

DEBUNKING THE BUNKERS OF AUSCHWITZ  
BLACK PROPAGANDA VERSUS HISTORY



# Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz

Black Propaganda  
versus History

Carlo Mattogno



Castle Hill Publishers  
P.O. Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK  
2nd, revised edition, February 2016

## **HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS, Volume 11:**

Carlo Mattogno:

*Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz: Black Propaganda versus History*

Translated by Henry Gardner

2nd, revised edition. The first edition had the title *The Bunkers of Auschwitz*

Uckfield, East Sussex: CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

February 2016

ISBN10: 1-59148-126-0 (print edition)

ISBN13: 978-1-59148-126-3 (print edition)

ISSN: 1529-7748

Published by CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

Manufactured in the United States of America and in the UK

© by Carlo Mattogno

Distribution: Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 243

Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

shop.codoh.com

Set in Times New Roman

[www.holocausthandbooks.com](http://www.holocausthandbooks.com)

Cover Illustration: top: current memorial at the claimed location of ‘Bunker 1’ northwest of the former Auschwitz-Birkenau camp; left: remnants of foundation walls of a building to the west of the ‘Central Sauna’ near the former Birkenau camp, falsely labeled as ‘Bunker 2’; right: drawing of the alleged ‘Bunker 2’ by former Auschwitz detainee David Olère, see Document 14 in the Appendix; bottom background: section of an aerial photo of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp of May 31, 1944, see Photo No. 9. in the Appendix.

# Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction .....	9
<b>Part One: Reality .....</b>	<b>13</b>
1. The Alleged Extermination of Jews at Auschwitz: Origins of the Decision and Its Execution .....	15
1.1. The Beginnings .....	15
1.2. Danuta Czech's Interpretation.....	15
1.3. Jean-Claude Pressac's Interpretation .....	16
1.4. Debórah Dwork's and Robert Jan van Pelt's Interpretation.....	17
1.5. Dating the Himmler-Höß Meeting .....	18
1.6. Dating 'Bunkers' 1 and 2 .....	20
1.7. The Location of the Birkenau 'Bunkers' .....	21
2. The 'Bunkers' in the Planning of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp .....	23
2.1. The Bureaucratic Procedure for the Construction of the Installations at Auschwitz-Birkenau .....	23
2.2. Plans and Cost Estimates for the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp (June 1941–July 1942) .....	28
3. The 'Bunkers' in the Construction of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp 35	
3.1. The Construction Reports of the Camps at Auschwitz and Birkenau .....	35
3.2. A Striking Example: House No. 44 / <i>BW</i> 36C .....	36
3.3. The 'Bunkers' on the Birkenau Maps .....	39
3.4. The Logistics of the 'Bunkers' .....	40
3.4.1. Water Supply.....	41
3.4.2. Sewage .....	41
3.4.3. Fencing and Watchtowers .....	41
3.4.4. Installation of a Power Line .....	42
3.4.5. Installation of Undressing Barracks for the Victims .....	42
3.4.6. Transportation of Materials .....	42
3.4.7. Laying of a Camp Railway.....	43
3.4.8. Road Works.....	43
3.4.9. Gastight Doors.....	44
3.5. The So-Called "Code Language" .....	44
3.5.1. "Baths for Special Actions".....	44
3.5.2. "House for Special Measures".....	45
3.5.3. "Barracks for Special Treatment" .....	45
3.6. Two Recently Discovered "Bunker" Documents.....	46
3.7. Conclusion .....	48

<b>Part Two: Propaganda.....</b>	<b>51</b>
4. The Origin of the Propaganda Story of the ‘Bunkers’ – Wartime Rumors.....	53
4.1. The First Reports.....	53
4.2. An Anonymous Report from the Secret Resistance Movement at Auschwitz.....	60
4.3. The Reports from 1943 .....	62
4.4. The Report of the “Polish Major” (Jerzy Tabeau) .....	64
4.5. The Report of Alfred Wetzler .....	67
4.6. Anonymous Reports from 1944 .....	69
4.7. Conclusions .....	71
5. The Propaganda Is Consolidated: Postwar Testimonies.....	73
5.1. Szlama Dragon’s Testimony .....	73
5.2. Comparative and Critical Analysis of the Two Depositions of Szlama Dragon .....	77
5.2.1. Terminology.....	77
5.2.2. ‘Bunker 1’ .....	79
5.2.3. ‘Bunker 2’ .....	80
5.2.4. Critical Analysis.....	81
5.2.5. The Topographical Location of the ‘Bunkers’ .....	84
6. Literary Variations on the Propaganda .....	87
6.1. Witnesses Who Stayed behind at Auschwitz .....	87
6.2. Witnesses Transferred Away from Auschwitz before the Soviet Occupation of the Camp.....	89
6.2.1. David Olère .....	90
6.2.2. Miklos Nyiszli .....	94
6.2.3. Sigismund Bendel.....	98
6.2.4. André Lettich.....	100
6.2.5. Adolf Rögner.....	103
6.2.6. Wilhelm Wohlfahrt.....	106
6.3. Later Accounts .....	108
6.3.1. Dov Paisikovic .....	109
6.3.2. Franciszek Gulba.....	113
6.3.3. Filip Müller .....	116
6.3.4. Moshe Garbarz .....	117
6.3.5. Milton Buki .....	119
6.3.6. Maurice Benroubi.....	123
6.4. The Latter-day Witnesses.....	126
6.4.1. Josef Sackar .....	126
6.4.2. Jaacov Gabai .....	127
6.4.3. Eliezer Eisenschmidt .....	128
6.4.4. Shaul Chasan .....	129
6.4.5. Leon Cohen .....	131
6.4.6. Szlama (Shlomo) and Abraham Dragon.....	132

6.4.7. Shlomo Venezia .....	135
6.5. The Contributions of the SS Witnesses .....	136
6.5.1. Maximilian Grabner .....	137
6.5.2. Hans Aumeier.....	138
6.5.3. Rudolf Höß.....	142
6.5.4. Pery Broad.....	145
6.5.5. Friedrich Entress .....	147
6.5.6. Hans Erich Mußfeldt .....	148
6.5.7. Hans Stark .....	150
6.5.8. Richard Böck.....	151
6.5.9. Karl Hölblinger .....	155
6.5.10. Johann Paul Kremer .....	156
6.5.11. Horst Fischer .....	156
6.6. Conclusions.....	159
<b>Part Three: Propaganda Becomes Historical “Reality” .....</b>	<b>161</b>
7. Making History Out of Propaganda.....	163
7.1. The ‘Bunkers’ in Soviet Investigations (February – March 1945) .....	163
7.2. Location of the ‘Bunkers’ .....	164
7.3. The ‘Bunkers’ in Polish (May 1945 – November 1947) and German (1949 – 1965) Investigations.....	167
7.4. Józefa Wisińska’s Declaration on the Location of ‘Bunker 1’ .....	171
7.5. Wisińska vs. Dragon: New Contradictions .....	173
7.6. The Timetable of the Birkenau ‘Bunkers’.....	173
8. The Development of Orthodox Historiography of the ‘Bunkers’ .....	175
8.1. Early Historiographic Attempts .....	175
8.2. Jean-Claude Pressac’s Contribution.....	178
8.3. Franciszek Piper’s Contribution.....	180
8.4. R.J. van Pelt’s Contribution .....	182
8.5. Marcello Pezzetti’s ‘Discovery’ of ‘Bunker 1’ .....	186
9. Material Proof, Aerial Photos, and Archeological Findings.....	189
9.1. The Aerial Photographs of 1944 .....	189
9.2. The Architectural Design of ‘Bunker 2’ in Relation to Its Alleged Homicidal Activity .....	190
9.3. The “Undressing Barracks” of ‘Bunker 2’ .....	192
9.4. The “Cremation Pits” in the Area of ‘Bunker 2’.....	194
9.5. The “Cremation Pits” of the ‘Bunkers’: Origins of the Propaganda Story .....	195
10. Conclusion .....	199
Historiographic Consequences.....	199
11. Editor’s Epilogue .....	203
12. Appendix.....	213
Documents .....	213

Photographs .....	240
Abbreviations.....	254
Tables.....	255
Bibliography .....	277
Index of Names.....	282



## Introduction

It is well known that the orthodox historiography on Auschwitz hinges on an order to exterminate the European Jews – supposedly given by Hitler to Himmler and then transmitted to Rudolf Höß – which took on concrete shape when the Auschwitz extermination camp was built.

According to the interpretation that has now become dogma, this order was carried out in four successive stages:

1. In September 1941, the first experimental homicidal gassing by means of Zyklon B was performed at Auschwitz; this represented the ‘discovery’ of the instrument of extermination.
2. In early 1942, the homicidal gassing activity was moved to the mortuary of the Auschwitz crematorium (later called “Crematorium I”).
3. In the succeeding months two farmhouses located outside the perimeter of the Birkenau camp were transformed into gas chambers (the so-called ‘Bunkers’) in order to kill Jews and sick inmates.
4. The fourth and final phase started in March 1943, when the extermination activity was transferred to the four Birkenau crematoria, which all had their homicidal gas chambers.

The starting point for this assumed sequence of events is thus the first homicidal gassing in the basement of Block 11 at Auschwitz between September 3 and 5, 1941, during which (according to the version invented by Danuta Czech<sup>1</sup>) 250 sick detainees and 600 Soviet prisoners of war were murdered. This event, or rather non-event, is very important for the orthodox historiography on Auschwitz, because it is said to have been the birth of the homicidal gas chambers.

In 1992, I dedicated to this alleged event a fairly extensive study, which later also appeared in an updated and expanded English edition, and is still the only one of its kind.<sup>2</sup> In it I demonstrated that this event has no historical foundation whatsoever.

<sup>1</sup> In the section entitled “La metodologia storiografica di Danuta Czech” of my book *Auschwitz: la prima gasazione*. Edizioni di Ar, Padua, 1992, pp. 140-144, I have shown that the Polish researcher has artificially constructed the orthodox version as published in the Auschwitz *Kalendarium* by fusing individual elements taken from completely contradictory testimonies. Updated English edition: *Auschwitz: The First Gassing*, 2nd edition, The Barnes Review, Washington, D.C., 2011.

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 1. Even today, there is no other book dealing with this topic. In the five-volume collective work *Auschwitz 1940-1945. Węzłowe zagadnienia z dziejów obozu (Fundamental Problems of the Camp History)*, by Danuta Czech, Tadeusz Iwaszko, Stanisław Kłodziński, et al.), Wydawnictwo Państwowego Muzeum Oświęcim-Brzezinka, 1995, which represents the historiographic peak of the Auschwitz Museum, scarcely more than four pages are dedicated to the question of the first gassing in the section by Franciszek Piper “Komory Gazowe i Krematoria” (“Gas Chambers and Crematoria”), Vol. III, pp. 97-102 (pages 97 and 102 contain in total 5 lines concerning this topic). Sandra Holtermann’s 20-page term paper titled *Die erste Vergasung in*

My book managed to shake even the confidence of Jean-Claude Pressac. In 1989, he still followed the orthodox interpretation of Danuta Czech's *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau* to the letter;<sup>3</sup> in 1993 he still accepted the reality of Czech's account of the first gassing, but he moved it to December 1941<sup>4</sup> on account of a polemical cue<sup>5</sup> I had given him; in 2000 he came to doubt its historical reality. In an interview, which he gave in 1995 but which was clearly updated in 2000, Pressac referred to my study (of which a French translation<sup>6</sup> had appeared in 1999) stating:<sup>7</sup>

*"If that first gassing did occur, it happened in December of 1941, or perhaps in January of 1942, and it has no link at all with the massacre of the Jews."* (emphasis added)

In the same way as does this elusive 'first gassing,' the alleged extermination activity of the Birkenau 'Bunkers' relies *exclusively* on testimonies.

As I have emphasized in a previous work,<sup>8</sup> the archives of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office, which were preserved in Moscow, allow us to re-establish a complete account of the buildings that were erected in Auschwitz during the first half of 1942. Yet neither Pressac nor Robert Jan van Pelt, the new orthodox 'expert' on Auschwitz, has searched those archives for documentary proof of the homicidal Birkenau 'Bunkers,' or, shall we say, none of them has found any evidence of their existence. But common sense dictates that, if those installations actually existed, there would be documentary proof of their existence.

The present study, which relies for the most part on unpublished documents, fills this embarrassing gap in the orthodox historiography and supplies us with a solid answer to the question as to whether the alleged homicidal 'Bunkers' of Birkenau were a historical reality.

This question became more pressing in 2002. In that year, Fritjof Meyer, a former senior editor of the German news magazine *Der Spiegel* (Hamburg), wrote an article in which he advanced the thesis that the alleged mass gasings at Birkenau were conducted essentially in the so-called 'Bunkers' rather than

*Auschwitz im September 1941 (The First Gassing at Auschwitz in September 1941;* Grin Verlag 2005) is necessarily superficial.

<sup>3</sup> J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation. New York, 1989, p. 184.

<sup>4</sup> J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz. Die Technik des Massenmordes*, Piper, Munich 1994, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. in this respect my study *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, Cal., 1994, pp. 37f.; reprinted in G. Rudolf (ed.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, The Barnes Review, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 141f.

<sup>6</sup> *Auschwitz: le premier gazage*, Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, Berchem, 1999.

<sup>7</sup> "Entretien avec Jean-Claude Pressac" by Valérie Igounet at La Ville-du-Bois, June 15, 1995, in: Valérie Igounet, *Histoire du négationnisme en France*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris 2000, p. 644.

<sup>8</sup> *Special Treatment in Auschwitz. Origin and Meaning of a Term*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, Ill., 2004.

in the alleged gas chambers of the crematoria.<sup>9</sup> That, in turn, has given rise within the official historiography to an internal dispute, which intensified in November 2003 with the involvement of Franciszek Piper, director of the history department at the Auschwitz Museum.<sup>10</sup>

According to the Auschwitz Museum, the inmates called these two presumed gassing buildings “little red house” (in Polish: *czzerwony domek*) and the “little white house” (in Polish: *biały domek*). Because these designations – as I shall show in the Part Two – were invented after the Soviet occupation of Auschwitz, I will not use them in this study and will instead continue to use the established term ‘Bunker,’ but only for reasons of clarity.

---

<sup>9</sup> “Die Zahl der Opfer von Auschwitz. Neue Erkenntnisse durch neue William Archivfunde,” *Ost-europa. Zeitschrift für Gegenwartsfragen des Ostens*, no. 5, May 2002, pp. 631-641. Cf. in this respect my article: “Auschwitz. Fritjof Meyer’s New Revisions,” in: *The Revisionist*, 1(1) (2003) pp. 30-37.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. in this respect my article “On the Piper-Meyer-Controversy: Soviet Propaganda vs. Pseudo-Revisionism”, *The Revisionist*. 2(2) (2004), pp. 131-139.



## Part One:

## Reality



# 1. The Alleged Extermination of Jews at Auschwitz: Origins of the Decision and Its Execution

## 1.1. The Beginnings

The account of the beginnings of the alleged extermination of Jews at Auschwitz rests essentially on the testimony of Rudolf Höß regarding his summons to Berlin by Himmler and on the decisions and the events that were to follow, as Höß described them in his various post-war statements.

Those declarations contain, however, a skein of chronological contradictions so entangled that historians who specialize in this field must resort to interpretations which are not only purely conjectural but also mutually exclusive. In their effort to create a coherent chronology, these scholars have had to distort the Auschwitz commander's statements in every possible way. This deformation has reached the point where – from the historiographic point of view – the safest interpretation is to say that the chronology given by Höß and the events he described are pure fiction. Although I am convinced that this latter view is correct, as I have demonstrated elsewhere with an abundance of arguments,<sup>11</sup> I shall assume in this chapter, as a working hypothesis, that the meeting between Himmler and Höß actually took place.

The specific aim of accepting such a hypothesis is to examine its consequences from the point of view of the planning and the construction of the Auschwitz camp, *i.e.*, to ascertain, by means of documents, whether the alleged extermination order actually did result in the installation of the two gassing 'Bunkers' at Birkenau.

## 1.2. Danuta Czech's Interpretation

In her *Auschwitz Chronicle*, Danuta Czech assigns the origin of the extermination of the Jews at Auschwitz to July 29, 1941. Under that date she writes:<sup>12</sup>

*"The commander of KL Auschwitz, Rudolf Höß, having been called by the Reichsführer SS, reports to Berlin. Without any witnesses, Himmler discusses with him the technical aspects of the so-called 'final solution of the Jewish question.' As a result of this meeting, Höß is charged by Himmler with the execution of the extermination of the Jews at KL Auschwitz; he is*

<sup>11</sup> Cf. L' "irritante questione" delle camere a gas ovvero da Cappuccetto Rosso ad... Auschwitz. Risposta a Valentina Pisanty, Graphos, Genoa, 1998, pp. 122-148.

<sup>12</sup> D. Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939-1945*, Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek 1989, pp. 106f. Engl.: Danuta Czech, *Auschwitz Chronicle, 1939-1945*, H. Holt, New York 1990. Since both books are organized chronologically, we did not replace the author's original page references to the German edition.

*to present construction projects for the homicidal annihilation installations within four weeks. Himmler tells Höß that SS Sturmbannführer Eichmann of RSHA will give him the details when the latter went to Auschwitz in the near future.”*

The date is entirely conjectural because there is no document confirming the reality of the Himmler-Höß meeting.

The dates given by Czech for Eichmann’s first visit to Auschwitz as well as the alleged first experimental gassing with Zyklon B are just as arbitrary. She places Eichmann’s first visit to Auschwitz<sup>13</sup> or a meeting in Eichmann’s office<sup>14</sup> in August of 1941, although Höß claimed that it took place in November.<sup>15</sup> The first experimental gassing by means of Zyklon B allegedly carried out by SS *Hauptsturmführer* Fritsch is also said to have occurred in August of 1941, according to Czech.<sup>16</sup> Again, these dates are totally arbitrary, because there are no documents to confirm the reality of any of the three events.

Eichmann’s second visit to Auschwitz cannot be used in the attempt to establish Czech’s chronology; thus, it is not even mentioned in the *Auschwitz Chronicle*. For the same reason, Höß’s alleged trip to Treblinka, as described in his ‘confessions,’<sup>17</sup> does not appear there either.

### 1.3. Jean-Claude Pressac’s Interpretation

Jean-Claude Pressac openly acknowledges that Höß’ declarations are chronologically unsound, but comes to a different conclusion:<sup>18</sup>

*“According to his notes, Höß is ordered to come to Berlin ‘in the summer of 1941.’ His report contains a glaring improbability in that the Reichsführer SS allegedly tells him: ‘The existing annihilation sites in the East (Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka; the killing activities of these camps started only in summer 1942<sup>[19]</sup>) are not in a position to handle the major actions envisaged (quoted from: Rudolf Höß, Kommandant in Auschwitz. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen, edited by Martin Broszat, dtv-dokumente, München 1963, p. 237). Hence, an obvious anachronism on Höß’ side.”*

For that reason, Pressac moves the Himmler-Höß meeting to the year 1942.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 108

<sup>14</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 115.

<sup>15</sup> Steven Paskuly (ed.), *Death Dealer. The Memoirs of the SS Kommandant at Auschwitz*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, N.Y., 1992, p. 29.

<sup>16</sup> D. Czech, *op. cit.* (note 12), pp. 115f.

<sup>17</sup> Statement by Höß of 14 March 1946 (NO-1210; Steven Paskuly (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 15), pp. 42f.) as well as his statement of 5 April 1946 (PS-3868).

<sup>18</sup> J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien...*, *op. cit.* (note 4), note 132 on p. 136.

<sup>19</sup> These activities are claimed to have started in late 1941 in Belzec, in early 1942 in Sobibor, and in summer 1942 in Treblinka.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 51.



*“In early 1942, Höß is ordered to report to Himmler in Berlin; the latter informs him that his camp has been selected to become the center for the mass extermination of the Jews.”*

Actually, this kind of dating, as I have stressed elsewhere,<sup>21</sup> creates further contradictions in chronology; the most serious one is the fact that the installation of the so-called ‘Bunker 1’ and the beginning of the extermination of Jews at Auschwitz, which, according to Höß, were the direct consequence of Himmler’s order, would thus have taken place at a date preceding that order.

#### 1.4. Debórah Dwork’s and Robert Jan van Pelt’s Interpretation

Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt worked out a much more sophisticated and original interpretation:<sup>22</sup>

*“According to Rudolf Höß, Himmler discussed the transformation of Auschwitz into an extermination site as early as June 1941. Is he correct? Did he have a conversation with Himmler in June 1941? If so, did they talk about the construction of killing installations at Auschwitz? And if they did, did Himmler mean, in June 1941, that this murder machinery was to be used to kill Jews?”*

To this question they reply in the following way:<sup>23</sup>

*“Höß’s Nuremberg confessions seemed to close the case concerning the origins of Auschwitz as a death camp. But internal inconsistencies in his statements, as well as additional indirect but pertinent evidence, suggest that Höß reinterpreted events that had indeed occurred in the light of the ultimate outcome. Probably, he had a conversation with Himmler in June 1941. Probably, they spoke about the construction of extermination facilities at Auschwitz. But probably, in June 1941, those installations were not intended for the mass murder of Europe’s Jews.*

*Let us look at Höß’s statements more closely. In his affidavit saying ‘I was ordered to establish extermination facilities at Auschwitz in June 1941’<sup>[24]</sup> he also explained that ‘At that time, there were already in the general government three other extermination camps; Belzek, Treblinka, and Wolzek. (Sobibor)’<sup>[25]</sup> These camps, however, came into operation only in 1942. In a detailed account of the role of Auschwitz in the genocide of the Jews that*

<sup>21</sup> *L’ “irritante questione” delle camere a gas...*, *op. cit.* (note 11), pp. 130f.

<sup>22</sup> D. Dwork, R. J. van Pelt, *Auschwitz 1270 to the present*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York/London 1996, p. 277.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 279.

<sup>24</sup> PS-3868; The German original states: “Ich hatte den Befehl, Ausrottungserleichterungen in Auschwitz im Juni 1941 zu schaffen” – where “Ausrottungserleichterungen” means “extermination mitigations,” not “extermination facilities.”

<sup>25</sup> PS-3868: “Zu jener Zeit bestanden schon drei weitere Vernichtungslager in Generalgouvernement: Belzek, Treblinka und Wolzek.” A “Wolzek” camp never existed. Its identification with Sobibór by Dwork/van Pelt is completely arbitrary.

*Höß wrote later that year, he again related Auschwitz to other killing sites and again made the same mistake about the dates.<sup>[26]</sup>*

*'Himmler greeted me with the following: 'The Führer has ordered the Final Solution of the Jewish Question. We, the SS, have to carry out this order. The existing extermination sites in the East are not in a position to perform these intended major operations. I have, therefore, chosen Auschwitz for this purpose.'*

*In June 1941 there were no 'existing extermination sites in the East.' As Höß insisted on various occasions that the conversation took place in 1941, although acknowledging that he may have been confused about the exact words, it would seem plausible that there was a meeting in June 1941 and that he was ordered 'to establish extermination facilities.' But how large were these meant to be and for whom were they meant?"*

The solution proposed by Dwork and van Pelt is that Höß was called to Berlin in 1941, but that Himmler, on that occasion, did not order him to launch the extermination of the Jews. We will see in Chapter 8, for which group of persons, according to the two authors, the 'extermination installations,' that is, the Birkenau 'Bunkers' were intended.

### 1.5. Dating the Himmler-Höß Meeting

Richard David Breitman has made an attempt to fix the date of Höß's summons to Berlin on the basis of Himmler's travels during the summer of 1941, which we know from his diary. Breitman writes:<sup>27</sup>

*"And Höss now dated the meeting as sometime during summer of 1941, but he could not remember exactly when.*

*Himmler was not in Berlin very often during the summer of 1941, especially after the invasion of the USSR. It seems most likely that he actually met with Höss sometime during July 13-15."*

In a note, the author explains:<sup>28</sup>

*"Various attempts to redate this meeting have been off the mark. Höss could not have mistaken a summer-1942 meeting with Himmler for 1941 – first, because Himmler's 1942 appointment book, which exists, contains no such entry, and, second, because Höss was already gassing Jews then.*

<sup>26</sup> R. Höß, "The Final Solution of the Jewish Question in Concentration Camp Auschwitz," in: by Steven Paskuly (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 15), p. 27: "Contrary to his usual custom, his adjutant was not in the room. Himmler greeted me with the following: 'The Führer has ordered the Final Solution of the Jewish Question. We the SS have to carry out this order. The existing extermination sites in the East are not in the position to carry out these intended operations on a large scale. I have, therefore, chosen Auschwitz for this purpose.'"

<sup>27</sup> R.D. Breitman, *The Architect of Genocide. Himmler and the Final Solution*, Knopf, New York 1991, p. 189.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 294f.

*It is most unlikely that Himmler set the Final Solution in motion before 22 June. Organizing the strategy for the Waffen-SS and the Einsatzgruppen must have taken a considerable amount of Himmler's time, and he had to see how successful the initial attack against the U.S.S.R. would be. Himmler left the capital for East Prussia on 25 June and did not return [to Berlin] until 13 July. On 15 July he went back to East Prussia. At most he went to Berlin for one brief visit during August, though we cannot be sure where he was on several days late that month."*

Breitman then discusses Himmler's travels in August 1942 and concludes:

*"Dates in September are too late for the meeting, since the first test gassing at Auschwitz occurred on 3 Sept. What is left is 13-15 July 1941."*

Danuta Czech, as we have already seen, proposes a date of July 29, 1941, for this event, justifying it in the following way: On that day, a detainee escaped from the camp and the telegram informing the cognizant SS authorities was signed by *Lagerführer* Fritzsch, in Höß's absence.<sup>29</sup> It is possible that Höß had gone to Berlin, but it is certain that he could not have met Himmler there on that day because the latter had been in East Prussia since July 15.

Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt propose a different method of dating. They state that Höß was in Berlin on June 13 and 14, 1941, to discuss the expansion of the Auschwitz camp with Kammler of the Main Office of Budget and Buildings,<sup>30</sup> and on that occasion he also met Himmler;<sup>31</sup>

*"Himmler, too, was in town, to celebrate the fifth anniversary of his appointment as chief of the German police. Given his personal interest in the future of Auschwitz, it seems likely that the completion of the first master plan [for construction of the camp] was an occasion for him to chat with Höss."*

The document which the authors invoke is a letter from Kammler to Höß dated June 18, 1941, which refers merely to a meeting of Höß with the head of Department I of Main Office of Budget and Buildings, SS *Oberführer* Lörner, and with Kammler without indicating where it took place.<sup>32</sup> In his Cracow 'notes' Höß tells of a visit by Kammler to Auschwitz in 1941 when the head of the Auschwitz Construction Office was still Schlachter,<sup>33</sup> hence before October 1, 1941, when Schlachter was replaced by Bischoff. The meeting of June 13-14 thus certainly occurred at Auschwitz.

The most probable date for the Himmler-Höß meeting is therefore 14-15 July 1941. Pressac's proposed dating of this event is historically untenable.

<sup>29</sup> D. Czech, *Kalendarium...*, *op. cit.* (note 12), p. 107

<sup>30</sup> D. Dwork, R. J. van Pelt, *op. cit.* (note 22), p. 214.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 280

<sup>32</sup> RGVA, 502-1-11, p. 37. Cf. Section 2.2.

<sup>33</sup> Kammler profile entitled "Der Chef der Office Group C im WVHA war der SS Gruppenführer Dr. ing. Kammler" and dated November 1946. AGK, NTN, 103, p. 244

## 1.6. Dating ‘Bunkers’ 1 and 2

All orthodox specialists of the history of Auschwitz agree that the so-called ‘Bunkers’ of Birkenau were set up for homicidal purposes, although differences do exist among them as to the kind of victims destined for them.

The official chronology of the *Auschwitz Chronicle* regarding the start of homicidal activity in ‘Bunkers’ 1 and 2 is accepted by practically all orthodox scholars dealing with this camp. According to the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, ‘Bunker 1’ went into operation on March 20, 1942. The author notes for that date:<sup>34</sup>

*“Gas chambers are put into operation in a Birkenau farmhouse modified for this purpose, this is the so-called Bunker no. 1.”*

The only discordant voice is that of Jean-Claude Pressac, who moves this alleged event by two months:<sup>35</sup>

*“The ‘red house’, after its modification, was given the name ‘Bunker 1’ and probably began to be used for this purpose from the end of May 1942 onwards.”*

In the chronological summary of his book, Pressac writes:<sup>36</sup>

*“In May [1942]: Modification of a small farm at Birkenau. The gas chamber of the Krematorium [I] is moved there because of the impending construction work. The unit, which will later be called ‘Bunker 1,’ consists of two chambers, not equipped with mechanical ventilation.”*

As for ‘Bunker 2,’ the *Auschwitz Chronicle* affirms that it became operational on June 30, 1942. The following entry for that date appears in the book:<sup>37</sup>

*“In connection with the impending arrival of further transports of Jews who are moved to Auschwitz by the RSHA to be annihilated there, more gas chambers are installed in a farmhouse, similar to Bunker 1. It is situated to the west of Crematoria IV and V, which will be built later, and is designated Bunker no. 2.”*

Pressac does not give a precise date but accepts the period:<sup>38</sup>

*“The ‘white house’, Bunker 2, is put into operation at the end of June 1942.”*

In the chronological summary, he adds:<sup>39</sup>

*“in June [1942] another Birkenau farmhouse is modified to become a gas chamber. In the process, the delousing plants of the Degesch Co. of Frankfurt a.M. are taken as a model (the chambers are arranged in parallel).”*

<sup>34</sup> D. Czech, *Kalendarium...*, (note 12), p. 186

<sup>35</sup> J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien...*, *op. cit.* (note 4), p. 49

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 154f.

<sup>37</sup> D. Czech, *Kalendarium...*, *op. cit.* (note 12), p. 239

<sup>38</sup> J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien...*, *op. cit.* (note 4), p. 52

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 52

*The unit, later to be called 'Bunker 2,' consists of four parallel chambers with a floor area of 105 m<sup>2</sup>; it has no mechanical ventilation."*

To summarize, 'Bunker 1' went into service in March or May 1942, 'Bunker 2' in June of that year.

Having established the chronological limits of the investigation, we must now examine their implications within the general outlines of the construction of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp as documented by the extant archival material.

### 1.7. The Location of the Birkenau 'Bunkers'

The location of the 'Bunkers' at Birkenau is presently considered an established fact: they have been definitively sited by the Auschwitz Museum as appears on the official map of Birkenau, published in Danuta Czech's *Auschwitz Chronicle*, where 'Bunker 1' is labeled "*1. provisorische Gaskammer*" (first temporary gas chamber), and 'Bunker 2' is called "*2. provisorische Gaskammer*"<sup>40</sup> (second temporary gas chamber).

That map will therefore constitute our geographical point of departure for the following historical and documentary study of the 'Bunkers.' In Part Three we will learn how the Auschwitz Museum arrived at its own position.

---

<sup>40</sup> D. Czech, *Kalendarium...*, *op. cit.* (note 12), p. 27. Cf. Document 1.