.

W. Stäglich & U. Walendy, *NS-Bewältigung*, Historical Review Press, 1979.

Thies Christophersen, *Der Auschwitz-Betrug*, *Kritik* no. 27 (Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch), n.d.

J.G. Burg, *Schuld un Schicksal*, Munich, 1962.

J.G. Burg, *Sündenböcke*, Munich, 1967.

J.G. Burg, *NS-Verbrechen: Prozesse des schlechten Gewissens*, Munich, 1968.

J.G. Burg, *Das Tagebuch (der Anne Frank)*, Munich, 1978.

J.G. Burg, *Majdanek in alle Ewigkeit?*, Munich, 1979.

Wilhelm Stäglich, *Das Institut für Zeitgeschichte -- eine Schwindelfirma?*, *Kritik* no. 38 (Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch), 1977.

Wilhelm Stäglich, *Die westdeutsche Justiz und die sogenannten NS Gewaltverbrechen* (Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch), 1978.

Heinrich Härtle, *Was "Holocaust" verschweigt*, Leoni am Starnberger See, 1979.

[8] See on this subject "Le Journal d'Anne Frank pourrait être un faux!" *Le Courrier des Yvelines*, 9 February, 1984, p. 4. -- "On sait aujourd'hui que le journal d'Anne Frank était un faux. Le beau mensonge," *Spéciale dernière*, 1 March 1984, p. 11.

[9] Other writings on the "Faurisson affair":

"Vérité et solidarité," *La Guerre sociale*, no. 7, p. 33-39.

Robert Poulet, "La vérité au compte-gouttes," *Rivarol*, 25 February 1983, p. 11.

"Note rassinieriane con appendice sulla persecuzione giudiziaria di R. Faurisson," *Alla Bottega*, March-April 1983, p. 33-41.

Robert Faurisson, "El caso Faurisson (o la represion en Francia)," *Cedade*, no. 104, February 1982, p. 9-12.

Robert Faurisson, "Revisionism on Trial: Developments in France, 1979-1983," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1985, p. 133-181.

[10] Other writings:

Ich Adolf Eichmann: Ein historischer Zeugenbericht, edited by Dr. Rudolf Aschenauer, Druffel-Verlag, Leoni am Starnberger See, 1980.

Léon Degrelle, *Lettera al Papa sulla truga di Auschwitz*, Sentinella d'Italia, Monfalcone, 1980.

Die grosse Holocaust Debate, translated from the US weekly *Spotlight*, December 1980.

H. Fikentscher, *Sechs Millonen Juden vergast-verbrannt*, *Kritik* no. 51, Kritik-Verlag, Arhus, Denmark.

J. Bochaca, "El mito de Anna Frank," *Cedade*, no. 104, February 1982, p. 18-20.

"Holocaust" News: "Holocaust" Story An Evil Hoax, Revisionists' Reprints, Manhattan Beach, 1982.

Mohamed Levy-Cohen, "Zur geschichtlichen Analyse der nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslager als Gegenstand des heutigen Kampfes," *Die Aktion*, no. 19-20, August-September 1983, p. 267-276; no. 21-22, November-December 1983, p. 293-303.

On the genesis and development of Revisionism see also:

A.R. Butz, "The International "Holocaust" Controversy," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1980, p. 5-22.

Robert Faurisson, "El verdadero motivo de angustia del Estado de Israel: el revisionisme historico," *Cedade*, no. 134, July-August 1985, p. 12-13.

[11] On reactions in the United States: *Revisionists' Reprints*, Manhattan Beach, January 1985.

[12] "Nürnberg und Auschwitz-Lüge," *Freiheit und Recht*, no. 7-8, July-August 1975, p. 15.

- [13] Martin Broszat, "Zur Kritik der Publizistik des antisemitischen Rechtsextremismus," in *Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, supplement to the weekly *Das Parlament*, 8 May 1976, p. 3-7.
- [14] Hermann Langbein, "Coup d'oeil sur la littérature néo-nazie," *Le Monde Juif* no. 78, April-June 1975, p. 8-20.
- [15] Georges Wellers, *La Solution Finale et la Mythomanie Néo-Nazie*, edited by Beate and Serge Klarsfeld, 1979.
- [16] Article by E. Kulka, *Quaderni del Centro di studi sulla deportazione e l'internamento*, no. 9 (1976-1977), p. 112-124.
- [17] Stefano Levi della Torre, "Nuove forme della giudeofobia" (3. Revisionismo), *La Rassegna mensile di Israel*, July-August 1984, p. 249-280.
- [18] Aside from *Le Lutteur de classe* already cited, we note on this subject "De l'exploitation dans les camps à l'exploitation des camps," *La Guerre sociale*, no. 3, June 1979, p. 9-31; "De l'exploitation dans les camps à l'exploitation des camps (suite et fin)," a clarification by *La Guerre sociale*, Paris, May 1981. "Le Mythe concentrationnaire," *Le Frondeur*, Spring 1981, no. 7, p. 9-17, Winter 1982, no. 8, p. 7-13; "Du judaïsme à la judaïte," *ibid.* July-September 1982, no. 9, p. 3-6. "Il caso Rassinier," *Alta Bottega*, July-August 1981.
- [19] Other important writings:
 P. Viansson-Ponté, "Le Mensonge," *Le Monde*, 17-18 July 1977, p. 13.
 G. Wellers, "Le Cas Darquier de Pellepoix," *Le Monde Juif*, no. 92, October-December 1978, p. 162-167.
 G. Wellers, "La Négation des crimes nazis: Le cas des documents photographiques accablants," *Le Monde Juif*, no. 103, July-September 1981, p. 96-107.
 Vincenzo et Luigi Pappalettera, "Un intervento di Pappalettera," *Storia illustrata*, no. 263, October 1979, p. 3844.
 Primo Levi, "Il difficile cammino della verità," *La Rassegna mensile di Israel*, no. 7-12, July-December 1982, p. 5-11.
 Lothar Baier, "Die Weisswäscher von Auschwitz: Robert Faurisson und seine Genossen," *Transatlantik*, July 1981, p. 14-26.
- [20] *Inquisitionsprozesse heute: Hexenprozess der Neuzeit*, Kritik no. 22, Kritik-Verlag 1981 (Christophersen trial). On the Faurisson affair, see the works already cited. Ditlieb Felderer was arrested on 26 November 1982 and condemned in May 1983 to ten months in prison for having distributed "documents inciting to hate," that is, for having denied the reality of the "extermination" of the Jews. (*The IHR 1982 Annual Report; IHR Newsletter*, May 1983, no. 19; *Revisionists' Reprints*, no. 6, Manhattan Beach, Autumn 1983).
- [21] Udo Walendy, *Der moderne Index*, Historische Tatsachen no. 7, Vlotho/Weser, 1980. Udo Walendy, *Strafsache wissenschaftliche Forschung*, Historische Tatsachen no. 21, Vlotho/Weser, 1984. *Beschlagnahmt! Eingelesen! Verboten! Bücher, die wir nicht lesen dürfen!*, Kritik no. 52, Kritik-Verlag, Mohrkirch 1981.
- [22] Wilhelm Stäglich, "Der Auschwitz Mythos: A Book and its Fate," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984, p. 47-68.
 Bulletin du "Comité contre l'application en 1983 des lois nazies de 1939 par l'Université Georg-August de Göttingen," n.d.
- [23] See "L'Affaire Roques," in André Chelain, *Faut-il fusiller Henri Roques ?*, Polémiques (Ogmios Diffusion), Paris, 1986, p. 6-16.

[24] See "L'Affaire Roques," *Le Monde Juif*, no. 122, April-June 1986, p. 49-79; "La campagne de presse. Les principaux articles et communiqués de presse de l'Affaire Roques?" in André Chelain, *Faut-il fusiller Henri Roques?*, op. cit., p. I-XVIII.

[25] See our article "Lo scandaloso scandalo Roques", *Orion*, n. 23, 1986, p. 189-190. The only attempt at a scholarly refutation of the doctoral thesis of Henri Roques is the article already cited, by Georges Wellers, "A propos d'une thèse de doctorat 'explosive' sur le Rapport Gerstein," *Le Monde Juif*, No. 121, January-March 1986, p.1-18. This article, with G. Wellers's most important writings on the "Gerstein Report," is refuted in detail in our work (title as in text), *Come si falsifica la storia: Georges Wellers e le "camere a gaz" di Belzec* (in preparation).

Notes Part 2

[1] IMT, vol. XIX, p. 483.

[2] Abbé G. Hénocque, *Les Antres de la Bête*, Paris 1947, p.115-116. Cited in: Robert Faurisson, *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire*, La Vieille Taupe, Paris, 1980, facsimile reproduction on p. 191-192.

[3] Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl et al., *Les Chambres à gaz, secret d'Etat*, Editions de Minuit, 1984, p. 230-231.

[4] IMT, vol. V, p. 198 (PS-3249).

[5] *Die Zeit*, no. 34, Friday 19 August 1960, p. 16.

[6] Meant here are the camps Chelmno, Belzec, Treblinka, Majdanek, Sobibor and Auschwitz-Birkenau mentioned on page 105 (of the article referred to in the following note).

[7] *VfZ*, 24th year, 1976, booklet 2, p. 109.

[8] *Books and Bookmen*, London, April 1975, p. 5.

[9] In fact, there is not the slightest evidence that the place in question ever had been or was destined to be a "gas chamber." See on this subject Robert Faurisson, *Mémoire en défense contre ceux qui m'accusent de falsifier l'histoire*, op. cit., p. 197-220.

[10] *Wie war es im KZ Dachau?* (How was it in the Dachau Concentration Camp?) Kuratorium für Sühnemal KZ Dachau, 1981, p. 16.

[11] *Idem*, p. 30.

[12] A unique exception -- but limited to the camps of the Old Reich -- is Olga Wormser-Migot who, in her analysis of the "eyewitness testimonies" on this subject, came to the conclusion that neither at Ravensbruck nor at Mauthausen had there ever been "gas chambers," [a] thereby arousing the anger of her colleagues. [b]

Supplement: Very recently Professor Michel de Bœuard came to admit honestly: "In the monograph of Mauthausen which I wrote for *Revue d'Histoire de la Seconde Guerre mondiale* in 1954, in two places I spoke of a gas chamber. Reflecting on this later I said to myself: where did I acquire the conviction that there was a gas chamber in Mauthausen? It wasn't during my stay at the camp. for neither I, nor anyone else suspected that there was one there; it was rather a rumor I heard after the war, that's granted. Then I noticed that in my text -- although I supported most of my statements with references -- there was no reference concerning the gas chamber ... " [c]

a) Olga Wormser-Migot: *Le Système concentrationnaire nazi 1933-1945*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1968, p. 541-544.

b) Germaine Tillion, *Ravensbruck*, Paris 1973, p. 235-248.

c) "La Thèse de Nantes," inquiry by Jacques Lebaillly in *Ouest-France*, 2-3 August 1986, p. 6.

- [13] Serge Thion, *Vérité historique ou vérité politique ? Le dossier de l'affaire Faurisson: La question des chambres à gaz*, La Vieille Taupe 1980, p. 87.
- [14] Gerald Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale: Il tentativo di sterminio degli ebrei d'Europa 1939-1945*, Milan, 1965, p. 651.
- [15] *Idem*, p. 71.
- [16] Likwidacja żydowskiej Warszawy, "Treblinka," *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego*, Warsaw, January-June 1951, p. 93-100. Citations: p. 95 and 99.
- [17] PS-3311. Accusation no. 6 against Hans Frank, Nuremberg 5 December 1945. An extract of this document was read during the Nuremberg trial. IMT vol. III, p. 632-633.
- [18] The American engineer Friedrich P. Berg, in an excellent technical study: "The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within a Myth" (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984), shows that a "gassing" by carbon monoxide produced by a diesel engine [a] "couldn't be more irrational and inefficacious. While a diesel engine produces carbon monoxide at an average concentration of 0.4%, a gasoline engine normally emits 7.0% carbon monoxide and 1.0% oxygen. By adjusting the carburetor, a carbon monoxide concentration of 12% (thirty times more than that of a diesel engine!) can be attained, which is why "the diesel gas chamber story is incredible on these grounds alone." (p. 38)
- a) According to official historiography, carbon monoxide for the "gas chamber" was produced by diesel engines.
- [19] Yankel Wiernik, *A Year in Treblinka*, New York 1944. Wiernik claims to have been deported to Treblinka on 24 August 1942, when the small building, with three "gas chambers," already existed. The new building, with ten "gas chambers," was completed in five weeks after the end of August. The Polish report on the "steam chambers" was received during the "first half of September" 1942, so that the two "eyewitness testimonies" concern the same period.
- [20] *Idem*, p. 18.
- [21] *Ibidem*.
- [22] Alexander Pechersky, *La rivolta di Sobibor*, Yiddish translation by N. Lurie, Moscow, Der Emes State Publishers, 1946. In Yuri Suhl, *Ed essi si ribellarono: Storia della resistenza ebraica contro il nazismo*, Milan, 1969, p. 31.
- [23] *Dokumenty i materialy*, opracował Mgr Blumental, Łódź, 1946, vol. I, p. 211.
- [24] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, *German Crimes in Poland*, Warsaw 1947, vol. II, p. 100.
- [25] *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 24 August 1950, p. 5.
- [26] *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 22 August 1950, p. 4. According to the official historiography, the "gas chambers" at Sobibor didn't have cellars. (*Le Chambres à gaz, secret d'Etat*, op. cit., p. 144; *NS-Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse*, edited by Adalbert Rückerl, Munich, 1979, p. 163).
- [27] Michael Tregenza, "Belzec Death Camp," *The Wiener Library Bulletin*, no. 4-42, 1977, p. 16-17.
- [28] *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego*, Warsaw, January-June 1954, no. 9-10, p. 307.
- [29] "Who knew of the Extermination? Kurt Gerstein's Story," *The Wiener Library Bulletin*, no. 9, 1955, p. 22.
- [30] *Polish Fortnightly Review*, 1 December 1942, p. 4.
- [31] Gerald Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale*, op. cit. p. 172.
- [32] "News is Reaching the Polish Government in London about the Liquidation of the Jewish Ghetto in Warsaw": Foreign Office Papers, FO 371-30917-5365, p. 79 (see

also *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*, New York 1943, p. 131. Report by Dr. I. Schwarzbart). According to Martin Gilbert, the report in question was written by the "eyewitness" Jan Karski and sent by him on 25 November 1942 to the Polish government-in-exile in London (M. Gilbert, *Auschwitz und die Alliierten*, Munich, 1982, p. 107-109). On the "eyewitness testimony" of Jan Karski, see below.

[33] Foreign Office Papers, FO 371-30924-5365, p. 122.

[34] *The New York Times*, 20 December 1942, p. 23.

[35] A. Silberschein, *Die Judenausrottung in Polen*, Geneva, 1944, V, p. 21-22.

[36] *The New York Times*, 12 February 1944, p. 6.

[37] Stefan Szende, *The Promise Hitler Kept*, London, 1945, p. 265.

[38] A. Silberschein, *Die Judenausrottung in Polen*, Geneva, August 1944, III, p. 42-43.

[39] Deformation of the name "Belzec," as may be seen from the context, where the other "extermination" camps, Treblinka and Sobibor, are mentioned. This deformation may be due to confusion with the small Polish town of Belzyce (very similar phonetically to Beldjitze) situated about 25 km from Lublin, or perhaps to an error in translation from Polish to Russian, or from Russian to German.

[40] IMT, vol. VII, p. 633-634.

[41] Jan Karski, *Story of a Secret State*, Boston 1944. A similar story already had appeared- without referring precisely to Belzec -- in the report of 25 November 1942, [a] and, with reference to Belzec, in the report of the Polish government-in-exile in London, 10 December 1942 [b] and in a report received in London in December 1942.

[c]

a) Foreign Office papers, FO 371-30917-5365.

b) Foreign Office papers, FO 371-30924-5365. Cf. *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*, *op. cit.*

c) *The Black Book of Polish Jewry*, *op. cit.*

[42] *Biuletyn Główniej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Niemieckich w Polsce*, Warsaw 1946, III, Oboz zagłady w Belzcu, p. 3145 (English translation: Central Commission for the Investigation of German Crimes in Poland. *German Crimes in Poland*, Warsaw 1947, vol. II, "Belzec Extermination Camp," p. 89-96). M. Muszkat, *Polish Charges against German War Criminals*, Warsaw 1948, case no. 1372 (The Camp in Belzec), p. 223-232.

[43] *Dokumenty i materialy*, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 217-224.

[44] Rudolf Reder, *Belzec*, Cracow, 1946; *Dokumenty i materialy*, *op. cit.* vol. I, p. 221-224 (testimony of Rudolf Reder).

[45] Thus far we have summarized and combined chapters XI and XII of our work *Il rapporto Gerstein: Anatomia di un falso* (Sentinella d'Italia, Monfalcone, 1985). The "testimony" of Rudolf Reder is analyzed in chapter VIII.

[46] Saul Friedländer, *Kurt Gerstein ou l'ambiguïté du bien*, Casterman 1967, p. 109.

[47] Helmut Krausnick, *Dokumentation zur Massenvergasung*, Bonn 1956, p. 3. Olga Wormser-Migot [a] and André Brissaud [b] express a more reserved judgment on the veracity of the "Gerstein report".

a) *Le Système concentrationnaire nazi 1933-1945*, *op. cit.* p. 426.

b) *Hitler et l'ordre noir*, Geneva 1974, p. 443, n. II.

In Chapter II "*La veridicità del rapporto Gerstein*" of our unpublished study "*Come si falsifica la storia: Georges Wellers e le "camere a gaz" di Belzec*", we enumerate 72 internal contradictions and occurrences belied by history that put the truth of the "Gerstein Report" gravely in question.

- [48] Pierre Vidal-Naquet, "Tesi sul revisionismo," *Rivista di storia contemporanea*, Turin, 1983, p. 7 and 8.
- [49] *Idem*, p. 6
- [50] Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz und die Alliierten*, op. cit. p. 9.
- [51] *The New York Times*, 3 July 1944, p. 3 ("Two Death Camps Places of Horror").
- [52] Executive Office of the President, War Refugee Board, Washington D.C., *German Extermination Camps-Auschwitz and Birkenau*, November 1944.
- [53] See our study *Auschwitz: un caso di plagio*, Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma 1986.
- [54] Executive Office of the President, War Refugee Board, op. cit. p. 14-16. The plan of the crematoria is on page 15. The citations are drawn from the translation. *Les Camps d'extermination allemands: Auschwitz et Birkenau*, Office français d'édition, Paris, 1945, p. 17-18.
- [55] *Ibidem*.
- [56] *Ibidem*.
- [57] Georges Wellers, *Les Chambres à gaz ont existé*, op. cit. p. 114-115. Georges Wellers, "Auschwitz," *Les Chambres à gaz, secret d'Etat*, op. cit. p. 207-208 (plan of crematorium II on pages X-XI).
- [58] Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl, *Les Chambres à gaz, secret d'Etat*, op. cit. p. 211.
- [59] IMT, vol. XX, p.550 et 551.
- [60] Georges Wellers, *La Solution finale et la mythomanie néo-nazie*, Paris, 1979, p. 8.
- [61] Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz und die Alliierten*, op. cit. p. 153.
- [62] *Ibidem* This statement does not appear in the English edition (*Auschwitz and the Allies: The Politics of Rescue*, Arrow, London, 1984, p. 130).
- [62a] *Washington Daily News*, February 2, 1945, p. 2 and 35.
- [63] *Trial of Joseph Kramer and Forty-Four Others (The Belsen Trial)*, William Hodge and Company, London-Edinburgh-Glasgow, p. 67-68. For an in-depth examination of the false testimony of Ada Bimko, we refer you to our study *Auschwitz: due false testimonianze*, Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma, 1986.
- [64] Alberto Cavaliere, *I campi della morte in Germania nel racconto di una sopravvissuta*, Milan, 1945, p. 40.
- [65] In the printed text of the judgment, only the first two letters of the family name of this witness are given.
- [66] Court of Assizes, in Frankfurt am Mains session of March 1949, C.F. Rüter, *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen, Sammlung deutscher Strafurteile wegen nationalsozialistischer Tötungsverbrechen 1945-1966*, Amsterdam 1968-1981, vol. XIII, p. 134.
- [67] IMT, vol. IV, p. 292.
- [68] *Storia illustrata*, special issue on the Nuremberg Trial, no. 156, November 1970, p. 78.
- [69] Louis de Jong, "Die Niederlande und Auschwitz," *VfZ*, 17th year, booklet 1, January, 1969, p. 9.
- [70] Court of Assizes Frankfurt am Main, session of 28 March 1949, C.F. Rüter, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
- [71] Reszö Kastner, *Der Bericht des jüdischen Rettungskomitee aus Budapest*, Geneva, 1946, p. 30.
- [72] PS-2605.

- [73] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland. *German Crimes in Poland*, op. cit. vol. I, p. 83-90. For more details: *Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 6, 1962; 7, 1964.
- [74] *Der Kastner-Bericht über Eichmanns Menschenhandel in Ungarn*. Preface by Prof. Carlo Schmidt Munich 1961. The phrase "which were out of use since autumn 1943" is omitted. In our study *Wellers e i "gasati" di Auschwitz* we have brought up a grave chronological contradiction in the Exterminationist historiography on the subject of the deportation of the Hungarian Jews. In fact, while, according to certain documents, that deportation had ended on the 8th [a] or on the 10th [b] July 1944, it is seen that the "Chronicle of Events in the Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp" [c] records the arrival of another 32 transports of Jews from Hungary between 15 July and 18 October 1944.
- a) *Der Kastner Bericht über Eichmanns Menschenhandel in Ungarn*, op. cit., p. 136.
 b) NG-5573; NG-5615.
 c) *Hefte von Auschwitz*, 7, 8, 1964.
- [75] USSR-8.
- [76] Gerald Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale*, op. cit., p. 559.
- [77] USSR-8.
- [78] The cremation of a cadaver in the very modern ovens of the firm "H.R Heinicke Combustion and Smokestack Construction," of Stadhagen, requires 60 minutes when the combustion chamber is already at a minimum temperature of 800 degrees centigrade (letter from the manufacturer to the author, 6 August 1987). The 46 ovens (muffles) of Birkenau could thus not have incinerated more than 1,104 cadavers in 24 hours.
- [79] The Court of Assizes Frankfurt am Main, session of 27 May 1955, C.F. Rüter, *op. cit.*, vol. XIII. After 1923 hydrocyanic gas was used for disinfection in Germany only in the form of Zyklon B. (Court of Assizes in Frankfurt am Main session 28 March 1949, C.F. Rüter, *op. cit.*, vol. XIII). Zyklon B is an absorption of hydrocyanic acid in an inert porous base (diatomaceous earth, e.g.) and is packaged in hermetically sealed tins. (NI-9098).
- [80] IMT, vol. VII, p. 470.
- [81] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, *German Crimes in Poland*, vol. I, p. 88.
- [82] Jan Sehn, *Le Camp de concentration d'Oswiecim-Brzezinka*, Warsaw, 1957, p. 147-148.
- [83] *Problèmes choisis de l'histoire du KL Auschwitz*, State Museum at Auschwitz, 1979, p. 45.
- [84] *Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 4, 1961, p. 110.
- [85] Jan Sehn, *Le Camp de concentration d'Oswiecim-Brzezinka*, op. cit., p. 132.
- [86] Eugen Kogon, *Der SS-Staat: Der System der deutschen Konzentrationslager*, Munich, 1946, p. 133.
- [87] Georges Wellers, *Les Chambres à gaz ont existé*, op. cit. p. 129.
- [88] *Trial of Joseph Kramer and Forty-Four Others (The Belsen Trial)*, op. cit. p. 67.
- [89] Poliakov & Wulf, *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden*, Berlin, Grunewald, 1955, p. 264 and 265.
- [90] IMT, vol. VI, p. 242.
- [91] *Auschwitz vu par les SS*, State Museum at Auschwitz, 1974, p. 128.
- [92] *Idem*, p. 195.

- [93] Léon Poliakov, *Auschwitz*, Julliard 1964, p. 166.
- [94] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland. *German Crimes in Poland*, op. cit. vol. I, p. 89.
- [95] *Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum Oswiecimiu, 7, 1964; 8, 1964.
- [96] Executive Office of the President, War Refugee Board, op. cit. p. 14. *Auschwitz et Birkenau*, French Publications Office, op. cit. p. 17.
- [97] Léon Poliakov, *Auschwitz*, op. cit. p. 162.
- [98] *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, by Dr. Miklos Nyiszli. Translated by Tibere Kremer and Richard Seaver. Fawcett Crest, New York, 1961, p. 48. In the original Hungarian text it is not "several thousand people," but "ötezer ember," (five thousand persons). (Dr. Nyiszli Miklós, *Dr. Mengele boncolóorvosa voltam az auschwitz-i krematóriumban*, Világ, Budapest, 1947, p. 38.)
- [99] *Témoignages sur Auschwitz*, Paris, 1946, p. 161.
- [100] NO-1210/D-749-a (see below). Rudolf Höss, *Le Commandant d'Auschwitz parle*, Paris 1979, p. 273.
- [101] NI-11953.
- [102] *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, op. cit., pp. 44-45 ("about 200 yards"). The original Hungarian text says "körülbelül kétszáz méter," (about 200 meters). (*Dr. Mengele boncolóorvosa voltam az auschwitz-i krematóriumban*, op. cit., p. 33.
- [103] Georges Wellers, "Essai de détermination du nombre de morts au camp d'Auschwitz," *Le Monde Juif*, no. 112, October-December 1983, p. 138.
- [104] Erich Kulka, "Auschwitz condoned," *The Wiener Library Bulletin*, no. I, 1968/69, vol. XXII, series 14, p. 3.
- [105] *Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 8, 1964, p. 66.
- [106] On this subject see: Heiner Lichtenstein, *Warum Auschwitz nicht bombardiert wurde*, Cologne, 1980.
- [107] These photos are more numerous and more interesting than those published in *The Holocaust Revisited*.
- [108] Executive Office of the President, War Refugee Board, op. cit. p. 36. *Auschwitz et Birkenau*, French Publications Office, op. cit. p. 34.
- [109] Dr. Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, op. cit., p. 68.
- [110] NI-11984.
- [111] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland. *German Crimes in Poland*, op. cit. vol. 1, p. 88-89.
- [112] *Auschwitz vu par les SS*, op. cit., p. 195. For an examination in depth of the "eyewitness testimonies" of Dr. S. Bendel, of Ada Bimko, and of Miklos Nyiszli, more extravagant and contradictory than they appear in this summary exposé, we refer back to our studies already mentioned: *Auschwitz: due false testimonianze* and "*Medico ad Auschwitz*," *La falsa testimonianza di Miklos Nyiszli* (to be published).
- [113] *Kommandant in Auschwitz: Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen des Rudolf Höss*, edited by Martin Broszat, Munich, 1981, p. 149.
- That Rudolf Höss had been given the third degree by his English interrogators in 1946 has been admitted, and proven in 1983 by Rupert Butler in his work *Legions of Death* (Hamlyn Paperbacks, 1983). Robert Faurisson shows the historic importance of that admission, of whose consequences Rupert Butler had no idea ("How the British obtained the confession of Rudolf Höss, commandant of the Auschwitz camp.") (*The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 7, No. 4.) For a detailed refutation of the

- "eyewitness testimony" of Rudolf Höss, refer to our study, *Auschwitz: Le false confessioni di Rudolf Höss* (Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma, 1987.)
- [114] *Kommandant in Auschwitz*, op. cit. p. 149, note 1.
- [115] PS-3868.
- [116] Gerald Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale*, op. cit. p. 131-132.
- [117] Adalbert Rückerl, *NS-Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse*, op. cit., p. 133 and 200.
- [118] Central Commission for Investigation of German Crimes in Poland, *German Crimes in Poland*, op. cit. vol. I, p. 96.
- [119] Crematoria IV and II of Birkenau were finished on the 22nd and the 31st of March 1943, respectively. (*Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 4, 1961, p. 85 and 87).
- [120] Crematoria II and III had five triple ovens each (*Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 4, 1961, p. 110).
- [121] If they had been as efficient as those of the firm H.R. Reinicke (see note 78), the ovens of Birkenau crematoria II and III could not have burned more than 720 cadavers in 24 hours.
- [122] Crematoria V and III were finished April 4th and June 25th, 1943, respectively. (*Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 4, 1961, p. 88 and 109).
- [123] Crematoria IV and V each had one oven with eight mufflers (*Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Panstwowego Muzeum w Oswiecimiu, 4, 1961, p. 110. See also: *Problèmes choisis de l'histoire du KL Auschwitz*, op. cit. p. 44).
- [124] PS-3868.
- [125] *Kommandant in Auschwitz*, op. cit. p. 167.
- [126] William L. Shirer, *Storia del Terzo Reich*, Turin 1969, p. 1476.
- [127] PS-3868 and NI-034.
- [128] It is said that a total of 405,222 detainees were registered at Auschwitz. (*Problèmes choisis de l'histoire du KL Auschwitz*, op. cit. p. 17).
- [129] See Part I, Section I (*JHR*, Vol 8, No. 2, Summer 1988).
- [130] *Kommandant in Auschwitz*, op. cit. p. 150.
- [131] Suzanne Labin, *Staline le Terrible*, Paris, 1948, p. 138.
- [132] Gerald Reitlinger, *La Soluzione finale*, op. cit. p. 617.
- [133] Freda Utley, *Kostspielige Rache*, Hamburg 1951, p. 215 and following. On the tortures inflicted on the accused in the Malmédy Trial, see also: *La Vérité sur l'affaire de Malmédy et sur le colonel SS Jochen Peiper*, Editions du Baucens, 1976; Dietrich Ziemssen, *The Malmédy Trial*, Institute for Historical Review, 1981.
- [134] IMT. vol. XIX, p. 440.
- [135] "Note rassinieriane con appendice sulla persecuzione giudiziaria di R Faurisson," *Alla Bottega*, March-April 1983, p. 41.