

A U S C H W I T Z L I E S

Germar Rudolf
Carlo Mattogno

Auschwitz Lies

Legends, Lies, and Prejudices
on the Holocaust



Castle Hill Publishers
P.O. Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK
Third edition, July 2016

HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS, Vol. 18:

Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno:

Auschwitz Lies. Legends, Lies, and Prejudices on the Holocaust

Third, slightly revised edition

The contributions by C. Mattogno (Italian) were translated by Henry Gardner; the contributions by Germar Rudolf (German) by Michael Humphrey, Carlos Porter, and himself.

Uckfield UK: CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW

July 2016

ISBN10 (print edition): 1-59148-139-2

ISBN13 (print edition): 978-1-59148-139-3

ISSN: 1529-7748

Published by CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

Manufactured in the United States of America and in the UK

© Germar Rudolf and Carlo Mattogno 2005, 2011, 2016

Distribution: Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 243
Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK
shop.codoh.com

Set in Times New Roman.

www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

Cover Illustrations: Left: Michael Shermer; center: Georges Wellers (while testifying during the Eichmann Trial in Jerusalem); right: Alex Grobman; bottom: The entrance building of the Birkenau camp.

Table of Contents

Introduction 7
 By Germar Rudolf

Pressac: From Paul to Pseudo-Saul 25
 By Germar Rudolf

Fantasies of a Biochemist 37
 By Germar Rudolf

Polish Pseudo-Scientists 47
 By Germar Rudolf

Green sees Red 71
 By Germar Rudolf

An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert 89
 By Carlo Mattogno

Professor Perjury 197
 By Germar Rudolf

Denying Evidence..... 201
 By Carlo Mattogno

The International Auschwitz Controversy..... 269
 By Germar Rudolf

The Elusive Holes of Death..... 279
 By Carlo Mattogno

Index of Names..... 395

Introduction

By Germar Rudolf

Toward the end of 1991, the late U.S. citizen Bradley R. Smith with his “Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust” (CODOH) caused a storm in a teapot with ads placed in student newspapers at various colleges and universities. These ads challenged the mainstream opinion on “the Holocaust.”¹ The editors of the student newspapers which ran Smith’s ads were massively attacked for allegedly “spreading hate.” Even two of the leading daily newspapers of the United States commented on Smith’s advertisement campaigns. An analysis of these articles may serve as an introduction to the topic of this book.

Here is what *The Washington Post* had to say about Smith’s ad:²

“The ad copy is just the sort that puts people’s free-speech convictions to flight: vile, straight-faced fabrications about ‘the good news of Holocaust Revisionism’ in full-page ads submitted recently to a wide range of college newspapers. In the ads, yet another group of haters presents artfully pseudo-academic assurances that no mass murder took place at Auschwitz, that eyewitness accounts are ‘ludicrously unreliable,’ that ‘it is now well documented’ (a lie) that confessions at war crimes trials were obtained through torture. Most insidious, the ad’s author attributes any dissension from the ‘Holocaust Story’ to ‘political correctness’ and ‘campus Thought Police,’ adroitly appropriating political symbols of the moment.

College newspapers have no obligation to accept these ads, of course, and some editors haven’t. Some, however, including those at Duke and Rutgers, have run them with rebuttals and discussion. This has brought an outcry from adults calling for an across-the-board ban on such material under existing guidelines that ban racist or antisemitic copy. The catch, though, is the false dispassionate and pseudo-scholarly tone of the ads, which studiously avoid code words and ethnic invective. Their offensiveness lies solely in their message.

Statements that the Holocaust never happened have surfaced in a variety of semi-public contexts lately – computer networks, talk radio – and, whether from the efforts of a small band of poisonous thinkers or from the gradual

¹ Bradley R. Smith, “The Holocaust Story: How Much is False? The Case for Open Debate” codoh.com/library/document/714/; updated: www.vho.org/Intro/GB/Flyer.html; www.vho.org/Intro/GB/Flyer.pdf.

² “College Ads and the Holocaust,” *Washington Post*, Dec. 21, 1991, A18.

erosion of a taboo, it's clear that such talk is becoming gradually more audible in public discourse. As a social development, this is not good news. But the idea that the way to combat these ads is to suppress them – automatically and in every case – is bad strategy. It plays into a key part of the offenders' argument: that evidence of the Holocaust is somehow sparse or hard to come by and that the truth has anything to fear from scrutiny.

The opposite is true. Poland is open now. Anyone can go to Auschwitz and see the roomfuls of grisly, literal evidence. Anyone can read not one, or 10, but hundreds of volumes of documents. Anyone can demolish the supposedly academic 'rise' laid out in these ads without half trying – and everyone has a responsibility to do so, given the chances. The student editors at Duke and Rutgers did this. The impulse to push away the creeping revisionist insinuation, to protect it from the bracing blast of refutation, is shortsighted. Ironically, one sole sentence near the beginning of the ad copy is in fact correct: 'Students should be encouraged to investigate the Holocaust story the same way they are encouraged to investigate every other historical event.'

Anyone reading Bradley Smith's books *Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist*³ or *Break my Bones*⁴ can easily find out that he is anything but a hater. These books also prove that Smith's dispassionate style is not at all "false." Furthermore, he never claimed himself or his ads to be "scholarly" or "academic," which is why he cannot be a "pseudo-" either.

In addition, why should it be deplorable that a historical taboo is challenged or eroding? Isn't it one of the main characteristics of tyrannies that they try to shield certain historical and political issues from criticism by declaring them taboo? And what exactly is it that makes a thinker "poisonous"? Just the fact that he thinks the unthinkable, the unwanted? Isn't this exactly what made Socrates a great philosopher?

Also, the claim that Smith wrote "vile, straight-faced fabrications," "creeping insinuations" and "a lie" is not only unsupported, but is a lie itself. In a 1986 book, the captors of Rudolf Höss, former commandant of Auschwitz, admitted how they tortured him in order to receive confessions from him intended to be used during the post-war trials.⁵

³ Bradley R. Smith, *Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist*, Prima Facie, Los Angeles 1987; see also the review Theodore J. O'Keefe, *JHR* 8(1) (1988), pp. 110-113 (www.ihr.org/jhr/v08/v08p110_OKeefe.html).

⁴ Bradley R. Smith, *Break His Bones*, published by author, San Ysidro 2003.

⁵ R. Butler, *Legions of Death*, Arrows Books Ltd., London 1986, pp. 236f.; cf.: Robert Faurisson, "How the British Obtained the Confessions of Rudolf Höss," *JHR* 7(4) (1986), pp. 389-403.

Or simply read what British journalist Alan Moorehead reported on what was going on in Allied prisons in Germany after the war in preparation of the infamous war crimes trials:⁶

“As we approached the cells of the SS guards, the [British] sergeant’s language become ferocious. ‘We had had an interrogation this morning,’ the captain said. ‘I am afraid they are not a pretty sight.’ [...] The sergeant unbolted the first door and [...] strode into the cell, jabbing a metal spike in front of him. ‘Get up,’ he shouted. ‘Get up. Get up, you dirty bastards.’ There were half a dozen men lying or half lying on the floor. One or two were able to pull themselves erect at once. The man nearest me, his shirt and face spattered with blood, made two attempts before he got on to his knees and then gradually on to his feet. He stood with his arms stretched out in front of him, trembling violently.

‘Come on. Get up,’ the sergeant shouted [in the next cell]. The man was lying in his blood on the floor, a massive figure with a heavy head and be-draggled beard [...] ‘Why don’t you kill me?’ he whispered. ‘Why don’t you kill me? I cannot stand it any more.’ The same phrases dribbled out of his lips over and over again. ‘He’s been saying that all morning, the dirty bastard,’ the sergeant said.”

And if that is still not enough, here is what Edward L. van Roden and Gordon Simpson had to say about these procedures. Van Roden served in World War II as Chief of the Military Justice Division for the European Theater. Together with Justice Gordon Simpson of the Texas Supreme Court, van Roden was appointed in 1948 to an extraordinary commission charged with investigating the claims of abuse during U.S. trials in Germany. Here is an excerpt of what van Roden wrote:⁷

“AMERICAN investigators at the U. S. Court in Dachau, Germany, used the following methods to obtain confessions: Beatings and brutal kickings. Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws. Mock trials. Solitary confinement. Posturing as priests. Very limited rations. Spiritual deprivation. Promises of acquittal. [...] We won the war, but some of us want to go on killing. That seems to me wicked. [...] The American prohibition of hear-say evidence had been suspended. Second and third-hand testimony was admitted, [...] Lt Perl of the Prosecution pleaded that it was difficult to obtain competent evidence. Perl told the court, ‘We had a tough case to crack and we had to use persuasive methods.’ He admitted to the court that the persuasive methods included various ‘expedients, including some violence and mock trials.’ He further told the court that the cases rested on statements obtained by such

⁶ Alan Moorehead, “Belsen,” in: Cyril Connolly (ed.), *The Golden Horizon*, Weidenfels and Nicholson, London 1953, pp. 105f.

⁷ E.L. van Roden, “American Atrocities in Germany,” *The Progressive*, February 1949, pp. 21f. (www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/Dachau/VanRoden1948.html).

methods. [...] The statements which were admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for three, four, and, five months. They were confined between four walls, with no windows, and no opportunity of exercise. Two meals a day were shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families or any minister or priest during that time. [...] Our investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him, and beat him with rubber hose. Many of the German defendants had teeth knocked out. Some had their jaws broken. All but two of the Germans, in the 139 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was Standard Operating Procedure with American investigators. Perl admitted use of mock trials and persuasive methods including violence and said the court was free to decide the weight to be attached to evidence thus received. But it all went in.

One 18 year old defendant, after a series of beatings, was writing a statement being dictated to him. When they reached the 16th page, the boy was locked up for the night. In the early morning, Germans in nearby cells heard him muttering. 'I will not utter another lie.' When the jailer came in later to get him to finish his false statement, he found the German hanging from a cell bar, dead. However the statement that the German had hanged himself to escape signing was offered and received in evidence in the trial of the others.

Sometimes a prisoner who refused to sign was led into a dimly lit room, where a group of civilian investigators, wearing U. S. Army uniforms, were seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center and two candles burning, one on each aide. 'You will now have your American trial,' the defendant was told.

The sham court passed a sham sentence of death. Then the accused was told, 'You will hang in a few days, as soon as the general approves this sentence: but in the meantime sign this confession and we can get you acquitted.' Some still wouldn't sign. [...]

In another case, a bogus Catholic priest (actually an investigator) entered the cell of one of the defendants, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and then gave him a little friendly tip: 'Sign whatever the investigators ask you to sign. It will get you your freedom. Even though it's false, I can give you absolution now in advance for the lie you'd tell.'"

Or take, for a change, the methods used in communist countries to obtain testimonies in war crime trials:⁸

"One of the witnesses involved in the 1962 case stated that he was threatened by an investigator 'with a pistol.' A second witness testified that he had

⁸ German monthly magazine *Focus*, Feb. 9, 2004.

incriminated Niznansky ‘under psychological and physical duress.’ Jan Holbus, another witness for the prosecution back in 1962, declared during his interrogation in 2001 that he was threatened that he ‘will leave the room with his feet first,’ if he does not testify as the prosecution expects him to.”

And read what a British Journalist found out about Britain’s torture centers in Germany after World War II:⁹

“Here [in Bad Nenndorf, north-west Germany], an organisation called the Combined Services Detailed Interrogation Centre (CSDIC) ran a secret prison following the British occupation of north-west Germany in 1945.

CSDIC, a division of the War Office, operated interrogation centres around the world, including one known as the London Cage, located in one of London’s most exclusive neighbourhoods. Official documents discovered last month at the National Archives at Kew, south-west London, show that the London Cage was a secret torture centre where German prisoners who had been concealed from the Red Cross were beaten, deprived of sleep, and threatened with execution or with unnecessary surgery.

As horrific as conditions were at the London Cage, Bad Nenndorf was far worse. Last week, Foreign Office files which have remained closed for almost 60 years were opened after a request by the Guardian under the Freedom of Information Act. These papers, and others declassified earlier, lay bare the appalling suffering of many of the 372 men and 44 women who passed through the centre during the 22 months it operated before its closure in July 1947.

They detail the investigation carried out by a Scotland Yard detective, Inspector Tom Hayward, following the complaints of Major Morgan-Jones and Dr Jordan. Despite the precise and formal prose of the detective’s report to the military government, anger and revulsion leap from every page as he turns his spotlight on a place where prisoners were systematically beaten and exposed to extreme cold, where some were starved to death and, allegedly, tortured with instruments that his fellow countrymen had recovered from a Gestapo prison in Hamburg. Even today, the Foreign Office is refusing to release photographs taken of some of the “living skeletons” on their release.”

Torture “a lie”? Who is lying here? And how can testimonies obtained that way be anything else but “ludicrously unreliable?”

Haters cannot be recognized by the content of their message but by their style, by their choice of words. The foremost indicators of hate are hateful, unfounded expressions, like “vile, straight-faced fabrications,” “group of haters,”

⁹ Ian Cobain, “The interrogation camp that turned prisoners into living skeletons,” *The Guardian*, Dec. 17, 2005; www.theguardian.com/uk/2005/dec/17/secondworldwar.topstories3

“a lie,” “insidious,” “false dispassionate,” “pseudo-academic,” “pseudo-scholarly,” “small band of poisonous thinkers” “creeping insinuation.” There you have a hater – writing in the *Washington Post*.

Next on my list is an article published in *The New York Times*:¹⁰

“Bradley Smith is a Californian who acknowledges that the Nazis were cruel to Jews but who denies that the Holocaust ever happened. He has tried to expound his views in a 4,000-word essay submitted as an advertisement to several college newspapers – giving headaches and heartaches to student editors. In the process he gives the public some valuable, if unintended, lessons in the workings of a free press.

Many readers would blanch if they came upon Mr. Smith’s pseudo-scholarly tract. Yes, he concedes, Jews were mistreated by the Nazis, and ‘many tragically perished in the maelstrom.’ But the idea that Nazi Germany exterminated six million Jews, Mr. Smith contends, is an irresponsible exaggeration. Gas chambers? A myth. Those actually were ‘life-saving’ fumigation shelters to delouse clothing and prevent disease.

Should college editors risk appearing mercenary by taking money for publishing such trash? Should they risk playing censors to protect other young minds by refusing the ad? Is there some middle course, like printing the ad but with appraisals of its bizarre musings?

The dilemma is acute, just as it can be for commercial newspapers when confronted with ads that offend decency, patriotism or commonly accepted history. But the first lesson here is that it is their dilemma and not a First Amendment question. That great ordinance directs that Congress make no law abridging free expression. Government may not censor Mr. Smith and his fellow ‘Holocaust revisionists,’ no matter how intellectually barren their claims. Whether to publish their ads is something for the newspapers to decide.

The second lesson is that there’s probably no right answer to the question of how they should decide. College editors have come out in different ways. Newspapers at Harvard, Yale, Brown and the University of California turned the ad down. Those at Cornell, Duke, Northwestern and Michigan printed it, sometimes citing free speech.

Perhaps the most creative response was that of the student editors at Rutgers University. The Daily Targum newspaper rejected the Holocaust tract as advertising but ran the text in its news columns, along with an editorial denunciation and comment by invited authors. The editors thus transformed revulsion into education.

The public does not usually require protection from bad ideas. Even so, initial instincts in favor of publication may sometimes yield to exceptions, against quackery, for instance, or on behalf of taste or fairness. The Times,

¹⁰ “Ugly Ideas, and Democracy,” *New York Times*, January 15, 1992.

for instance, has from time to time refused advertisements – like one insisting that a politician killed in a plane crash had himself sabotaged the flight; that claim seemed unjustly unanswerable.

Denying the Holocaust may be monumentally more unjust. Yet to require that it be discussed only within approved limits may do an even greater injustice to the memory of its victims. To print or not to print? The diversity of responses from diverse editors demonstrates something more important than the answer. When there is free expression, even the ugliest ideas enrich democracy.”

There is much less hate in these lines than in those printed by the *Washington Post*. The usual misplaced accusation of being “pseudo-scholarly,” denigrating dissenting opinions as “trash” or mere “bizarre musings” is as bad as it gets. Much finer are the psychological slip-ups of this author. For example, why is there even a need to consider whether or not to “protect other young minds” from dissenting historical views? And why exactly is it a “creative response” to address revisionist writings with “editorial denunciation and comment”? Denunciations and comments are not exactly scholarly refutations.

Such tolerance by the *New York Times*, however, did not last very long. After Bradley Smith had made various advertisement campaigns with alternating success for more than ten years, the leading editors of the *New York Times* finally decided that they had enough of it. They came to the conclusion that the First Amendment is not a good thing after all. They decided to teach all student editors a lesson that they had a moral obligation to suppress revisionist dissent. Arthur Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, as well as Abraham Foxman, President of the Jewish Anti-Defamation League, two of the most influential men in American culture and politics, joined together in 2003 to personally put an end to Smith’s work at the universities. The Anti-Defamation League pronounced:¹¹

“When a campus newspaper editor is asked to print an ad denying that the Holocaust took place – or calling for ‘open debate’ on the subject – can he or she say ‘no’ without compromising freedom of the press?

In the view of the ADL and The New York Times, the answer is yes. Both organizations have been disturbed by the continuing – and often successful – attempts by Holocaust deniers [...] to place advertisements and other materials in campus newspapers. Out of their common concern came an annual colloquium, ‘Extremism Targets the Campus Press: Balancing Freedom and Responsibility.’

‘We seek to educate campus journalists,’ said ADL Campus Affairs/Higher Education Director Jeffrey Ross, ‘to balance freedom of the press with responsibility of the press when responding to hate submissions.’”

¹¹ *ADL on the Frontline*, Anti-Defamation League, special summer edition 2003; cf. Bradley Smith, “Revisionist Notes,” *The Revisionist* 1(4) (2003), pp. 364-366.

So now we know it for sure: Revisionism is hate. Period. Even if presented dispassionately and without invectives. It is hate because it is hated. And it is hated because after more than ten years of trying, it finally must have dawned on these haters from the *New York Times* and the ADL that revisionist arguments cannot be refuted. *The Washington Post*'s claim about "roomfuls of grisly evidence" at Auschwitz – they must have come to see – is nothing but a collection of trivial wartime memorabilia, and in the meantime the "hundreds of volumes of documents" referred to in the same article turned out to support revisionist claims.

Truth is hate for those who hate the truth. And those who call for censorship against peaceful, well-behaved dissenters are without any doubt haters – and intentional obfuscators, which is just another word for liars. Because those who tell only one side of a story and deliberately hide the other know that they are not telling the entire truth or no truth at all. Such people are called liars.

* * *

The term "Auschwitz Lie" was coined by a German war veteran named Thies Christophersen who had been stationed at an experimental farm at the village of Harmense near Auschwitz during the war. In 1973 Christophersen published a brochure, in which he described his experiences. He claimed that during his time at Auschwitz he never heard or saw anything about mass murder against Jews. The title of his anecdotal brochure made history:

*The Auschwitz Lie*¹²

Of course, with this term Christophersen meant the exact opposite of what is generally meant by it today. Whereas Christophersen maintained that the claim of mass extermination at Auschwitz is a lie, today claims like that spread by Christophersen are decried as "the Auschwitz lie."¹³

Fact is that the term "Auschwitz Lie" has become a part of the German as well as the English language. And it is also a fact that lies are continuously being spread about Auschwitz to an extreme degree.

The term lie itself requires an explanation. In the more narrow sense, this is the intentional expression or dissemination of something that is knowingly untrue. In order to be a liar, it does not suffice to distribute something that is not true, because most untruths are spread without malice, because they are erroneously assumed to be true.

But then there is something that I want to call "intentional lack of knowledge." All who spread a false claim, even though it would be their obligation to have the knowledge that it is untrue, are guilty of this offense against

¹² *Die Auschwitz-Lüge*, Series *Kritik*, issue no. 23, Kritik Verlag, Mohrkirch 1973.

¹³ See for example Thomas Wandres, *Die Strafbarkeit des Auschwitz-Leugnens*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin 2000.

truthfulness. These individuals are not intentional liars, but liars due to crass carelessness. For instance, I call an expert a careless liar who spreads untrue claims about an important topic of his field of expertise, even though he should have the expert knowledge to know that it is not true – or at least he could easily find out, and has the professional duty to find out, that it is untrue.

The present book is a compilation of various papers written over the years either by Italian revisionist scholar Carlo Mattogno or by me, a native German revisionist scholar residing in the United States. They all deal with articles or books written by authors who are opposed to the revisionist interpretation of what is generally referred to as “the Holocaust” in general, and with what did or did not happen at Auschwitz in particular. Some of our papers have been published before, either in printed form or only online, some of them in English, others only in German or Italian. Since one of the most important aspects of an academic dispute is the discussion of opposing views, we decided to update the most important of our papers and publish them in printed form. This gives the reader an opportunity to find in one volume a whole range of topics and disputes covered from a revisionist point of view. It may serve as a hallmark of the depth and quality of revisionist arguments and also of the superiority of our interpretation compared to that of the “orthodox” historians.

Quite a few of the papers and books criticized in this volume have been announced as “definite refutations” of revisionist arguments by the media or by their authors themselves. It is the goal of this book to emphasize that nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, after perusing this book, the reader will understand that the attempts at refuting revisionist arguments dealt with in this book were utter failures without a single exception.

A similar edition of the present book appeared also in the German language, consisting exclusively of contributions authored by me.¹⁴ Some of the papers included in the German edition have not been included in this volume, because they address works that appeared only in the German language and are thus not available to the reader unfamiliar with that language. Those who can read German are highly recommended to read those papers as well. For those who cannot read German, I may briefly summarize them here.

The political importance of some of the German papers I scrutinized in the German edition of this book results from the fact that the German government has quoted them as proof for their (false) claim that my own research results on

¹⁴ G. Rudolf, *Auschwitz-Lügen*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hasting 2005; 3rd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016; www.holocausthandbuecher.com/index.php?page_id=18.

Auschwitz (or those by Fred Leuchter,¹⁵ whose work preceded mine) are incorrect, so for instance in 2002 the yearly report of the German “Office for the Protection of the Constitution.”¹⁶

One of the first papers to critically address revisionist arguments about forensic aspects of Auschwitz was authored by Hellmuth Auerbach, a historian from Germany’s official Institute for Contemporary History in Munich.¹⁷ In this brief paper, which claims to refute the technical and chemical arguments of the revisionist *Leuchter Report* regarding Auschwitz, Auerbach makes several claims, none of which he backs up with any evidence. Since most of the issues he addresses are of technical nature, for which he cannot claim to have any expert knowledge, it cannot surprise that his unfounded claims are untenable.¹⁸

Two years after Auerbach, Werner Wegner authored a paper¹⁹ also trying to refute the *Leuchter Report*.¹⁵ The only expert knowledge this 90 year old geriatric had, however, was as a social worker. Hence, it is not surprising that his article was not just devoid of evidence supporting his historical as well as technical claims, but also so much off the mark with many of its ludicrous claims that merely reading his paper made my hair stand up straight.²⁰ That such a dilettantish work was quoted by government officials¹⁶ and mainstream historians²¹ in the first place is an indication how desperate they really were to quote just about anything which claims to refute revisionist arguments.

At the end of 1991, Austrian chemist Dr. Josef Bailer critiqued the *Leuchter Report* in a little booklet published in Austria.²² In it, Bailer assumes that the

¹⁵ See now Fred A. Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports: Critical Edition*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005; 4th ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015.

¹⁶ Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (ed.), *Rechtsextremistischer Revisionismus. Ein Thema von heute*, Cologne 2002, p. 19, fn. 22 (on F. Leuchter) and p. 20, fn 24f. (on G. Rudolf), with reference to subsequently quoted works by Hellmuth Auerbach, Werner Wegner, and Josef Bailer.

¹⁷ Hellmuth Auerbach, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, November 1989, published in: U. Walendy, *Historische Tatsachen* No. 42, Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho 1990, p. 34. In an updated version published as “Leuchter-Report,” in: Wolfgang Benz (ed.), *Legenden, Lügen, Vorurteile*, 7th ed., dtv, Munich 1995, pp. 147ff.; also as “Die Authentizität des ‘Leuchter-Reports’,” in: Der Bundesminister des Innern (ed.), *Aktuelle Aspekte des Rechtsextremismus*, Bonn 1994, pp. 101-104.

¹⁸ See “Institut für Zeitlegenden” in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 15-28.

¹⁹ W. Wegner, in: U. Backes, E. Jesse, R. Zitelmann (eds.), *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit*, Propyläen, Frankfurt/Main 1990, pp. 450-476 (www.vho.org/D/dsdv/Wegner.html, with inserted comments of mine).

²⁰ See “Ein Sozialoberrat schreibt Geschichte” in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 55-73.

²¹ For instance, Robert J. van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz. Evidence from the Irving Trial*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2002, p. 51, claiming that “Wegner amply demonstrated that Leuchter’s science did not pass critical muster.”

²² J. Bailer, “Der Leuchter-Bericht aus der Sicht eines Chemikers,” in: *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit*, Dokumentationszentrum des österreichischen Widerstandes, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kultur (eds.), Vienna 1991, pp. 47-52.

claimed homicidal gassings at Auschwitz were performed with extremely low amounts of poison, resulting in long execution times. Fact is, however, that all witnesses who testified about such gassings claimed very short execution times, requiring high poison amounts. Dr. Bailer also exhibited an astounding lack of understanding of the chemical process involved when hydrogen cyanide (the poisonous component of Zyklon B) reacts with masonry. As the lack of references clearly shows, he did not even bother to consult any expert literature on the topic. Despite criticism directed at his study,²³ Bailer repeated his unsustainable objections in later publications without responding to his critics, and again without any effort to consult the most basic chemical standard literature.²⁴ Dr. Bailer's argument ran something like this: He could not see how hydrogen cyanide could react with masonry to form long-term stable compounds (Iron Blue). Therefore, any such compound found today in masonry, which was once exposed to Zyklon B gas, cannot originate from this gas. It must have another origin, like for example wall paint. The problem with this approach is that Dr. Bailer did not even try to look into the various ways hydrogen cyanide does react with masonry. He also studiously ignored all of the evidence presented to him clearly showing that a) there are possible reactions leading to such long-term stable compounds, and b) that the compounds found in masonry in Auschwitz cannot possibly stem from wall paint. This is so because a) this type of wall paint did not exist, b) these compounds can be found also within the wall, c) there is no paint layer on the walls, to name only a few facts refuting Dr. Bailer's claim.²⁵ Dr. Bailer's nonsense about the wall paint was subsequently not only quoted as "proof" that I am wrong by German authorities,¹⁶ but was also a justification for a team of Polish scientists to exclude from their analysis the long-term stable compounds at issue. I deal with those Polish scientists in the chapter "Polish Pseudo-Scientists" in the present book. As such, the impact of Dr. Bailer's flawed contributions was considerable.

Even more bold were the lies spread by the German Press Agency (*Deutsche Presseagentur*, dpa) in a press release on March 29, 1994. Contrary to all well-

²³ As early as 1993: E. Gauss (alias G. Rudolf), *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert, Tübingen 1993, pp. 290-293 (online: www.vho.org/D/vuezz); Gauss, "Chemische Wissenschaft zur Gaskammerfrage," *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 41(2) (1993), pp. 16-24 (online: vho.org/D/DGG/Gauss41_2);

²⁴ J. Bailer, "Die 'Revisionisten' und die Chemie," Brigitte Bailer-Galanda, Wolfgang Benz und Wolfgang Neugebauer (ed.), *Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge*, Deuticke, Wien 1995, pp. 99-118; also in B. Bailer-Galanda, W. Benz, W. Neugebauer (ed.), *Die Auschwitzleugner. 'Revisionistische' Geschichtslüge und historische Wahrheit*, Berlin 1996, pp. 130-152.

²⁵ See my updated critique: "Lüge und Auschwitz-Wahrheit" in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 189-231; a slightly older version of this paper is available in English online: "Critique of Truth and the Auschwitz-Lie" (online: www.vho.org/GB/Books/cq/critique.html); see also my deliberations in *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 211f., 248f., 269f.

establish scientific facts about the extreme long-term stability of the relevant compounds, this press release claimed:²⁶

“Cyanide compounds decompose very quickly. In the ground, this occurs even after six to eight weeks; in masonry, these compounds could only be preserved under ‘absolute conditions of conservation including complete exclusion of air and bacteria.’”

Inquiries with the dpa press office in Stuttgart which had published the report revealed that the writer responsible for the report, Albert Meinecke, had simply invented this alleged “expert opinion.”²⁷ This obvious lie continues to be disseminated by German and foreign media²⁸ as well as by German government agencies such as, for example, the Bavarian Ministry of the Interior.²⁹

In summer of 1991, German physician and writer Till Bastian addressed revisionist arguments on a more general level with two major articles published in the German weekly newspaper *Die Zeit*.³⁰ It was triggered by the growing prominence of the *Leuchter Report*, the reputation of which Bastian intended to destroy. Whereas the first article mainly consists of innuendoes and political name-calling against revisionists, the second article focuses on some technical and historical arguments. However, Bastian’s arguments are rather superficial,³¹ for he followed the arguments outlined by the equally superficial Hellmuth Auerbach.¹⁷ Even though Bastian later augmented his argument with an extended edition published as a small booklet, it added little to the depth of his argument.³² Despite its poor historical quality, this booklet was quite a success due

²⁶ German daily newspapers, for instance: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, *Südwestpresse-Verband* (March 29, 1994), *taz*, *Frankfurter Rundschau* (March 30, 1994).

²⁷ G. Rudolf, “Über die frei erfundene Expertenmeinung der ‘dpa’,” *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 42(2) (1994), pp. 25f. (online: www.vho.org/D/DGG/Rudolf42_2.html); Engl. in G. Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, *op. cit.* (note 25), pp. 385-387. Updated German version as “Fälscherwerkstatt dpa” in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 117-130.

²⁸ So for instance by the South African newspaper *The Citizen*, June 24, 1995, p. 8.

²⁹ See the Bavarian State Ministry for the Interior, *Verfassungsschutzbericht 1997*, Munich 1998, p. 64. A corresponding reference to the factual incorrectness of the remarks made in this regard by the *Arbeitskreis Zeitgeschichte und Politik* (in a letter by president Hans-Jürgen Witzsch, dated Oct. 8, 1998, Fürth) was countered by the Ministry as follows: “Your efforts to deny and/or relativize the crimes of the National Socialists have been known to the security authorities for years. [...] We see no occasion for a discussion of gas chambers.” The letter, from Dr. Weber of the Bavarian State Ministry of the Interior dated Oct. 13, 1998, ref. IF1-1335.31-1, probably established a new world record for stupidity.

³⁰ “Die Auschwitz-Lügen,” *Die Zeit*, Sept. 18, 1992, p. 104; “Der ‘Leuchter-Report,’” *ibid.*, Sept. 25, 1992, p. 90. The articles were completely reproduced in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 75-83.

³¹ See “Die Zeit lügt!” in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 75-116.

³² *Auschwitz und die „Auschwitz-Lüge“: Massenmord und Geschichtsfälschung*, Beck, Munich 1994, 102 pp; 6th ed., *ibid.*, 2016, 137pp.; this recent 6th edition was thoroughly analyzed by Carlo Mattogno, *Till Bastian, Auschwitz und die „Auschwitz-Lüge*,” Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016 (in press).

to its small size and probably also because of its cheap, politically correct polemics.

In 1996, Markus Tiedemann, a German student of philosophy, published a book intended as a guideline for history teachers to refute revisionist arguments.³³ Tiedemann's book is full of polemics, innuendoes, unfounded and untrue statements about revisionism, and unsupported and false historical claims.³⁴ Should any teacher ever try to use this book to refute revisionist arguments, he would quickly suffer total shipwreck if facing a real revisionist. Despite the fact that this book is totally worthless from a historical point of view, it won the German prize "*Das politische Buch*" (The Political Book) in 1998. Hence, it was praised because of its political usefulness to denigrate and defame revisionism. Due to its success, it was republished by several other publishers under license in 2000³⁵ and with support of the German Social-Democratic Party,³⁶ which at that time dominated the German federal government.

Another much more serious and competent opponent of revisionism is retired German professor for the history of ideologies Dr. Ernst Nolte. In 1993 he wrote a book on current and upcoming controversies about National Socialism.³⁷ A major part of this book addresses revisionist arguments on the Holocaust in an attempt to refute them. In contrast to all other works that appeared so far and which claimed to refute Holocaust revisionist arguments, this is the only one that abstains from political name-calling and innuendoes. Nolte is also the only mainstream scholar who publicly admits that revisionists have a right to doubt and to critically challenge the orthodox view. He even goes so far as to maintain that revisionist works on the Holocaust are superior to those of mainstream historiography.³⁸ In a later publication he indicated that he has even moved a little closer to revisionism in that he accepts certain revisionist arguments and conclusions as inescapable in the light of existing evidence.³⁹ This lack of hostility toward revisionism and the revisionists has caused Prof. Nolte much distress. After all, lack of contempt for revisionism is punished with massive contempt by media and politics in return. The level and quality of Nolte's arguments are to some degree comparable to those of M. Shermer and A. Grobman as discussed by Carlo Mattogno in this volume – minus the polemics of

³³ Markus Tiedemann, "*In Auschwitz wurde niemand vergast.*" *60 rechtsradikale Lügen und wie man sie widerlegt*, Verlag an der Ruhr, Mülheim 1996; it was positively reviewed by Germany's most respected daily newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Jan. 15, 1997.

³⁴ See "In Auschwitz wurde niemand vergast" in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 261-282.

³⁵ Goldmann, Munich, and Omnibus, Munich.

³⁶ Rather: the SPD's fund raising organization and think tank Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

³⁷ Ernst Nolte, *Streitpunkte. Heutige und künftige Kontroversen um den Nationalsozialismus*, Propyläen, Berlin 1993.

³⁸ For some excerpts of Nolte's statements in this and in other books see G. Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010, Chapter 2.14.

³⁹ Ernst Nolte, *Der kausale Nexus*, Herbig, Munich 2002, pp. 96f., 122.

the latter. Including an English translation of my response to Dr. Nolte⁴⁰ would therefore have been a duplication of arguments. We therefore decided not to reproduce it here.

Also omitted was my response to German mainstream journalist Fritjof Meyer, who in 2002 triggered a controversy about the claimed mass murder at Auschwitz by decommissioning the Birkenau crematoria as sites of mass murder and by drastically reducing the Auschwitz death toll to roughly half a million. However, as a probably even more valuable replacement, an article of mine was included which widened the scope and range of the topic by focusing on the latest outcrop of this controversy after it had spilled into the English speaking world with a paper published in the journal *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* in 2004. This article of mine in the present book under the title “The International Auschwitz Controversy” also includes references to all scholarly papers know to me about this controversies, most of which are available in English as well.

Not included in this volume either is a critique of the works published by Dr. Robert Jan van Pelt,⁴¹ a Jewish native of the Netherlands who teaches cultural history in Canada. Several revisionist responses to van Pelt’s works have been published over the years, to which I may direct the reader’s attention.⁴² Since van Pelt’s 2002 book on Auschwitz is also the most comprehensive, it deserved more than a mere response in a simple article. We therefore decided to dedicate an entire book to refuting van Pelt.⁴³

Other attempts at refuting revisionist arguments on Auschwitz not thoroughly dealt with in the present study include Jean-Claude Pressac’s two works on Auschwitz,⁴⁴ which have been analyzed by several revisionists in a separate anthology.⁴⁵ I only included an overview on Pressac’s background and his

⁴⁰ See “Im Streit mit Professor Nolte” in G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 131-187.

⁴¹ *The Pelt Report*, expert report on Auschwitz as presented by the defense team during the 2000 court case of British historian David Irving against Deborah Lipstadt and her publisher; online at <http://hdot.org/en/trial/defense/van.html>; this document was later expanded into a book, see Robert J. van Pelt, *op. cit.* (note 21).

⁴² C. Mattogno, “Auschwitz 1270 to the Present” (www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/irving-eng.html); G. Rudolf, “Critique of Claims Made by Robert Jan Van Pelt” (vho.org/GB/c/GR/RudolfOn-VanPelt.html); “Critique of the ‘Findings on Justification’ by Judge Gray” (vho.org/GB/c/GR/CritiqueGray.html); Ernest Sommers, “Holocaust Orthodoxy: The Road Paved with Moral Certainty,” *The Revisionist*, Codoh series, No. 3, 2000; Samuel Crowell, *The Revisionist*, Codoh series, No. 4, 2002; Robert H. Countess, “Van Pelt’s Plea against Sound Reasoning,” *The Revisionist* 1(1) (2003), 99-104; Paul Grubach, “World War I Atrocity Propaganda and the Holocaust,” *The Revisionist* 1(1) (2003), pp. 104-109.

⁴³ Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity*, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010; revised as: *The Real Case for Auschwitz*, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015.

⁴⁴ J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989; *idem*, *Les Crématoires d’Auschwitz, la Machinerie du meurtre de masse*, CNRS Éditions, Paris 1993.

⁴⁵ Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016.

methods in this volume. There are, moreover, a number of attempts at refuting revisionist arguments which were left out here because they either address issues other than Auschwitz,⁴⁶ or because they are more general in nature and would for the most part repeat arguments addressed in the chapter “Denying Evidence” in the present volume.⁴⁷ They have all been addressed in dedicated monographs.⁴⁸

* * *

The pen is mightier than the sword, and for this reason propaganda lies are the most powerful weapons in the hands of governments. When it comes to refuting or merely attacking revisionism, political zeal and fanaticism go rampant. Propaganda lies against revisionism and revisionists are therefore widespread. As an example of an especially vicious lie I would like to present a statement about me spread by the German federal government:⁴⁹

“The actual degree of Rudolf’s ‘seriousness’ and ‘respectability’ is revealed by an article published by him in the right-wing extremist ‘Quarterly for Free Historical Research’ under the title ‘About Fear and How to Overcome it.’ In it he indirectly calls for violence against a public prosecutor highly committed to prosecuting revisionism.”

Of course, this highly respectable German government publication does not give any source for this claim, which could, after all, enable the reader to verify if this statement is true or not, and that is not what Germany’s Big Brother wants his underlings to do. I therefore may quote from my article referred to by this Orwellian German authority:⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Jonathan Harrison, Roberto Muehlenkamp, Jason Myers, Sergey Romanov, Nicholas Terry, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka: Holocaust Denial and Operation Reinhard. A Critique of the Falsehoods of Mattogno, Graf and Kues. A Holocaust Controversies White Paper*, <http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com>, December 2011.

⁴⁷ Most notably: Günter Morsch, Bertrand Perz (eds.), *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Metropol Verlag, Berlin 2011; James and Lance Morcan, *Debunking Holocaust Denial Theories: Two Non-Jews Affirm the Historicity of the Nazi Genocide*, Sterling Gates Books, Papamoa, New Zealand, 2016.

⁴⁸ On Harrison *et al.* see Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues, *The “Extermination Camps” of “Aktion Reinhardt”—An Analysis and Refutation of Factitious “Evidence,” Deceptions and Flawed Argumentation of the “Holocaust Controversies” Bloggers*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, 2015.

On Morsch *et al.* see C. Mattogno, *Inside the Gas Chambers: The Extermination of Mainstream Holocaust Historiography*, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2014.

On Morcan see C. Mattogno, *Fail: “Debunking Holocaust Denial Theories”: How James and Lance Morcan botched their Attempt to Affirm the Historicity of the Nazi Genocide*, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016, (in press).

⁴⁹ Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 16), p. 21.

⁵⁰ Germar Rudolf, “Von der Angst und wie man sie überwindet,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 4(2) (2000), pp. 122-124.

“Mark Weber correctly stated that revisionist hunters like [public prosecutors] Hans-Heiko Klein would no longer be alive if the often described ‘danger from the right-wing’ in Germany would indeed be so huge, as media and politicians claim. [...] Indeed, that Heiko Klein is still alive borders on a miracle and proves how harmless the entire German ‘scene’ really is. One certainly could not win a war of liberation with such freedom fighters. [This is sarcasm. Anyone having some humor here?]

I have been repeatedly asked to publish the full names of all persons involved in the persecution of dissidents by the authorities. After all, one never knows what good this kind of information could do in the future. That is exactly the reason why I hesitate to do this. After all the political trials and persecution, Germany really needs only one thing in the future: A large-scale amnesty, a reconciliation with itself, an end to self-flagellation and self-destruction. I am therefore strictly opposed to any kind of threat, should the table be turned one day, and then the other side will be the target. What would then be the difference between them and us? Don’t count on me!”

In other words: I said the exact opposite of what the German government claimed I said: I urgently advised not to use violence against the lackeys of the German authorities, who persecute peaceful dissidents and destroy their social existence.

Hence, we have firmly established the first liar: the federal government of Germany. The exposure of the other liars follows in the upcoming chapters.

Germar Rudolf, Chicago, July 7, 2005,
updated on July 4, 2016

* * *

P.S.: Since each contribution to this book is independent, it was not always possible to avoid some repetitions. I have tried to reduce them to a minimum, though, and to point the reader to other contributions in this book instead.

In order to enable the reader to easily find the sources quoted in the footnotes, I have included Internet addresses of the source where known to me. The fluctuations of addresses on the Internet will render several of those Internet references invalid with time. The use of search engines will help to remedy the situation in most cases.

Since some countries censor the Internet, some readers may not be able to reach some of the Internet addresses given here. In such cases I recommend to use anonymizing services. Using them allows all of us to safely surf the net without having to fear Orwellian interferences.

For reasons of limited space, no Internet addresses were given for articles from the revisionist periodicals *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (VffG, = Quarterly for Free Historical Research) and *The Revisionist*

(*TR*), although they are all available online. The individual papers can be reached at www.vho.org/VffG and <http://codoh.com/library/categories/1178/>, respectively. Most revisionist books can be downloaded for free at www.vho.org/download, and the more recent ones at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com.