

The “Extermination Camps” of “Aktion Reinhardt”

*An Analysis and Refutation
of Factitious “Evidence,” Deceptions and Flawed Argumentation
of the “Holocaust Controversies” Bloggers*

PART ONE OF TWO

**Carlo Mattogno
Thomas Kues
Jürgen Graf**



Castle Hill Publishers
P.O. Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK
April 2015

HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS Series, vol. 28:

Carlo Mattogno, Thomas Kues, Jürgen Graf:

The “Extermination Camps” of “Aktion Reinhardt”:

An Analysis and Refutation of Factitious “Evidence,” Deceptions and Flawed Argumentation of the “Holocaust Controversies” Bloggers

2nd, slightly corrected edition

Uckfield, East Sussex: CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

Part One of Two.

April 2015

ISBN: 978-1-59148-087-7 (part 1)

978-1-59148-088-4 (part 2)

ISSN: 1529-7748

Published by CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

Manufactured in the United States of America and in the UK

© 2013, 2015 by CARLO MATTOGNO, JÜRGEN GRAF, THOMAS KUES

Distribution: Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 243
Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

Distribution USA: TBR Books, The Barnes Review
P.O. Box 15877
Washington, D.C. 20003, USA
1-877-773-9077

Set in Times New Roman.

www.BarnesReview.com

www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

www.codoh.com

If these sites are inaccessible in the country where you live, try an online anonymizing service.

Covers: Part 1 features a recent photograph of the Sobibór railway station near the former camp grounds; Part 2 features a recent photograph of the Treblinka bolder memorial.

Table of Contents

	Page
PART ONE	9
Introduction: The Dragon Slayers	11
1. Dr. James Smith’s Plight	11
2. Four Intrepid Dragon Slayers	14
3. Why the <i>Holocaust Controversies</i> Blog is Loathed by Holocaust Historians and Holocaust Propagandists	16
4. The Tactics of the “Controversial Bloggers”	19
Chapter 1: The Insane Challenge	22
1.1. “The Falsehoods of Mattogno, Graf and Kues”	22
1.2. Notes on Three Errors.....	23
1.3. The Sources of Our Opponents	24
1.3.1. The Gerstein Report	25
1.3.2. The Alleged Babi Yar Massacre	26
1.3.3. The Imaginary “ <i>Erntefest</i> ” Slaughter.....	28
1.4. The Role of Auschwitz and the Reinhardt Camps in Orthodox and Revisionist Historiography	31
1.5. The Alleged Revisionist “Conspiracy Theory”	37
1.6. The Overwhelming Absurdity of the Official Version of Events	42
1.6.1. The Alleged Extermination of Able-Bodied Jews	42
1.6.2. The Missing Crematoria.....	43
1.6.3. The Genesis of the Alleged Gas Chambers.....	43
Chapter 2: Scope and Significance of the Present Study	46
2.1. The Adversaries and Their Credentials	46
2.2. Genesis of Holocaust Historiography and the Revisionist Method.....	62
2.3. Auschwitz: First Example of Holocaust Schizophrenia	84
2.4. Scope and Significance of Our Response.....	85
Chapter 3: The Propaganda Origins of the Extermination Camps Legend	89
Chapter 4: The “Noble Victors” and Their Untiring Quest for “Justice”	147
Chapter 5: The <i>Führer</i> Order and the Alleged NS Extermination Policy	166
5.1. The Alleged NS Policy of “Mass Starvation” of Eastern Populations	168
5.2. The “Starvation Policy” and the “More Active Shooting Policy”	184
5.3. The “Reprisal Policy” and the Jewish Extermination.....	192
5.4. “Decimation by Labour”	201

5.5. The “ <i>Gas Vans</i> ”	213
5.6. The “Criticism” against Mattogno	215
5.7. The “Local Exterminations”	269
5.8. The “Europe-Wide Final Solution”	312
5.9. “Killing of Soviet Jews”	366
Chapter 6: “Aktion Reinhardt” in the Context of National Socialist Jewish Policy	378
Chapter 7: Where They Went: The Reality of Resettlement	561
7.1. Notes on some Additional “Conspiraloon” Claims	561
7.2. A “Handful” of Vague News Reports?	562
7.3. General Remarks on the Alleged Impossibility of Resettlement to the East	564
7.4. Ostland	573
7.4.1. Vievis, Vaivara, Salaspils and Maly Trostenets	573
7.4.2. Statements by Kube and Lohse	576
7.4.3. The Witnesses Rage and Grünberg	581
7.4.4. Herman Kruk’s Diary	582
7.4.5. Some Notes on the Ghettos in RK Ostland	596
7.5. The Ukraine	608
7.6. Deportations to the Military-Administered Parts of the Occupied Eastern Territories	621
7.7. The Direct Transports to the East 1941–1942	628
7.8. Transports to the “Extermination Camps” from the East	630
7.9. Testimonies from railway workers	653
7.10. The Fate of the Jews Deported in 1944	659
7.11. The Ultimate Fate of the Surviving Deportees	668
7.12. Additional Response by Carlo Mattogno:	677
PART TWO	713
Chapter 8: Alleged “Gas Chambers” in “Aktion Reinhardt” Camps	714
8.1. Carlo Mattogno’s Response	714
8.2. Thomas Kues’s Response	856
8.2.1. Carbon Monoxide Poisoning and Skin Discoloration	856
8.2.2. Myers’s Critique of Archeological Evidence at Sobibór	868
8.2.3. New Book on Archeological Surveys at Sobibór 2000–2012	886
8.2.4. Archeological Research at Sobibór 2000–2011	896
8.2.5. C. Sturdy Colls’s Archaeological Research at Treblinka	939
Chapter 9: Myers’s “Direct” and “Indirect” Witnesses	953
9.1. Preliminary Remarks	953
9.2. Myers’s Categories of Witnesses	956
9.3. Belzec	958

9.4. Sobibor	960
9.5. Treblinka.....	965
9.6. Miscellaneous Inanities	967
Chapter 10: Testimonies on the “Aktion Reinhardt” Camps.....	971
10.1. Carlo Mattogno’s Response.....	971
10.2. Thomas Kues’s Response.....	1026
10.2.1. Myers’s “Minor Anomalies”: the Example of Rudolf Höss	1026
10.2.2. False Confessions by Defendants during Trials.....	1029
10.2.3. Gustav Franz Wagner.....	1034
10.2.4. The first gas chamber building at Sobibór	1039
10.2.5. Erich Bauer	1040
10.2.6. Hubert Gomerski.....	1044
10.2.7. The Sobibór Prisoner Revolt, Himmler’s 1943 Visit to Sobibór, and “Witness Convergences”	1051
10.2.8. Addendum: A Complementary Survey of the Sobibór Eyewitness Testimonies.....	1055
Chapter 11: “Aktion Reinhardt” Camps and Chelmno: Real and Alleged Mass Graves	1071
Chapter 12: Cremating the Alleged Victims in the “Aktion Reinhardt” Camps	1169
Conclusions on the “Aktion Reinhardt” Camps	1328
Chapter 13: Conclusions	1333
13.1. Asinine, Judeophantic Arrogance.....	1333
13.2. The Bogeyman of “Anti-Semitism”	1355
Epilogue	1357
Bibliography.....	1361

PART ONE

Introduction: The Dragon Slayers

By Jürgen Graf

1. Dr. James Smith’s Plight

On October 7, 2010, *The Jewish Chronicle Online* reported the following:

“Holocaust Denial is slowly becoming a thing of the past, according to a leading authority who claims there are only three or four ‘pure denial experts’ left. Dr. Nicholas Terry, founder of the anti-denial blog HC [Holocaust Controversies], told a Leicester University conference that denial these days has ‘great brand recognition, but almost zero customers’. Dr. Nicholas Terry, a historian at Exeter University, said: ‘My assessment is that there have been around 100 authors since the 1940’s who have written what can be considered pure denial books or pamphlets. Most of these experts are now either dead or inactive. It’s down to only three or four authors who are capable of writing such books.’ He said there are another 100 cheerleaders or propagandists who talk down the Holocaust, but without contributing original ideas. These include Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and 500 ‘footsoldiers’ who are active online.’ [...] But Dr. James Smith, chairman of the Beth Shalom Holocaust Centre, warned of the continuing danger: ‘The problem is, even after professional Holocaust deniers have died, their published material remains in circulation, is available on the Internet and remains as pernicious and dangerous as ever,’ he added.”

Dr. Nicholas Terry’s estimate that there have been about one hundred authors since the 1940s who have written revisionist books or pamphlets is realistic; I arrived at a very similar figure a couple of years ago. However, these one hundred or so revisionist writers were, and are, apparently so dangerous – not only for official historiography but for the whole “democratic” system of the “free world” – that many Western countries have adopted thought crime laws which make Holocaust revisionism a criminal offence and stifle all free debate about the extent of the persecution of the Jews during the Second World War. It goes without saying that these totalitarian laws flagrantly violate the constitutions of the respective countries and unmask their political leaders, who incessantly proclaim their commitment to “freedom” and “human rights,” as shameless hypocrites. Anti-revisionist repression is especially ferocious in Austria and in the Federal Republic of Germany where in some cases revisionists have been sentenced to many years in prison. Better

evidence is hardly needed to prove that the official version of the fate of the Jews during the Second World War is rotten to the core.

The adherents of the orthodox Holocaust story regularly compare revisionists to those who think that the earth is flat. Such people do indeed exist; they even have their own organization, the Flat Earth Society, and their own website.¹ But interestingly enough, nobody bothers the Flat Earthers. The political and scientific establishment refuses to pay any attention to them; not in their wildest dreams would our politicians envisage promulgating anti-constitutional laws in order to silence them. No Dr. James Smith from a Beth Shalom Holocaust Centre castigates their published material as “pernicious and dangerous.” After all, the Flat Earthers have no chance of winning: Any competent astronomer could easily trounce them in an open debate.

On the other hand, orthodox Holocaust historians are mortally afraid of a debate with qualified revisionist researchers. To prove this assertion, we need look no further than the collective volume *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas* (New Studies on the National Socialist Mass Killings by Poisonous Gas)² which was published in 2011. In his introduction to this volume, Thomas Krüger writes:³

“This collective volume [...] explains the intentions and structures of revisionist propaganda and presents suggestions and concepts for dealing with revisionist denial.”

As it is not possible to “deal with revisionist denial” on a scientific basis without summarizing and analyzing the revisionists’ claims and arguments, one would of course expect the authors of *Neue Studien* to do precisely this, but in fact they categorically refuse any debate. Two of the editors of the volume, Günter Morsch and Bertrand Perz, explain why they are unwilling to address the arguments of their opponents:⁴

“There can be no question of responding to pseudo-scientific arguments in order to refute them, because this would confer their representatives and their absurd theories an aura of respectability.”

In accordance with this strategy, in his article about the alleged homicidal gassings at Sachsenhausen concentration camp,⁵ G. Morsch ignores the only detailed revisionist study about this camp, an article by

¹ <http://theflatearthsociety.org/cms/>

² Günter Morsch, Bertrand Perz (eds.), *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Metropolis Verlag, Berlin 2011.

³ *Ibid.*, p. XII.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. XXIX.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 260-276.

Carlo Mattogno published in 2003.⁶ Likewise, Dieter Pohl, the author of an article about the Camps of *Aktion Reinhardt*,⁷ does not mention the revisionist monographs about Treblinka⁸ and Belzec.⁹

However, one of the authors of *Neue Studien*, Achim Trunk, deviates from this strategy of silence by discussing, and attempting to refute, several revisionist arguments in his article “Die todbringenden Gase” (The lethal gasses),¹⁰ thus conferring upon the “pseudo-scientific deniers” an undeserved “aura of respectability,” as Morsch and Perz would put it. Unfortunately for Trunk, his “refutation” fails miserably, because in his recent response to the collective volume, *Schiffbruch* (Shipwreck), Carlo Mattogno demolishes Trunk’s objections with the greatest ease.¹¹ The only revisionist argument Trunk is able to refute is Fred Leuchter’s assertion that the explosiveness of hydrogen cyanide would have prevented the SS from installing gas chambers in the same building as crematoria ovens. This argument is indeed unsound, since the danger of an explosion would only have existed if exorbitant quantities of HCN had been used. But since Carlo Mattogno had pointed out this fact fully fifteen years before the publication of the collective volume,¹² and because Leuchter’s error was corrected in a revised edition of his report authored together with Germar Rudolf and Robert Faurisson,¹³ Trunk merely forces an open door.

To put it in a nutshell, orthodox Holocaust historians face a dire dilemma: Either they choose not to respond to the revisionists, which is tantamount to unconditional surrender, or they try to refute them, thus initiating a debate which they are bound to lose. We can therefore fully understand the plight of poor Dr. James Smith, chairman of the Beth Shalom Holocaust Centre, haunted day and night by the idea that “even

⁶ Carlo Mattogno, “KL Sachsenhausen. Stärkemeldungen und ‘Vernichtungsaktionen’ 1940 bis 1945,” in: *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, No. 2/2003, pp. 173-185.

⁷ G. Morsch, B. Perz (eds.), pp. 185-196.

⁸ Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, *Treblinka: Vernichtungslager oder Durchgangslager?*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2002. – English Version: *Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004.

⁹ Carlo Mattogno, *Belzec. Propaganda, Zeugenaussagen, archäologische Untersuchungen, historische Fakten*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2004. – English Version: *Belzec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research and History*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004.

¹⁰ G. Morsch, B. Perz (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 23-49.

¹¹ Carlo Mattogno, *Schiffbruch. Vom Untergang der Holocaust-Orthodoxie*, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2011, pp. 28-45. An English translation is forthcoming from The Barnes Review under the title *Confronting Revisionism*, 2013.

¹² Carlo Mattogno, *Olocausto: Dilettanti allo sbaraglio*, Padua 1996, pp. 212-215.

¹³ Fred Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports. Critical Edition*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005; 3rd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2011.

after professional Holocaust deniers have died, their published material remains in circulation, is available on the Internet and remains as pernicious and dangerous as ever.” One would really have to have a heart of stone not to feel sorry for this unfortunate man!

2. Four Intrepid Dragon Slayers

Dr. Smith need not have worried; the saviors were near. Four intrepid dragon slayers have set out to rid the world of the revisionist peril. And behold, one of them is none other than the very same Dr. Nicholas Terry whom *The Jewish Chronicle* quotes at the beginning of the above-mentioned article. Together with three other heroic fighters against “negationism” – Roberto Muehlenkamp, Jonathan Harrison and Sergey Romanov – Nicholas Terry runs the blog *Holocaust Controversies* which, unlike other websites promoting the orthodox Holocaust story, not only mentions revisionist books and arguments, but discusses them and even “makes mincemeat of them,” as Sergey Romanov puts it:¹⁴

“Mattogno and Graf are really nothing but intellectual dwarves. Even amateurs like Roberto [Muehlenkamp] or me, relying on publicly available sources, can make mincemeat of them.”

Harken to these joyful tidings, Dr. Smith! *Holocaust Controversies* can make mincemeat of the revisionists! Surely these geniuses were sent by Yahweh himself to save the world from the horrible revisionist dragon? Surely the articles these geniuses have published on their blog all appear in printed form in an ever-increasing series of collective volumes which are the pride of every university library in the Free World? Surely the grateful Holocaust historians make ample use of the invaluable insights of these champions of the orthodox narrative?

As a matter of fact, they do not. Although Terry, Muehlenkamp, Harrison and Romanov have authored hundreds of articles since the creation of their blog in 2006, as a group they have never published anything in print. Mainstream Holocaust historians persistently ignore them. The collective volume *Neue Studien* does not even name them in a footnote. And while the anti-revisionist *Aktion Reinhard Camps* (ARC) website does indeed mention the *Holocaust Controversies* group, it is only to deliver a scathing rebuke to its members:¹⁵

“Unauthorized links to our website from the controversial and grossly

¹⁴ <http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com/2006/10/thats-why-it-is-denial-not-revisionism.html>.

¹⁵ www.deathcamps.org/dedication/

inaccurate hate blog posting of the following persons: Roberto Muehlenkamp, Sergey Romanov, Dr. Nick Terry, are not condoned by ARC. We maintain no connection to Holocaust hate blogs, and would caution all to avoid being misled by these individuals.”

Why this black ingratitude? Why are these tireless fighters against denialism either ignored or reviled by their fellow anti-negationists? Why do the narrow-minded Holocaust historians stubbornly refuse to recognize their titanic struggle?

The solution to this apparent riddle is simple. First, there is the often puerile tone of the “Controversial Bloggers,” complete with the use of insulting and obscene language, which self-respecting adults of any persuasion naturally do not want to be associated with. When a writer pretending to engage in historical debate on a subject as important and controversial as the Holocaust nonetheless peppers his articles and private communications with insults and four-letter words, he not only reveals a deplorable level of intellectual and moral development, but also demonstrates a fundamental lack of respect for the subject itself. And this lack of seriousness is all the more glaring as it manifests itself not only in language and tone, but in the use of arguments so flimsy and embarrassing that at times they must seem to orthodox Holocaust historians as tantamount to sabotage. A single example will suffice.

In a “Holocaust Controversies” discussion of the so-called Gerstein report and the alleged homicidal gas chambers of Belżec, Roberto Muehlenkamp approvingly quotes the opinion of one Charles Provan, according to whom “703 people, over half children, can fit into an area of 25 m²,” and then adds on his own account:¹⁶

“The number was probably higher in the Belzec gas chambers, considering that the Jews killed there were emaciated due to the lack of food in the ghettos in eastern Poland in 1942 and of relatively small stature, as Provan pointed out.”

Now, the idea that the Jews allegedly gassed at Belżec were all children or Lilliputians, and that they were standing on each other’s shoulders in the gas chambers (for this is essentially what Muehlenkamp’s claim implies), may seem funny to some people, but the joke will undoubtedly be lost on the academic world of Holocaust orthodoxy, and Jews definitely do not appreciate this kind of humor. The latter group may well feel the need to defend the Holocaust narrative against revisionist critique, but they would hardly want it defended by clowns.

On page 35 of their sprawling *Belzec, Sobibór, Treblinka: Holocaust Denial and Operation Reinhard*, object of the present refutation, the

¹⁶ http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com/2006/05/carlo-mattogno-on-belzec_27.html

“Holocaust Controversies” bloggers state:

“This critique has been written without pay in our spare time during evenings, weekends and vacations. None of us has ever been paid for our activities.”

If there is one passage in the entire text of which I believe every word, it is certainly this one! No one in his right mind would contribute so much as a penny to support the “research” of people who claim that 703 human beings – or more – can fit into an area of 25m². For the Jewish ideologues of the Holocaust Industry, people like Roberto Muehlenkamp are an embarrassment, allies whom they can do without. That isn’t to say that the defenders and beneficiaries of Holocaust Orthodoxy need no allies at all – just allies of a different type. They need politicians who promulgate laws against revisionism. They need judges who enforce these laws and send revisionists to prison or ruin them with heavy fines. They need journalists who insult and defame revisionists without ever having read any of their writings. They need court historians who rehash the traditional Holocaust wisdom without ever giving a thought to the question whether the alleged events were physically possible. But they certainly do not need “helpers” who get them into a mess by inadvertently exposing the overwhelming absurdity of accepted Holocaust lore.

3. Why the *Holocaust Controversies* Blog is Loathed by Holocaust Historians and Holocaust Propagandists

As we have seen, Roberto Muehlenkamp apparently believes that 703 persons, or more, can fit into an area of 25m². The German judges at the first Treblinka trial in Düsseldorf (1964-1965) were graced with an only marginally greater endowment of common sense. In their verdict, they described the “old gas chamber building” as follows:¹⁷

“The building, solidly constructed out of brick upon a concrete foundation, contained three gas chambers, which were approximately 4 x 4 m in area and about 2.6 m high. [...] An accepted holding capacity of approximately 200 to 350 people per gas chamber in the old house [...] might safely be said to be the most probable according to all [information].”

Thus, according to these sterling jurists, as many as twenty-two people per square meter could be crammed into the three chambers of the

¹⁷ Adalbert Ruckerl, *NS-Vernichtungslager im Spiegel deutscher Strafprozesse*, dtv, Frankfurt 1977, pp. 206f.

old gas chamber building! (By the way, no Holocaust historian has ever been able to explain why it would have been a good idea to subdivide the gassing building into three rooms, thereby reducing the available space and complicating the gassing procedure.)

Absurd as these claims may be, they are the logical consequence of the official picture of the Holocaust. If no fewer than 491,000 Jews were gassed at Treblinka between 23 July and 30 September 1942, as Israeli Holocaust historian Yitzhak Arad would have us believe in his "standard work" on the Aktion Reinhardt camps,¹⁸ and if the gas chambers of the old building indeed had a total surface of merely forty-eight square meters, the capacity of these chambers must have been truly astounding, just as the Diesel engine allegedly used to perform the gassing must have functioned impeccably around the clock during the whole period of seventy days. It stands to reason that it is not in the interest of orthodox Holocaust historians to draw public attention to the detailed evidentiary basis for their claims. Indeed, they are generally averse to any discussion about the technical feasibility of the mass gassing claims, preferring to stick instead to the famous motto of the thirty-four French scholars who declared in 1979:¹⁹

"One should not ask how such a mass murder was technically possible.

It was technically possible because it happened."

The fact of the matter is that Kurt Gerstein, key witness to the alleged homicidal gassings at Bełżec, claimed that 700 to 800 victims were herded into a gas chamber with an area of 25m². Any moderately intelligent Holocaust historian or Holocaust propagandist naturally must realize that the best way to deal with "testimony" like that is to pass over it in discreet silence. To attempt to justify Gerstein's ridiculous assertions, as Muehlenkamp does, is not only to make a fool of oneself personally, but also to expose the total unreliability of Gerstein's report, thus dealing a devastating blow to the credibility of the official version of the Bełżec story. When Israeli Holocaust historian Yitzhak Arad quoted from the report in the well-known collective volume *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas* [National Socialist Mass Killings by Poisonous Gas], he had enough savvy to delete all references to the alleged capacity of the Bełżec "gas chambers."²⁰

¹⁸ Yitzhak Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka. The Operation Reinhard Death Camps*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 1987, p. 392-397.

¹⁹ "Il ne faut pas se demander comment, techniquement, un tel meurtre de masse a été possible. Il a été possible techniquement puisqu'il a eu lieu." *Le Monde*, 21 February 1979.

²⁰ Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl *et al.* (eds.), *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt 1983, pp. 171 f.

Raul Hilberg, who was undoubtedly the most competent of the Holocaust historians, understood this principle well, which is no doubt why he did not so much as acknowledge the existence of revisionists or revisionism in his standard work *The Destruction of the European Jews*.²¹ Jean-Claude Pressac, on the other hand, failed to heed the injunction of the thirty-four French historians, attempting to show over the course of two books that the alleged mass murder in the "gas chambers of Auschwitz" had indeed been technically possible.²² In doing so he merely succeeded in opening a breach in the wall of the exterminationist bunker, as revisionist scholars quickly pointed out the numerous fallacies in his reasoning.²³ The end of the story is well-known: Pressac was forced to make the most startling concessions to the revisionists and drastically reduced the death toll for the alleged "extermination camps."²⁴ Because of this unpardonable heresy, he fell out of grace with the powers that be, and when he passed away in 2003 at age 59, the media, which had hailed him as the nemesis of revisionism after the publication of his second book in 1993,²⁵ reacted with icy silence. Ironically, the only known obituaries commemorating him were written by three of his former adversaries, Robert Countess, Carlo Mattogno and myself.²⁶

The propagandists who run the website *Aktion Reinhard Camps* may be intellectually dishonest, but they are no common fools. Just as Yitzhak Arad, Raul Hilberg or the authors of the collective volume *Neue Studien*, they know better than to draw attention to the technical and logical absurdities of the Holocaust story, carefully hushing them up instead. They eschew any discussion about the historical accuracy of the official version of events, because they know only too well that such a discussion would open the proverbial can of worms. And yet our

²¹ Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 3 volumes, Homes and Meier, New York 1985.

²² Jean-Claude Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989. Jean-Claude Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz*, CNRS, Paris 1993.

²³ Robert Faurisson, "Bricolages et gazouillages à Auschwitz et Birkenau selon J. -C. Pressac," *Revue d'Histoire Révisionniste*, No. 3, November 1990. S. Verbeke (ed.), *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten*, Berchem 1995. Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity. A historical and technical study of Jean-Claude Pressac's "Criminal Traces" and Robert Jan van Pelt's "Convergence of Evidence"*, The Barnes Review, Washington 2010.

²⁴ Valérie Igounet, *Histoire du négationnisme en France*, Editions du Seuil, Paris 2000, p. 641.

²⁵ "Radio and TV talk shows analyzed its importance for hours. Pressac has been adopted as a hero by the French press and embraced by France's leftist intellectuals as the man who has proven that the Holocaust really happened." Sharon Waxman, "Speaking Terms: Europe's Left And Right Are Too Divided To Even Talk About It," *Chicago Tribune*, December 13, 1993, p. 1.

²⁶ *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, No. 3/2003, pp. 406-415.

would-be dragon slayers routinely do just that. This, and not the abusive language of Nicholas Terry or the obscenities of Roberto Muehlenkamp, is the real reason why orthodox historians and propagandists loathe the *Holocaust Controversies* blog, and even – as in the case of the *ARC* website – “caution all to avoid being misled by these individuals.”

4. The Tactics of the “Controversial Bloggers”

Almost any book of history is bound to contain some errors. If the author becomes aware of them, or if they are pointed out to him by friend or foe, he usually corrects them in the following edition, if there is one. It stands to reason that revisionist books constitute no exception to this rule.

The tactics used by the “Controversial Bloggers” are basically very simple: they search for mistakes in the books of their opponents – one mistake on page 82, a second on page 175, a third on page 243 – and then try to use these mistakes to discredit the book as a whole. A single example will be sufficient to illustrate this method.

In my 1999 critique of Raul Hilberg,²⁷ I erroneously stated that Hilberg had not adduced any reference for his claim that on October 12, 1941, the Germans shot 10,000 Jews at the cemetery of Stanisławów, Poland. As a matter of fact, Hilberg had indeed mentioned a (totally unreliable) source, the declarations of some self-styled “eyewitnesses.” My mistake, which was of course due to carelessness, prompted Nicholas Terry to write:²⁸

“Graf opted to omit the contents of the footnote on the same page and [to] claim no evidence was advanced. Therefore, Graf is an outright liar.”

But why on earth would I have “opted to omit the contents of the footnote”? The issue of the alleged Stanisławów shooting is not particularly important; had I not mentioned it at all, my critique of Hilberg would have lost nothing of its force. As a matter of fact, the embarrassment of having such an elementary mistake pointed out by an adversary clearly outweighs any benefit I could have hoped to derive from a deliberate deception.

Ironically, Terry twice commits similar errors when attacking me in

²⁷ Jürgen Graf, *Riese auf tönernen Füßen. Raul Hilberg und sein Standardwerk über den “Holocaust,”* Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 1999. English version: *The Giant with Feet of Clay. Raul Hilberg and his Standard Work on the “Holocaust,”* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2001.

²⁸ <http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com/2006/05/jrgen-graf-is-liar.html>.

his contribution to *Bełżec, Sobibór, Treblinka: Holocaust Denial and Operation Reinhard*. The first error concerns the person of Erich Bauer, the alleged “Gasmeister” of Sobibór. In the book about Sobibór written by Thomas Kues, Carlo Mattogno and myself,²⁹ I stated:

“What is the basis of these assertions [that Bauer had been the “Gasmeister”]? In the early accounts of witnesses about Sobibor, Erich Bauer is either not mentioned at all or mentioned only in passing. His name neither appears in the two Pechersky reports nor in the testimony of Leon Feldhendler – which lists, after all, 10 SS men by name. Zelda Metz has a total of seventeen names of SS men stationed at Sobibor, Bauer among them [the names of these 17 SS men are enumerated in my footnote 494, Bauer is the fifteenth on the list] but does not ascribe to any of them any specific crimes.” (pp. 172f.)

This does not prevent Terry from writing:

“Typically, Graf highlights Bauer’s absence in the testimony of one witness [Feldhendler] while omitting his inclusion in the next statement in his source [Metz].” (p. 76)

By his own standards, I am therefore entitled to call Terry “an outright liar”!

Then on page 150, Terry states:

“Graf doesn’t even manage to mention the word ‘ghetto’ once in The Giant with Feet of Clay.”

Had this splendid scholar bothered to read *The Giant with Feet of Clay* more carefully, he would have noticed that the word “ghetto” appears on no fewer than twenty pages of the book (pp. 10, 16-18, 38-42, 44, 55-57, 59, 65, 69, 107-109, 112) and as the title of a subchapter.³⁰

The same Nicholas Terry, for whom trivial errors are automatically “outright lies” when committed by revisionists even though he is guilty of more serious errors himself, does not shrink from slander. Twice, in June 2009 and in May 2011, Terry accused German revisionist Udo Walendy of being a brazen forger. In his journal *Historische Tatsachen* Walendy had reproduced in facsimile a clipping from the London-based Polish newspaper *Dziennik Polski* dated 11 July 1942, together with a German translation of the most important passages.³¹ According to the

²⁹ Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues, Carlo Mattogno, *Sobibor. Holocaust Propaganda and Reality*, The Barnes Review, Washington 2010.

³⁰ We include “ghettoization” per Terry’s complaint. The text of the book in the PDF file offered on VHO or HolocaustHandbooks.com is not searchable without the appropriate font installed. One rather suspects that what our academic sleuth’s research program consisted of was 1) download and open the PDF file, 2) type CTRL+F and enter the “ghetto” search string and 3) close the PDF afterwards, only to proceed to denounce what I “didn’t even manage” to do.

³¹ Udo Walendy, “Der Fall Treblinka,” *Historische Tatsachen*, no. 44, Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho 1990.

Dziennik Polski article, the Germans had already gassed large numbers of Jews at Treblinka. But as all Holocaust historians agree that the first transports arrived at Treblinka on 23 July 1942, twelve days *after* the publication of the article, the information conveyed by *Dziennik Polski* thus was necessarily false – a classic case of atrocity propaganda which throws light on the origins of the Treblinka myth.

On 19 June 2009, Terry wrote:³²

“I am looking forward to consulting a copy of Dziennik Polski for the relevant date at some point in the future and showing that this is an unequivocal example of denial forgery.”

Almost two years later, on 13 May 2011, our tireless researcher had still not got around to “consulting a copy of *Dziennik Polski* for the relevant date” – although that did not prevent him from repeating his attacks on Walendy. So a few months later, revisionist Thomas Kues finally took Terry to the woodshed: He obtained a copy of the Polish newspaper and showed that there had been no forgery at all. *Dziennik Polski* had indeed spoken of mass gassings at Treblinka nearly two weeks before the camp became operational.³³

Accusing a scholar of falsifying his sources is about the most serious charge one can levy against him. The fact that Terry had the effrontery to call Walendy a forger without any evidence to back up the accusation unmasks him as a unprincipled slanderer. His “error” is vastly worse than the one I had committed in the case of the alleged Stanisławów shooting because I did not accuse Hilberg of having falsified anything; I only made the (incorrect) claim that he had given no reference for a specific assertion.

³² <http://rodohforum.yuku.com/sreply/130194/Revisionists-proven-Udo-Walendy-forged-document-reply-130196>; now removed.

³³ www.inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2011/volume_3/number_3/a-premature_news_report.php

Chapter 1: The Insane Challenge

By Jürgen Graf

1.1. "The Falsehoods of Mattogno, Graf and Kues"

Curious to see how the *Holocaust Controversies* group would react when challenged to write a comprehensive critique of a revisionist study, I twice threw down the gauntlet to Roberto Muehlenkamp in recent years, first in October 2010, and again in June 2011, offering him the choice between several revisionist works. As I had received nothing from him by 5 December 2011, I stated in an article at that time that he had apparently "thrown in the towel."³⁴ This was a bit premature, however, for only three weeks later Muehlenkamp (or one of his fellow bloggers) sent me a large PDF text file entitled *Bełżec, Sobibór, Treblinka: Holocaust Denial and Operation Reinhard, A Critique of the Falsehoods of Mattogno, Graf and Kues*.³⁵ The authors were Jonathan Harrison, Roberto Muehlenkamp, Jason Myers,³⁶ Sergey Romanov and Nicholas Terry, and the objects of their critique were the following three books:

- Mattogno, Carlo, Jürgen Graf, *Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004 (henceforth: *Treblinka*)
- Mattogno, Carlo, *Bełżec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research and History*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004 (henceforth: *Bełżec*)
- Graf, Jürgen, Thomas Kues and Carlo Mattogno, *Sobibór: Holocaust Propaganda and Reality*, The Barnes Review, Washington 2010 (henceforth: *Sobibór*)

I confess that I was utterly amazed at the folly of these people and the delusional ambition of their project. After all, to refute our trilogy on the Aktion Reinhardt Camps would be tantamount to proving that Bełżec, Sobibór and Treblinka were indeed extermination camps where huge numbers of Jews were murdered in gas chambers. But even Raul Hilberg, whose knowledge of the wartime documents certainly was

³⁴ "A challenge to Dr. Christian Lindtner." <http://globalfire.tv/nj/12en/history/lindtner.htm>

³⁵ Jonathan Harrison, Roberto Muehlenkamp, Jason Myers, Sergey Romanov, Nicholas Terry, *Bełżec, 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.

³⁶ Apparently Yahweh in his infinite wisdom has recruited a fifth genius to assist the other four in their endeavor.

vastly greater than that of five “controversial bloggers” put together, had been unable to prove that so much as a single Jew had been gassed in any of these three camps, so how on earth could non-entities like Harrison, Muehlenkamp, Myers, Romanov and Terry honestly hope to succeed where the most knowledgeable of Holocaust historians had failed? Did they seriously believe they were better than Hilberg?

1.2. Notes on Three Errors

It is easy to imagine how frantically the five “controversial bloggers” must have looked for errors in our books, and it was to be expected from the outset that they would indeed find a few. With regard to my own writings, they were able to detect only a handful of genuine mistakes. Below I will restrict myself to commenting on three of these not addressed elsewhere: one from *Sobibór*, one from *The Giant with Feet of Clay* and one from my article “David Irving and the Aktion Reinhardt Camps.”

The first of these mistakes is pointed out by Nick Terry on p. 76 of the critique. In *Sobibór*, I had commented on the trial of Hubert Gomerski and Johann Klier, which took place in Frankfurt in 1950, stating that the proceedings were “accompanied by a massive campaign in the media still under Allied control.” (p. 179). To this Terry objects:

“In order to support his assertion, he [Graf] cites precisely one newspaper article from the Frankfurter Rundschau, a paper based in the same town as the trial was being held. This ‘massive campaign in the media’ evidently did not include either Die Zeit or Der Spiegel, neither of which ran a single story on the trial.”

Note taken; I should indeed have verified if the proceedings had been reported in other German media before speaking of “a massive campaign.”

The second error is pointed out by Jonathan Harrison on pp. 106f. On page 40 of *The Giant with Feet of Clay*, I had written that, according to Raul Hilberg, the “mobile killing unit” *Einsatzgruppe A* had killed 125,000 Jews up to 15 October 1941, the overwhelming majority of them between August and October. As *Einsatzgruppe A* only had 990 members, about 240 of them non-combatants, I concluded that for logistical reasons, this unit could not have killed 120,000 Jews within a mere two and a half months. But Hilberg explicitly states that *Einsatzgruppe A* was supported by other German units, plus local helpers. In the light of this fact, I am compelled to concede that the alleged

mass killings may indeed have been possible from a logistical point of view – which of course does not mean that they actually occurred.

A third mistake of mine is adduced by Nick Terry on pp. 221f. In my article “David Irving and the Aktion Reinhardt Camps”³⁷ (which Terry erroneously calls “an open letter to David Irving”), I had argued that a transport of 1,000 Warsaw Jews to Minsk on 31 July 1942 must by necessity have passed through Treblinka, “as the deportation of Jews from the Warsaw ghetto had commenced eight days before, and as everybody agrees that at that time all Warsaw Jews were deported to Treblinka.” Since about 11,000 deported Warsaw Jews did *not* go to Treblinka, this argument was not sound. As Terry notes on p. 221, I later acknowledged my error in a private Swedish language message to a correspondent in Sweden.

So *Holocaust Controversies* have once again proved that they are indeed capable of detecting a few isolated mistakes scattered over hundreds of pages of revisionist books and articles – something nobody ever doubted in the first place. But their aim is more ambitious by far. They want to prove that Belżec, Sobibór and Treblinka were indeed extermination centers, thus refuting the revisionist thesis that they were transit camps. Let us now take a look at the sources they use to achieve this goal.

1.3. The Sources of Our Opponents

At first sight, the text presented by our adversaries – 533 copiously annotated pages – looks impressive, but even a cursory reading shows that it contains a good deal of useless junk. Instead of concentrating on their avowed aim – the refutation of Mattogno, Graf and Kues – the five authors present an overall summary of the orthodox version of the fate of the Jews in Poland and the occupied Soviet territories. In order to show off their erudition and give their polemic a veneer of scholarship, they adduce a plethora of sources, quoting myriads of books, the majority of which I am pretty sure they have not read.

While the language of our opponents in *Belżec, Sobibór, Treblinka* is more temperate than on their blog (they mostly refrain from using obscene language, though on several pages Terry slips somewhat, giving a demonstration of his more usual intellectual level by using the word “bullshit” repeatedly and phrases such as “the Shits ‘n’ Giggles depart-

³⁷ Jürgen Graf, “David Irving and the Aktion Reinhardt Camps,” *Inconvenient History*, Volume 1, No. 2, 2009.

ment,” p. 60), their style is consistently overbearing and insolent. For this reason, they cannot expect us to handle them with kid gloves.

An analysis of the evidence the authors present to prove the alleged systematic extermination of the Jews reveals an appalling lack of critical spirit on their part. Being Holocaust fundamentalists, our opponents unquestioningly accept even the most spurious sources as long as these support their narrative. Not in a million years would they admit that certain documents might have been manipulated or fabricated, that certain confessions of “Nazi perpetrators” might have been obtained under duress, or that certain eyewitnesses might have lied. If the statements of a self-styled eyewitness are so crazy that even the Controversial Bloggers cannot pretend they are true, the latter conclude instead that the witness in question simply committed an excusable error. Referring to “witnesses” who claimed two or even three million victims for *each* of the three Reinhardt camps, our adversaries have the audacity to speak of “overestimates from disoriented survivors”! (p. 17)

Again and again, the Holocaust Controversies authors rely on demonstrably phony evidence to advance their claims. I could cite numerous examples, but I will confine myself here to three: arguments relating to the so-called Gerstein Report, the alleged massacre at Babi Yar and the imaginary *Erntefest* mass shooting at Majdnek.

1.3.1. The Gerstein Report

Since the bizarre “confessions” of the mentally deranged SS officer Kurt Gerstein have always been the cornerstone of the Belżec extermination camp myth, Holocaust orthodoxy has no choice but to portray the man as a credible witness – at least when his embarrassing role in the story cannot be elided altogether. And sure enough, Nicholas Terry, author of the first chapter of the book (“The Hoax That Dare Not Speak Its Name”), argues that it is “hard for deniers to explain” why Gerstein had given a “detailed description of the gas chambers at Belżec” (p. 70). Now, Terry may not have read Mattogno’s book about the Gerstein report³⁸ (because he could not find it in an English library, see p. 53), but surely he is familiar with Henri Roques’s magnificent analysis of the six different versions of the report,³⁹ which is amply sufficient to “make mincemeat” of this line of evidence, as Terry’s crony Sergey Romanov might put it. However, while Mattogno and Roques’s critiques are in-

³⁸ Carlo Mattogno, *Il rapporto Gerstein. Anatomia di un falso*, Sentinella d’Italia, Monfalcone 1985.

³⁹ André Chelain, *La thèse de Nantes et l’affaire Roques*, Polémiques, Paris 1989.

deed conclusive, simple common sense alone is all that's really needed to judge Gerstein's value as a witness. Not content with claiming that at Belzec 700 to 800 victims were crowded into a gas chamber with an area of 25 m², Gerstein also asserted that fully 20 million people had been gassed by the Nazis in total! And these are only two of the most salient absurdities in his "confessions." Taken as a whole, the report is about as credible as the confessions of medieval witches about their wild orgies with the devil. The fact that Terry is forced to quote this text as a reliable source shows the full extent of his despair. Whom but the uninformed can this third-rate historian hope to fool?

1.3.2. The Alleged Babi Yar Massacre

Of all the mass shootings allegedly perpetrated by the Germans and their local helpers on the Eastern Front, the Babi Yar massacre is the most notorious. On 29 September 1941, 33,711 Jews are said to have been killed at the Babi Yar ravine near Kiev. Predictably, Jonathan Harrison uncritically accepts the official version of Babi Yar in his chapter about the "Extermination of Soviet Jews, June 1941-March 1942." (p. 100)

Udo Walendy⁴⁰ and Herbert Tiedemann⁴¹ have documented the wild implausibility of the official version of Babi Yar. As just one example, the various "witnesses" to this alleged crime flagrantly contradict each other on the most basic issue of identifying the killing instrument: the victims were shot with rifles, or submachine guns, or slaughtered with bayonets, or buried alive, or blown up by mines, or squashed with tanks, or killed by means of lethal injections, or drowned in the Dnieper, or exploded by hand grenades, or had their heads crushed with rocks, or were suffocated in gas vans.⁴¹ Needless to say, none of these embarrassing discrepancies are mentioned by Harrison.

Had the Germans really murdered more than 33,000 Jews on the outskirts of Kiev on 29-30 September 1941, the Soviet government would have learned of this atrocity within days and immediately denounced it in the strongest terms. As it happens, the first official mention of the "massacre" came at an impossibly late date. On 6 January 1942, Soviet foreign minister V. Molotov stated that "a large number" of Jews had been stripped naked, beaten (!) and shot in the Jewish cem-

⁴⁰ Udo Walendy, "Babi Jar. Die Schlucht mit den '33,711 ermordeten Juden,'" *Historische Tatsachen*, no. 51, Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho 1992.

⁴¹ Herbert Tiedemann, "Babi Yar. Critical Questions and Comments," in Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd. ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 501-528.

etery of Kiev.⁴¹

So much for “eyewitness testimony.” What about forensic remains?

According to the official version of the Babi Yar story, the bodies of the victims were dug up and burned by the SS in September 1943, as the Red Army was approaching the Ukrainian capital, in order to destroy all evidence of the crime. If we are to believe the “witnesses,” this mass cremation action wrapped up just before the end of the month.⁴² Yet on September 26, the German Luftwaffe flew a reconnaissance mission over Kiev, taking aerial photographs of numerous parts of the city, including the district in which Babi Yar was located. In 1992, revisionist researcher John Ball obtained a copy of the Babi Yar photograph from U.S. archives, and published it. His commentary encapsulates what any objective observer can see from the photograph itself:⁴³

“1943 air photos of Babi Yar ravine and the adjacent Jewish cemetery in Kiev reveal that neither the soil nor the vegetation is disturbed, as would be expected if materials and fuel had been transported one week earlier to hundreds of workers who had dug up and burned tens of thousands of bodies in one month.”

However, it remains to be noted that the killing of 33,711 Jews near Kiev is indeed mentioned in one of the *Einsatzgruppen* reports.⁴⁴ So either the report is a forgery, or it is formally authentic but historically inaccurate. In either case, the report casts doubts on the authenticity, or veracity, of the *Einsatzgruppen* reports as a whole.

Does this mean that *no* Jews were shot near Kiev in late September 1941? Indeed it does not. As soon as German troops had occupied the Ukrainian capital on September 19, 1941, tremendous explosions rocked the city, and on 25 September a major fire caused widespread damage. Before long, mines had destroyed almost all public buildings, and hundreds of German soldiers and Ukrainian civilians had perished.⁴⁵ To this kind of terrorist activity the German military typically responded as occupying armies throughout history have responded to similar provocation: with reprisals. If shown hard evidence that two or three thousand Jews were indeed shot towards the end of September 1941, I would not be overly surprised. Since the Germans would not have wanted to alienate the local ethnic Ukrainians (many of whom had welcomed them as liberators from the “Jewish”-Communist yoke), ac-

⁴² According to the Nuremberg transcript, the witnesses Ostrovski & Co. made their escape on Sept. 29—with the implication that the cremation action had just finished (that’s why the SS was then allegedly shooting the work crews). IMT, vol. VII, p. 556.

⁴³ John Ball, *Air Photo Evidence*, Ball Ressource Service, Delta 1992, p. 108.

⁴⁴ 102-R.

⁴⁵ Herbert Tiedemann, “Critical Questions and Comments,” *op. cit.*

ording to the grim logic of war the local Jews would have emerged as the natural target of such reprisals.

In any case, crucial questions remain unanswered. If a certain number of Jews were indeed killed, and if the killing itself was indeed carried out at one location in Babi Yar, why do the various "eyewitness" reports allege such wildly differing – and absurd – killing methods? On the other hand, if reprisals were carried out at another location (and in fact, Babi Yar is not mentioned at all in the respective *Einsatzgruppen* report), why did the Soviets not identify the place of execution correctly? After all, in the absence of external observers to check their assertions, they could have claimed as many victims as they wanted either way.

1.3.3. The Imaginary "Erntefest" Slaughter

On 24 July 1944, the Majdanek concentration camp near Lublin, Poland, was overrun by the advancing Red Army. Three weeks later, a Polish-Soviet commission "ascertained" that no fewer than 1.5 million prisoners had been murdered in the camp. Subsequent research by Polish historians has since reduced this figure, however, first to 360,000 in 1948 and then to 235,000 in 1992.⁴⁶ Then, in 2005, Tomasz Kranz, head of the research department of the Majdanek Memorial Institution, caused a minor sensation by once more revising the number of victims downward, this time to 78,000.⁴⁷ Yet, as I have shown in an article first published in 2008, Kranz's figure is still too high by at least 28,000 deaths.⁴⁸ Furthermore, in the book about Majdanek which he co-authored with me and which first appeared in German in 1998, Carlo Mattogno came to the conclusion that about 42,200 prisoners had perished at Majdanek,⁴⁶ a figure which might actually be too low, though only by a few thousands.⁴⁸ So the orthodox historians, who had all the pertinent documents at their disposal from the beginning, had impudently and tenaciously lied for decades, while two "deniers," with limited resources, who had spent only several days in the Majdanek archives, came very close to the truth! It goes without saying that our five oppo-

⁴⁶ Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek. A Historical and Technical Study*, 3rd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2012, chapter 4.

⁴⁷ Tomasz Kranz, "Ewidencja zgonów i śmiertelność więźniów KL Lublin," in *Zeszyty Majdanka XXIII* (2005).

⁴⁸ Jürgen Graf, "Révision du nombre des victimes de Majdanek," *Sans Concession* No. 42-45 (September-December 2008). English translation: "Official Reductions of the Majdanek Death Toll" in: Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek, op. cit.* (note 46), pp. 260-274.

nents would rather bite off their tongues than acknowledge this embarrassing fact.

Kranz’s startling revision seriously undermined the credibility of the official history of the camp – assuming, that is, that it was ever credible in the first place. Obviously wanting to limit the damage, Kranz has tried to save the two central pillars of the “extermination camp” legend as regards Majdanek: the lie that there were homicidal gassings at the camp (in a later article he claims that 11,000 to 12,000 prisoners were killed⁴⁹) and the lie that 17,000 Jews, previously employed at armaments production sites, were shot there on 3 November 1943. Together with the alleged murder of 25,000 Jewish workers purportedly shot at two of Majdanek’s satellite camps, Poniatowa and Trawniki, on the same day, this invented massacre has inexplicably found its way into Holocaust mythology under the name “*Aktion Erntefest*” or “Operation Harvest Festival.” Predictably, Nicholas Terry wholeheartedly endorses this story (pp. 233f.)

A week before the alleged mass shooting, Oswald Pohl, chief of the SS Economic-Administrative Main Office (*Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungshauptamt*, or SS-WVHA), had sent the commandants of all concentration camps, including Majdanek, a directive. The text declared, in part:⁵⁰

“From nothing at all, we have created armaments production sites that are unparalleled anywhere. We must now do everything to ensure that our achievements to date are not only maintained, but constantly increased. Since the plants and factories are the vital aspects of this, this can only be achieved by maintaining and increasing the inmates’ capacity to work.”

This directive shows how desperately the German military industry needed workers, so how can any sane person seriously believe that the SS killed 42,000 of them just one week later without any reason? Needless to say, there is not a shred of documentary or material evidence corroborating the claim that such a massacre occurred; as so often, the whole story is based exclusively on “eyewitness reports.”

Ironically, official Polish historiography does not conceal the fact that sick prisoners were transferred to Majdanek from Auschwitz, both before and after the alleged “*Erntefest*” slaughter. For example, in the entry for 3 June 1943 in her *Auschwitz Chronicle*, Danuta Czech notes:⁵¹

⁴⁹ Tomasz Kranz, “Massentötungen durch Giftgas im Konzentrationslager Majdanek,” in G. Morsch, B. Perz (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 227.

⁵⁰ Archiwum Muzeum Stutthof, I-IB 8, p. 53.

⁵¹ Danuta Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau*

"542 male and 302 female inmates from Majdanek were transferred from Auschwitz to the concentration camp Lublin, Majdanek."

According to the same source, on 25 November 1943 "the registration was ordered of those inmates suffering from malaria who were quartered in the inmates' infirmary and the recovery blocks [of Auschwitz]; the malaria patients would be transferred to the Lublin camp (Majdanek)."⁵²

Auschwitz, one must remember, is supposed to have been the greatest of all the "extermination camps." Why then had the Auschwitz SS not killed these "useless eaters" on site by gassing or lethal injection, but instead decided to send them on to Majdanek – where they were not exterminated either?

Between 12 December 1943 and March 1944, transports of sick inmates continued to arrive in Majdanek from various other camps of the Reich.⁵³ Again, nobody claims these people were exterminated there. Apparently we got it all wrong: far from killing sick Jews and sparing healthy ones, the SS spared the invalids and shot the able-bodied! A truly revolutionary insight, is it not, Dr. Terry?

In the ninth chapter of our book about Majdanek, Carlo Mattogno quotes the "confessions" of Erich Mussfeldt, former chief of the Majdanek crematorium, who described in Polish captivity how the Jews were shot in three ditches near the crematorium building.⁵⁴ Mattogno summarizes the statement as follows:⁵⁵

"According to E. Mussfeldt, the killing began at 6 or 7 o'clock in the morning and ended around 5:00 p.m., so it could not have taken more than 11 hours. The Jews were liquidated in groups of ten. Assuming the executions took place in all three ditches simultaneously, this would indicate (17,000 : 30 =) 567 separate executions. Therefore each execution took (11 x 3,600 =) approximately 70 seconds. In this short time, the ten people making up each of the three groups had to climb down into the ditch and lie down on the bodies of their predecessors, to be shot in their turn. After the first few executions, the victims would literally have had to climb onto the corpses of the earlier victims."

Would this have been possible? Perhaps, but only if all went absolutely smoothly. What a pity that Mussfeldt did not tell his interrogators

1939-1945, Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek 1989, p. 511. English title: *Auschwitz Chronicle: 1939-1945*, Henry Holt, New York, 1997.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 663.

⁵³ Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, *op. cit.* (note 46), p. 65.

⁵⁴ Anna Zmijewska-Wisniewska, "Zeznania szefa krematorium Ericha Muhsfeldta na temat byłego obozu koncentracyjnego w Lublinie (Majdanek)," *Zeszyty Majdanka* no. I, 1965.

⁵⁵ J. Graf, C. Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, *op. cit.* (note 46), p. 217.

how long the SS and the Jews had practiced the procedure in order to get it right! Of course the whole story is nonsense: the Jews would have known that they had nothing left to lose and would have tried to escape or to set up resistance. Terry, who has read our book about Majdanek, is fully aware of this fact.

Woefully unable to counter Mattogno’s arguments, the British historian resorts in effect to changing the subject:

“Mattogno’s attempt at ‘debunking’ the massacres in his 1998 brochure [sic!] on Majdanek is fairly feeble in its grasp of the available sources. [...] Moreover, his total omission/ignorance of the parallel massacres at Trawniki and Poniatowa mean that we will simply send him back to the library and archives to deal with all the evidence rather than cherry-pick it.” (p. 234)

Had Mattogno and I written a book about “Operation *Erntefest*,” we would doubtless have studied the evidence for the “parallel massacres” as well, but our subject was Majdanek, and only one of the ten chapters of our book dealt with “*Erntefest*.” As the very idea that the Germans should have killed large numbers of desperately needed munitions workers is risible from the outset, and as the evidence which the Holocaust historians cite for the alleged mass killing at Majdanek is frankly preposterous, neither Mattogno nor I felt obliged to deal with Trawniki and Poniatowa. If the central part of a story is wildly implausible, there is no reason to assume that the secondary parts are any better.

The fact that the biggest mass shooting allegedly committed by the Germans in World War Two belongs to the realm of fantasy of course does not mean that *no* shootings of Jews, or non-Jews, took place (no serious revisionist has ever made such an outlandish assertion), but it should give pause to a “moderate revisionist” like Samuel Crowell, who in his interesting book *The Gas Chamber of Sherlock Holmes* rejects the gas chamber lie, but uncritically accepts the claim that “Nazi Germany” massacred (*i.e.*, shot) “millions” of Jews.⁵⁶

1.4. The Role of Auschwitz and the Reinhardt Camps in Orthodox and Revisionist Historiography

It has been said that the beginning of a book is the calling card of its author(s). So let us take a look at the calling card of the five authors of

⁵⁶ Samuel Crowell, *The Gas Chambers of Sherlock Holmes*, Nine-Banded Books, Charlestown 2011, p. xiv.

Belzec, Sobibór, Treblinka: Operation Reinhard and Holocaust Denial. Their "refutation" of Mattogno, Graf and Kues begins as follows:

"From the earliest days of their movement, Holocaust deniers have largely centered their arguments on the Auschwitz death camp. Surveying the literature which makes up so-called Holocaust Revisionism, the obsession [sic!] with Auschwitz is undoubtedly one of its defining features. Since the early 1990s, with the advent of the modern world-wide web, Holocaust deniers have taken to the internet to try and argue their case. Until recently, the ensuing online debates between advocates of Holocaust denial and their critics have likewise focused on Auschwitz. In 2005, there was even a formal debate on Auschwitz between several prominent Revisionists and their critics, hosted at the Real Open Debate on the Holocaust forum. Around the same time, however, a noticeable shift in Revisionist discourse began to make itself felt. After arguing for so long over Auschwitz, and losing those arguments in open court during the Irving vs. Lipstadt libel trial of 2000, deniers began to turn their attention to the so-called Aktion Reinhard camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka. Although these camps had been discussed in passing in many older Revisionist works, it was not until the mid-2000s that they became a veritable fixation for Holocaust deniers." (p. 6)

The assertion that the "deniers" began to turn their attention to the Reinhardt camps only "after arguing for so long over Auschwitz, and losing those arguments in open court during the Irving vs. Lipstadt libel trial of 2000" is ridiculous beyond description. Consider the following:

- David Irving is a brilliant historian of World War II, but he is definitely not an expert on the Holocaust. As a matter of fact, he has never written a scientific paper, much less a book about the subject.
- As I showed in my aforementioned article "David Irving and the Aktion Reinhardt Camps," Irving is not, and has never been, a technically informed, systematic revisionist. The only aspects of the official Holocaust story he disputes are the alleged gassings in the crematoria of Auschwitz I and Birkenau and the *Führerbefehl*.
- At the Irving vs. Lipstadt trial of 2000, Judge Charles Gray did not have to decide whether the Holocaust is a historical fact or not. This would have exceeded his competence. He only had to decide whether Lipstadt and Penguin books had defamed Irving by calling him a "Holocaust denier," and he decided that they had not.
- With regard to Auschwitz in particular, however, Gray nonetheless *did* exceed his competence as judge, pronouncing his opinion on what an "objective, fair-minded historian" should or should not

“have serious cause to doubt”:⁵⁷

“Having considered the various arguments advanced by Irving to assail the effect of the convergent evidence relied on by the Defendants, it is my conclusion that no objective, fair-minded historian would have serious cause to doubt that there were gas chambers at Auschwitz and that they were operated on a substantial scale to kill hundreds of thousands of Jews.”

In this respect, then, the Controversial Bloggers are certainly correct: Gray did in fact “rule” on Auschwitz. The problem lies in the implication that revisionism *in general* “[lost] those arguments in open court,” when the truth of the matter is that for the most part “those arguments” were never heard by the court at all. What the court heard instead were *Irving’s* arguments, and in defending himself from the charge of “Holocaust denial,” Irving found himself compelled to distance himself from precisely those expert revisionists – routinely defamed as “deniers” – who might have helped him win his case. The outcome of *Irving v. Lipstadt* may have been a defeat for one poorly informed historian with a bad legal strategy, but it was by no means a defeat for scientific revisionism.

- Finally, the implication that revisionists, having lost the argument about Auschwitz “in open court,” now have abandoned the field to their opponents and turned instead to the *Aktion Reinhardt* camps as a last resort, is utterly false. On the contrary, revisionists have handily answered the so-called argument from “convergent evidence” which Gray mentions in his judgment, most notably in Carlo Mattogno’s exhaustive critique of the “expert opinion” of Lipstadt star witness Robert Jan van Pelt.⁵⁸

In sum, then, revisionists have by no means lost the argument with regard to Auschwitz – quite the contrary – and in recently turning their attention to the *Aktion Reinhardt* camps they are not retreating but advancing.

It is, of course, undeniably true that revisionists initially concentrated their attention almost exclusively on Auschwitz, but this is easily explained by the fact that the exterminationists themselves centered their propaganda on that camp from the beginning, thus forcing their opponents to meet them on the battlefield of their own choice.

That Auschwitz quickly became the cornerstone of the Holocaust myth was natural for several reasons:

- a) After the end of the Second World War, Europe was literally teem-

⁵⁷ England and Wales High Court (Queen’s Bench Division), “Decision *David Irving v. Penguin Books Limited, Deborah E. Lipstadt*,” 13.91.

⁵⁸ Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity.op. cit.*.

ing with former Auschwitz inmates, and many of them were eager to describe their "miraculous survival," thus enabling the media to flood the world with a continuous stream of stultifying Auschwitz propaganda.

- b) Upon their capture of the camp, the Soviets seized vast numbers of documents left behind by the German administration. Among this wealth of documents, they found a few items which could be interpreted as a confirmation of the gas chamber and extermination claims, the most famous examples being Karl Bischoff's letter of 29 January 1943 in which he mentions a "Vergasungskeller" (gassing cellar).⁵⁹
- c) The Auschwitz camp fell into the hands of the Red Army almost intact, thus enabling the Polish communists to set up a memorial site where visitors could be shown through a sort of Holocaust House of Horrors, complete with a gate bearing the inscription "*Arbeit macht frei*," empty cans of a pesticide, piles of shoes and glasses, and other "irrefutable evidence" for a gigantic mass murder in chemical slaughterhouses.

With Bełżec, Sobibór and Treblinka, the situation was fundamentally different. There were relatively few "eyewitness reports"; only a handful of documents had survived; the Germans had destroyed the camps before their retreat. Under these circumstances, the three Reinhardt camps did not lend themselves for propaganda purposes as easily as Auschwitz. There was, to be sure, Kurt Gerstein's surrealistic report of a supposed gassing at Bełżec, and the media later did its best to promote the lurid fantasies of imposters like Jean-François Steiner, Martin Gray, Richard Glazar and Toivi Blatt, but overall the development of this part of the narrative was overshadowed by the vast output of Auschwitz-related propaganda.

From the very beginning, however, the Auschwitz lie was living on borrowed time. The same factors which made it so useful to the beneficiaries of the legend later enabled revisionists to debunk it:

- a) Many witnesses, such as Rudolf Höss and former members of the so-called crematorium *Sonderkommando* had described the alleged gassings in great detail. Sooner or later a skeptical researcher was bound to emerge who would study the technical literature about Zyklon B and compare it with the "eyewitness reports." This skeptical researcher was Robert Faurisson, who in the late 1970s was the first to point out the impossibilities of the alleged gassing procedure.

⁵⁹ Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, BW 30/34, p. 100.

- b) Far from corroborating the notion of a German extermination policy, the Auschwitz documents, which have gradually become accessible to revisionist historians, prove that there was no such policy:
- The *Sterbebücher* (Death Books) of Auschwitz, which the Russians made available to the Red Cross in 1990 and the data of which were published in printed form five years later,⁶⁰ show that Jewish children and elderly Jews were not “gassed upon arrival without registration” as official historiography claims, but were regularly registered at the camp.
 - The wealth of documents about medical assistance at Auschwitz⁶¹ categorically excludes the possibility of it having been an “extermination camp.” Valuable information about this aspect of the camp’s history can be gleaned even from orthodox Holocaust literature. For example, as Polish historian Henry Świebicki has shown, no fewer than 11,246 inmates underwent surgery at Auschwitz between 10 September 1942 and 23 February 1944 alone.⁶²
 - The deliveries of coke to the Auschwitz concentration camp are fully documented from a period ranging from February 1942 to October 1943: they amounted to 1,032.5 tons.⁶³ On average some 20 kg of coke are required for the incineration of a human body, which means that 51,625 bodies could be cremated at Auschwitz during the aforementioned period. As the *Sterbebücher* show, this figure corresponds almost exactly to the number of prisoners who died from February 1942 to October 1943. The only possible conclusion is that the SS did not plan to cremate the bodies of any hypothetical gassing victims.
 - Two German wartime documents quoted by Mattogno in one of his articles⁶⁴ prove that the corpses of prisoners who had died in the camp could be taken to the crematoria at any time. The inevitable conclusion is that the morgues of the crematoria were indeed in regular use *as* morgues and thus could not possibly have been used as homicidal gas chambers disguised as shower rooms.

⁶⁰ Staatliches Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau (ed.), *Sterbebücher von Auschwitz*, Saur, Munich 1995.

⁶¹ Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: Assistenza sanitaria, “selezioni” e “Sonderbehandlung” dei detenuti immatricolati*, Effepi, Genova 2010.

⁶² Staatliches Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau, *Auschwitz: Studien zur Geschichte des Konzentrations- und Vernichtungslagers*, Oświęcim 1999, p. 330.

⁶³ Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, D-AUI-4, Segregator 22, 22a.

⁶⁴ Carlo Mattogno, “Die Leichenkeller der Krematorien von Birkenau im Licht der Dokumente,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* No. 3, 4/2003.

c) According to the Holocaust story, *Leichenkeller* (morgue) 1 of Krematorium II at Auschwitz-Birkenau was the epicenter of the genocide. Robert J. van Pelt, for example, has claimed that as many as half a million people were gassed in this room which had an area of exactly 210 square meters.⁶⁵ (For the sake of comparison, during World War Two, 291,557 American soldiers were killed in action on all fronts.⁶⁶) But since *Leichenkeller* 1 has survived to the present in a relatively intact condition, it is possible to take samples from its walls and other surfaces for forensic testing. In pioneering research undertaken at great personal cost, revisionists Fred Leuchter and Germar Rudolf have shown that brick and mortar samples from the ruins, analyzed in independent laboratories, contain no relevant traces of the ferrocyanide compounds which would necessarily have formed if hydrogen cyanide gas had been regularly used in such an environment. Furthermore, as Germar Rudolf,⁶⁷ Brian Renk⁶⁸ and Carlo Mattogno⁶⁹ have demonstrated, the holes in the ceiling of *Leichenkeller* 1 never existed through which the poison-bearing Zyklon B pellets were allegedly introduced into the gas chamber. The gassing of the Jews in *Leichenkeller* 1 literally is a "murder" without a murder weapon.

For all practical purposes, the Auschwitz gassing myth was decisively debunked by 1994 with the publication of the important collective volume *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*.⁷⁰ This did not mean that no further research about Auschwitz was necessary, of course, but it did allow revisionist researchers to begin devoting more of their time and energy to the study of the other alleged "extermination camps." In late 1995, during our second visit to the newly opened archives in Moscow, Carlo Mattogno and I decided to write a book about Treblinka. We later modified our plans and tackled Majdanek first because it was a much easier subject; Treblinka would come next, followed by Bełżec and Chelmno

⁶⁵ Robert J. van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis 2002, pp. 68, 458, 469.

⁶⁶ John Whiteclay-Chambers II et al., *The Oxford Companion to American Military History*. Oxford Uni. Press, New York City 1999, p. 849. cf. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_military_casualties_of_war

⁶⁷ Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003.

⁶⁸ Brian Renk, "Convergence or Divergence? On Recent Evidence for Zyklon Introduction Holes at Auschwitz-Birkenau Crematory II," *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 33-51.

⁶⁹ Carlo Mattogno, "Keine Löcher, keine Gaskammern," *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* No. 3/2002, pp. 284-304; extended in Engl.: "No Holes, No Holocaust," *The Revisionist* No. 4/2004, pp. 387-436.

⁷⁰ Ernst Gauss (ed.), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1994. Enlarged English translation: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 41).

(studied by Mattogno alone) and Sobibór (studied by the two of us, together with Thomas Kues, who had previously written several carefully researched articles about this camp).

In my introduction to *Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?* I stated:

“An historian who wishes to check with scientific methods the picture of the four ‘pure extermination camps’ [the three Reinhardt camps plus Chelmno] sees himself confronting a far more difficult task than a researcher who has set himself the same goal with respect to Auschwitz and Majdanek. The latter can study the documents of the camp administration, which are available in great number; he can examine the quarters – some of these preserved in undamaged condition, others in ruins – which according to the prevailing notion served as gas chambers for killing human beings, to see whether their structure was suited for this function and whether the crematoria were capable of turning into ashes the number of bodies claimed. All of these possibilities are denied to the historian of the ‘pure extermination camps.’” (Treblinka, p. 10)

No doubt it is for those very same reasons that the *Holocaust Controversies* bloggers have chosen to challenge the revisionists on the subject of the Reinhardt camps, not Auschwitz or Majdanek. Indeed, attempting to refute Mattogno’s *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity* or Graf and Mattogno’s *Concentration Camp Majdanek* would have been the height of folly on their part. As far as Auschwitz and Majdanek are concerned, the exterminationist position is hopeless from the beginning, and the authors of *Holocaust Controversies* are fully aware of this fact.

1.5. The Alleged Revisionist “Conspiracy Theory”

At the beginning of his chapter “The Hoax that dare not speak its Name,” Nicholas Terry writes:

“From its inception, Holocaust Revisionism has repeatedly asserted that we have been lied to about the fate of European Jewry at the hands of the Nazis. However much it might be denied by some contemporary negationists, Holocaust denial is unthinkable without some form of conspiracy theory.” (p. 38)

With his usual dishonesty, Terry here presents a straw man version of the revisionist thesis. Of course nobody in possession of his mental faculties would seriously claim that the officially accepted Holocaust story is the product of a conspiracy in which the participants all agreed to suppress the truth and promote instead a falsified version of events agreed upon in advance. To refute Terry’s nonsensical insinuation, I

will shortly recapitulate how the legend really originated.

It is a well-known aphorism that the first casualty of war is truth. In World War One, British atrocity mongers accused the Germans of cutting off the hands of Belgian children, crucifying enemy soldiers on church doors and distilling glycerin from the bodies of their own dead soldiers.⁷¹ After the end of the war, this primitive propaganda against the "Huns" was discontinued. It was no longer needed.

In 2002 and in early 2003, the Bush and Blair regimes in the U.S. and U.K. spread the lie that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction in order to justify their imminent war of aggression against a country which in reality could not possibly threaten them. A few months after the occupation of Iraq, Saddam's "weapons of mass destruction" were forgotten.

In September 1939, the Germans conquered the western half of Poland, a country which was home to numerous large Jewish communities; in the summer of 1941, they overran the previously Soviet-occupied eastern half as well. Since the Germans had plenty of guns and the Jews had very few, the Jews were unable to resist the increasingly harsh measures imposed by the Germans (ghettoization, confinement in concentration camps, conscription for forced labor) which made their lives miserable and indeed provoked the deaths of large numbers of them. In order to mobilize world opinion against the tormentors of their people, Jewish underground movements in Poland soon began spreading all kinds of mind-boggling stories about the extermination of their co-religionists whom the Germans allegedly were murdering by electricity, steam, gas and other exotic means. The *Holocaust Controversies* bloggers make a futile attempt to explain away these embarrassing contemporary reports about electrocution facilities and steam chambers and the like as simple "inaccuracies," "wartime hearsay" and "Chinese whispers" (p. 16), but this explanation does not hold water for a minute. In order to "make mincemeat" of this theory (to use Sergey Romanov's charming formulation), it suffices to recall the lengthy report about the "steam chambers" of Treblinka published by the resistance movement of the Warsaw ghetto on 15 November 1942. I will quote merely an excerpt:⁷²

"Now comes the last act of the Treblinka tragedy. The terrified mass of

⁷¹ Arthur Ponsonby, *Falsehood in Wartime*, George Allen and Unwin, 1928.

⁷² Krystyna Marczevska, Władysław Ważniowski, "Treblinka w świetle Akt Delegatury Rzządu du na Kraji," (Treblinka in the Light of the Files of the Delegation of the Government of the Polish Republic for the Nation) in: *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce*, volume XIX, Warsaw 1968, pp. 136 f.

men, women and children starts on its last road to death. At the head a group of women and children is driven, beaten by the accompanying Germans, whips in their hands. The group is driven ever quicker, ever heavier blows fall upon the heads of the women who are mad with fear and suffering. [...] The floors of the chambers are slippery. The victims slip and fall, and they cannot get up for new numbers of forcibly driven victims fall upon them. The chief throws small children into the chamber over the heads of the women. When the execution chambers are filled, the doors are hermetically closed and the slow suffocation of people begins, brought abroad by the steam issuing from the numerous vents in the pipes. At the beginning stifled cries penetrate to the outside; gradually they quiet down and minutes later the execution is complete.”

According to another passage in the report, two million (!) Jews had already been killed in the steam chambers of Treblinka, and the Germans were preparing to exterminate the entire Polish population as well in those very same chambers!

In 1944, a Geneva-based rabbi, Adolf Abraham Silberschein, published another lengthy report about Treblinka, which he chose to christen “Tremblinki.”⁷³ As the pious rabbi was apparently not too sure about the killing method used at “Tremblinki,” he opted for a creative synthesis: On the one hand, he spoke of “gas chambers,” while on the other hand he stated that the bodies of the victims, “under the influence of the water vapor,” became clumped together. I will now quote some excerpts from his “report”:

“Every day groups of a thousand people were brought into the gas and oven chambers. [All historians agree that there were no crematoria ovens at Treblinka.] At first, as at their arrival, they were lead into the bath by the Kapos. Everyone had to take off clothing and shoes and remained naked. For the further deception of the victims, each was handed a little piece of soap. [...] Hauptmann Sauer took them over in the reception room of the extermination facilities. [...] He did not miss any opportunity to flog every single person. [If groups of a thousand people were brought to “Tremblinki” every day, and if Sauer flogged every single victim, he must have been in enviable physical shape! More pertinently, he would have made nonsense of the alleged deception of telling the Jews they were going to take a shower.] The extermination cells all fill up. When they are full, they are hermetically sealed, from every side the pipes open out of which flows gas. The death of asphyxiation reaps a quick harvest. Then the Kapos must go to work. With pitiless blows, the guard personal force them to perform the work. The gates of death open – but the dead bodies somehow cannot be pulled out individually, for they have all clumped together with one an-

⁷³ Adolf Abraham Silberschein, *Die Judenausrottung in Polen*, Geneva 1944, vol. 3.

other and stiffened under the water vapor. [...] But the camp of Tremblinki had another specialty: To wit, the Jewish Arthur Gold Orchestra gave concerts there, and it had the duty of playing for those who were been lead to their deaths!!!! At the same time as thousands of Jews were poisoned in the gas chambers, the musicians had to play cheerful melodies. Whichever of them refused to do it was hanged up by his feet with his head down."

By claiming that the authors of such ridiculous reports, which Matogno and I extensively quote in *Treblinka*, were acting in good faith and merely committed an excusable error by relying on "wartime hearsay," our opponents once again make fools of themselves. As a matter of fact, such reports were classic examples of coarse atrocity propaganda; they were obvious *hoaxes*. The "Chinese whisper" theory also fails to explain why the Soviet commission which visited Treblinka in late August 1944 and questioned twelve former inmates of the camp "ascertained" that "three million people" (!) had been killed by pumping the air out of the chambers (!).⁷⁴

Starting in December 1941, the reports concocted by various Jewish underground movements were forwarded to Jewish organizations all over the world. The fact, however, that the press in the Allied nations did not give repeated frontpage coverage of the allegedly ongoing mass slaughter,⁷⁵ if at all, indicates to what extent the Jewish leaders in these nations believed these grotesque tales. They were much too intelligent to take them at face value.

After the war, however, the victors decided to maintain and even extend their wartime extermination propaganda, because unlike the horror stories of World War I and the lies about Iraqi weapons of mass destruction they were still very useful to the interested parties:

- Zionist Jews with influence in international media and political circles naturally understood that the Holocaust tale would give them the status of a martyr nation, victim of a crime of unprecedented magnitude. Henceforth anybody critical of organized Jewry, its aims and its methods could automatically be castigated as a "vile anti-semitic" eager to perpetrate a new Holocaust. This muzzling of dissenting voices in turn made possible the anachronistic creation of the modern state of Israel in 1948. At that time, Britain had just granted independence to India, and dozens of other Asian and African territories were striving ever harder to shed the white man's rule. Yet at

⁷⁴ Gosudarstvenny Arkhiv Rossiskoy Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation), Moscow, 7021-115-9, p. 108.

⁷⁵ See Laurel Leff, "News of the Holocaust: Why FDR Didn't Tell and the Press Didn't Ask," http://varianfry.org/documents_english/leff_fdr_press.pdf

the very moment of worldwide de-colonization, the Zionists were permitted to launch a new colonial venture in the Near East, one with terrible consequences for the Palestinian people. Israel’s former ambassador to the United Nations, Abba Eban, made no secret of the fact that the Holocaust had been instrumental to the foundation of the Zionist entity.⁷⁶

“One reason of this really stupendous victory was without the faintest doubt the Shoah. The memory of the genocide was still alive.”

- Despite the animosity which has always characterized Polish-Jewish relations, the Poles also stood to benefit from the Holocaust hoax. After all, Poland had annexed huge tracts of German territory at the end of the war and brutally expelled the overwhelming majority of their ethnic-German population. In order to justify this crime against humanity, the Poles thus needed an even more heinous German crime to point to – the Holocaust. However, if the Holocaust story was to be widely believed, it had to be given a minimum of coherence. As it was simply not credible that the Germans should have used a wide array of outlandish, if not unfeasible killing methods in their “extermination camps,” – the steam chambers, subterranean electrocution installations, etc. – they were eventually relegated to the memory hole and replaced by homicidal gas chambers using poison gas.
- And for the Western Allies and the Soviet Union the Jewish extermination tale was of great utility as well, for it enabled them to hush up their own crimes, such as the indiscriminate fire-bombing of German cities and the Katyn massacre. Thanks to the Holocaust story, Stalin was able to take on the role of a savior who had freed half of Europe from a tyranny even more cruel than his own. More importantly, the victorious powers could use the Holocaust myth to prevent any resurgence of German nationalism. It allowed them to poison the German people with a collective guilt complex which rendered Germans unable to defend their national interests.

As we can see, then, no “conspiracy theory” is needed to explain the birth of the Holocaust myth and its survival after 1945. Rather, the “hoax,” as Arthur Butz memorably dubbed it in his seminal 1976 study *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*,⁷⁷ was born from the exigencies of wartime propaganda, but has since been perpetuated because it serves the converging interests of various national and transnational parties

⁷⁶ Quoted in *Sans Concession*, No. 67-70, October 2011, p. 15.

⁷⁷ Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Historical Review Press, Brighton 1976.

which have both the will and the means to enforce its acceptance by the public. In an excellent recent article, “The Non-Jewish stake in the Holocaust mythology,”⁷⁸ revisionist Paul Grubach outlines numerous reasons why the hoax continues to be tenaciously defended even six and a half decades after the end of the Second World War.

1.6. The Overwhelming Absurdity of the Official Version of Events

The official version of what transpired at the Reinhardt camps can be summarized in a few sentences:

Bełżec, Sobibór and Treblinka were “pure extermination camps.” Except for a handful of *Arbeitsjuden* needed to keep the camps running and some small groups of Jews redirected to Majdanek or smaller labor camps in the Lublin district, all Jews deported to these three camps were immediately gassed with engine exhaust fumes without prior registration, regardless of whether they were able-bodied or not. Since there were no crematoria at the Reinhardt camps, the bodies of the gassing victims had to be burned in the open air, most of them after previous burial.

Numerous points can be made to show the absurdity of this account, as indeed will become clear over the course of this volume. For now, however, we need consider only two.

1.6.1. The Alleged Extermination of Able-Bodied Jews

Numerous German documents, many of which Mattogno and I quote in our books on the camps, prove that German industry was in constant and desperate need of manpower during the war. A single example will suffice here. On 28 December 1942, alarmed at the high levels of mortality among camp inmates due to epidemic disease, Richard Glücks, Chief of the Concentration Camp Inspectorate of the SS-WVHA, sent a circular to all concentration camps commandants making them personally responsible for maintaining inmates in a condition fit for work. Glücks declared:⁷⁹

“The First Camp Physicians are to use all means at their disposal to effect a considerable decrease in the mortality in the individual camps. [...]

⁷⁸ www.inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2010/volume_2/number_1/non_jewish_stake_in_holocaust_mythology.php

⁷⁹ NO-1523.

The Reichsführer-SS has ordered that mortality absolutely must decrease”

So how can any reasonable person believe that the Germans were stupid enough to kill hundreds of thousands of valuable workers? In this context, we should remember that, even according to the orthodox version of events, able-bodied Jews were *not* exterminated at Auschwitz. And yet at the so-called Aktion Reinhardt camps few able-bodied Jews are said to have survived the alleged selection and extermination processes. No Holocaust historian has ever been able to explain this glaring contradiction.

1.6.2. The Missing Crematoria

“Normal” concentration camps such as Buchenwald and Dachau, for which no mass killings are alleged today, were equipped with crematoria for the disposal of the bodies of detainees who had died while in custody, but inexplicably the SS forgot to install crematoria at the “pure extermination camps” where they would have been far more urgently needed. Consequently, one and a half million corpses allegedly had to be burned with primitive manual means in the open air, nearly half a million of them in winter!⁸⁰

Rather than rejecting this insult to sound human reason, our opponents at *Holocaust Controversies* wholeheartedly endorse it as part of their narrative. Who is being unreasonable?

1.6.3. The Genesis of the Alleged Gas Chambers

The craziest aspect of the officially sanctioned version of events, however, is its explanation for the genesis of the alleged gas chambers at the *Aktion Reinhardt* camps. To illustrate this point, I can do no better than quote what Carlo Mattogno wrote on the subject in *Sobibór*:

“The Encyclopedia of the Holocaust wants to make us believe that the SS had to envisage ‘the killing of the 2,284,000 Jews then living in the five districts of the General Government’ as part of Aktion Reinhardt. To realize this objective, the SS planners are said to have built a single extermination camp – Belżec – with a gassing installation absolutely ridiculous in view of its task: three gas chambers having a total of 96 square meters. [...]

At Sobibór, which was built to overcome the deficiencies of Belżec, the

⁸⁰ The bodies of 434,000 Jews allegedly killed at Belzec, where cremation is said to have commenced in December 1942, plus the bodies of some tens of thousands of Jews allegedly murdered at Sobibor.

SS likewise set up three gas chambers, but they were even smaller, 36 square meters altogether, or, if we follow the sentence of the Sobibór trial at Hagen, three chambers each 4 by 4 meters, or 48 square meters altogether!

Only slowly and painfully the SS is said to have realized that 'the gas chambers turned out to be too small, the 'output' of the Sobibór camp was too low,' and hence they ostensibly decided to build another three chambers of the same size, 4 by 4 meters, to reach a total of 96 square meters. [...]

At Treblinka, the last of the claimed eastern extermination camps to be set up and said to have been built on the experience gained at Belżec and Sobibór, the same mistake was made again: once again three small gas chambers are claimed, 4 by 4 meters = 16 square meters each, with altogether 48 square meters, exactly like those at Sobibór, which had turned out to be too small! And, as at Belżec, the first gas chambers were replaced by 'six or ten' (!) new chambers, 8 by 4 meters each. Furthermore, to make things even more absurd, the old gas chambers at Belżec were torn down instead of being left intact or repaired in order to ensure a higher extermination capacity. [...]

Hence SS-Obersturmführer Richard Thomalla who is said to have built all three alleged extermination camps of Aktion Reinhardt, one after another, would have been a perfect fool, if one were to follow mainstream Holocaust historiography, and even more so Wirth and Globocnik, who had ordered him to do the work. Actually, it is mainstream Holocaust history which is wearing the fool's cap." (pp. 260-262)

Indeed! Had the National Socialists really tried to implement their alleged genocidal objectives in the way summarized by Mattogno, they would have been the biggest cretins since the extinction of the Neanderthal man. But then they would of course have lost the war on the very first day.

Together with the paucity of documents and the absurdity of the eyewitness reports, the inanity of this account of the genesis of the alleged Aktion Reinhardt gas chambers is undoubtedly the reason why very few Holocaust historians have wanted to deal with these camps in detail. In the first chapters of both *Treblinka* and *Sobibór*, I present a survey of the existing literature about these camps, showing that the few works with any pretense to scholarship are all based on phony sources and that the bunglings of brazen liars are accepted as classics of the Treblinka and Sobibór literature. Predictably our Controversial Bloggers make no attempt to refute this assessment, unless of course one considers the one sentence which they devote to my survey of the literature a "refutation":

“While Graf assumes that writing pot shots and snarky comments against memoirists and historians about the camps count as proper literature reviews, he is sadly mistaken.” (p. 13.)

In reality, to pretend that the works of these “memoirists” and “historians” have any merit is a bit too much even for our five intrepid bloggers. How could anybody claim to discern a taste of authenticity in the books of a Vasily Grossman or a Stanislaw Szmajzner? How could anybody justify a brazen forger like Yitzhak Arad who in his “standard work” on the camps impudently falsifies the report of the Jewish resistance movement from 15 November 1942, replacing the embarrassing “steam chambers” at Treblinka with “gas chambers”?⁸¹ As I stressed in *Sobibór*, the only orthodox historian of the *Aktion Reinhardt* who deserves some respect is Jules Schelvis, but even he is unable to prove in his book about the camp that a single Jew was ever gassed at Sobibór.

Our five would-be dragon slayers think they can do better, of course. However, as “refuting Mattogno, Graf and Kues” is tantamount to defending the official version of the Reinhardt camps story, riddled as it is with contradictions and absurdities, they face an unenviable task. There is no middle course: the three Reinhardt camps were so small that they could only have ever accommodated a tiny fraction of the nearly 1.5 million Jews deported to them, so they must by necessity have been *either* extermination camps, as the orthodox historians claim, *or* transit camps, as the revisionists claim; *tertium non datur*. But if they hope to prove that Belżec, Sobibór and Treblinka were in fact extermination camps, the Controversial Bloggers necessarily will have to contend with all the absurdities which orthodox historiography relies on for its “evidence” in this connection, including the ridiculous story about the genesis of the gas chambers.

Let us now see how Jonathan Harrison, Roberto Muehlenkamp, Jason Myers, Sergey Romanov and Nick Terry handle this task. The results of their endeavors will show once and for all whether the official story of the *Aktion Reinhardt* gassings can be saved by our daring bloggers, or whether it too, like the myth of Auschwitz, remains doomed to end on the scrapheap of history – and Yahweh cheated us by sending out five clowns.

⁸¹ Y. Arad, *Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka, op. cit.*, pp. 354 f.

Chapter 2: Scope and Significance of the Present Study

By Carlo Mattogno

2.1. The Adversaries and Their Credentials

Jürgen Graf has been a revisionist since the early 1990s. He is the author of many studies, the most important of which, totalling well over 900 pages, are:

- *Der Holocaust auf dem Prüfstand. Augenzeugenberichte versus Naturgesetze.* Guideon Burg Verlag, Basel, 1992;
- *Auschwitz. Tätergeständnisse und Augenzeugen des Holocaust.* Neue Visionen GmbH, Verlag, Würenlos, 1994;
- *Riese auf tönernen Füßen. Raul Hilberg und sein Standardwerk über den "Holocaust."* Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings, 1999;
- *Krach mirowogo porjadka (The Collapse of the Global Order),* Moscow, 2008.

He has also written numerous articles, the most important of which are available for consultation at <http://juergen-graf.vho.org/>.

Thomas Kues has dedicated himself to revisionism since 2007. He is the author of many articles, including:

- "Evidence for the Presence of 'Gassed' Jews in the Occupied Eastern Territories" (ongoing article series in the *Inconvenient History* online journal);
- "The Maly Trostenets 'Extermination Camp' — A Preliminary Historiographical Survey," *Inconvenient History*, vol. 3 (2011), nos. 1 and 2.
- "Tree-Felling at Treblinka," *Inconvenient History*, vol. 1 (2009), no. 2.
- "The Alleged First Gas Chamber Building at Sobibór" (<http://codoh.com/library/document/654>);
- "On Rudolf Höss' alleged visit to Treblinka" (<http://codoh.com/library/document/652>).

His principal line of research is far removed from mere "negationism," incidentally, since he attempts to reconstruct, within the limits of the available sources, the fate of the Jews deported to the East.

Graf and myself [C. Mattogno], together or separately, have visited the following former German concentration camps, or their locations:

- Auschwitz-Birkenau,

- Buchenwald,
- Chełmno,
- Dachau,
- Gusen,
- Mauthausen,
- Gross-Rosen,
- Lublin-Majdanek,
- Stutthof,
- Płaszów,
- Bełżec,
- Sobibór,
- Treblinka,
- the ex-ghetto of Terezín
- and Fort IX at Kaunas.

Together or separately, we have accessed the following archives:

- Archives of Dachau Concentration Camp
- Federal Archives at Koblenz
- State Archives at Weimar
- Municipal Archives of Erfurt
- Archives of the Stutthof Museum
- Archives of the State Museum of Gross-Rosen, Wałbrzych
- State Archives of Katowice
- Archives of the State Museum of Majdanek
- Provincial State Archives of Lublin
- Archives of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau
- Archives of the Central Commission for the Investigation of Crimes against the Polish People National Memorial, Warsaw
- State Archives of the Russian Federation, Moscow
- Russian State War Archives, Moscow
- Federal Security Office of the Russian Federation, Moscow
- State Institute for War Documentation, Amsterdam
- State Military Archives, Prague
- Archives of the Ministry of the Interior of the Czech Republic, Prague
- Archives of the Jewish State Museum, Prague
- Archives of the Terezín Monument
- Central State Archives of the Slovak Republic, Bratislava
- National Slovak Archives
- National Historical Archives of Belarus in Minsk
- Central State Archives of Lithuania, Vilnius

- National Archives of Hungary, Budapest.
- State Archives of Łódź
- State Archives of the District of Lwów.

We have received documents from a number of institutions, including:

- Deutsches Patentamt, Berlin
- Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen, Ludwigsburg
- Institut für Zeitgeschichte, München
- Staatsarchiv Nürnberg, Nürnberg
- Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, Paris
- Swiss Federal Archives, Bern
- National Archives, Washington D.C.
- Yivo Institute for Jewish Research, New York
- Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, New York
- Public Record Office (now within The National Archives), Kew
- The Jewish Museum, London
- Wiener Library, London
- Studium Polski Podziemnej, London
- Imperial War Museum, London
- Yad Vashem, Jerusalem
- State Archives of Israel, Jerusalem
- Friedman Archives, Haifa
- Riksarkivet, Stockholm.

That our research interest was initially concentrated on Auschwitz is not due to any sort of “obsession” with the camp, but rather to the obvious fact that Auschwitz was considered at that time the “center” of the Holocaust, and because relatively large quantities of documentation exist about that camp. Based on the substantial documentary material I gathered there, I have authored a series of systematic studies on essential aspects of the history of the Auschwitz complex, totalling approximately 3,300 pages:

- *The Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005;
- *Auschwitz: The First Gassing. Rumor and Reality*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005; 2nd. ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2012;
- *Auschwitz: Crematorium I and the Alleged Homicidal Gassings*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005;
- *The Bunkers of Auschwitz. Black Propaganda versus History*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2004;

- *Special Treatment in Auschwitz. Origin and Meaning of a Term.* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2004;
- *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations.* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005;
- *Auschwitz: assistenza sanitaria, "selection" e "Sonderbehandlung" dei detenuti immatricolati.* Effepi, Genova, 2010;
- *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations.* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005;
- *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity. A historical & technical study of Jean-Claude Pressac's Criminal Traces and Robert Jan van Pelt's Convergence of Evidence,* 2 vols., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010;
- *I forni crematori di Auschwitz. Studio storico-tecnico con la collaborazione del dott. ing. Franco Deana.* 2 vols., Effepi, Genoa, 2012.

Over the course of years of research, conducted with limited resources and at great personal sacrifice, Graf and I collected a wealth of documentation on the former concentration camps of Lublin-Majdanek and Stutthof as well, material corroborated by careful inspection of the installations of the camps themselves. Based on this documentation, we have co-authored the following studies:

- *Concentration Camp Majdanek: A Historical and Technical Study.* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2003; 2nd. ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2012, and
- *Concentration Camp Stutthof and its Function in National Socialist Jewish Policy.* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2003.

All the books mentioned above offer an abundant harvest of material (documents, testimonies, photographs, material comparisons) which had previously been unknown or ignored, so that dismissing this material out of hand as simply "negationist" makes no sense.

From a strictly revisionist (*i.e.*, critical) point of view, the search for documents was dictated by the observation that, as regards the question of the alleged homicidal gas chambers, "justified confidence" in Holocaust historiography is inversely proportional to the documentation examined; that is, the greater and the richer the documentation, the more difficult it is to demonstrate the (presumed) existence of homicidal gas chambers and the easier it becomes to refute the related arguments for their existence. This is also true of the orthodox arguments critical of revisionism: the greater and the richer the documentation, the more trifling the arguments of our exterminationist critics. The most obvious demonstration of this pattern is seen in the examples of Auschwitz,

Majdanek and Stutthof.

The reason for the pattern itself lies in the fact that it is more difficult to systematically distort a huge mass of documents which, precisely because of their abundance, usually permit an effective understanding of the events they relate to. In addition, it is equally difficult to refute a genuine convergence of documentary evidence.

On the other hand, where the documentation is nearly non-existent, as for the “Aktion Reinhardt” camps, Holocaust-related “reconstruction” is necessarily conjectural, based almost exclusively on testimonies. Even if a pretense of “material evidence” is subsequently raised by proponents of the exterminationist thesis, this turns out to be, upon critical investigation, simply smoke and mirrors.

Over the course of our research, Graf and I did not neglect to examine whatever materials existed in relation to these camps, sparse as they are; we also found testimonies, reports and a variety of other elements which had previously been unknown or ignored. This research resulted in three books, one each for the three principal “Aktion Reinhardt” camps (the fourth being Lublin-Majdanek):

- *Bełżec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004;
- *Treblinka. Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?* Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2004;
- *Sobibór. Holocaust Propaganda end Reality*, written in collaboration with T. Kues, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010.

These three works total more than 900 pages.

Our critics, in extreme terms, accuse us of faking our findings. They claim, in fact, to have unmasked the so-called “Falsehoods of Mattogno, Graf and Kues,” as stated in the subtitle to their book.

But can one seriously believe that Graf and I spent fifteen years of our lives in exhausting travel, at great personal sacrifice (which in Graf’s case, as is well known, involved serious disruption to his personal and professional life), in order to write thousands of pages with the intention simply to “falsify” history? In the realm of reasonable possibility invoked by our critics, is it not at least more *probable* that our intentions were honest? That we were motivated by the desire to ascertain the truth, or to approximate the truth insofar as possible, or – as the great French revisionist Robert Faurisson would say – by a desire for *akribéia*? If we had really wished to falsify history, we would not have undertaken exhausting journeys in search of documents, but would have rather simply copied the sources from existing literature, as the “contro-

versial bloggers” have done.

Now let’s take a look at our critics: Jonathan Harrison, Roberto Muehlenkamp, Jason Myers, Sergey Romanov, Nicholas Terry. Who are they? The terms in which describe themselves are rather vague:

“Two of us live in the USA (one a native, the other an immigrant from the UK); one of us lives in England, one Portugal and one in Russia.” (p. 35)

They have, in fact, good reason to be circumspect, because they are all affiliated with the notorious *Holocaust Controversies* blog, the members of which are well known to have been banished by the ARC (*Aktion Reinhard Camps*) site, a prominent website promoting the orthodox Holocaust narrative:

“As part of our ongoing effort to restore the Action Reinhard Camps website to its original state, [prior to it being vandalized back in 2006], we have identified this page as one of several forged/faked Holocaust documents created by the Holocaust Controversies group, and maliciously inserted into our pages by Michael Peters. We have removed the page and will replace it, and any other erroneous information with accurate historical data that is untainted by those ‘controversial bloggers’ who seek nothing more than to sow the seeds of discord and malcontent amongst the historical community.”

These are, in fact, serious criminal offenses. The ARC site adds (see Illustration 2.1):⁸²

“‘Holocaust Controversies’ is a controversial blog whose sole stated purpose is an insane dedication to manufacture dispute, and foster Internet-based altercation with Holocaust deniers and revisionist believers. However they have not limited their dispute to deniers, and are notorious for attacking Holocaust scholars and websites as well. The Holocaust Controversies members are linked to the attack on ARC, as well as the fabrication of forged documents and photos. Their entire membership has since been banned from this website, and we would remind everyone that the Action Reinhard Camps website maintains no connection to the members of that disreputable blog.

Holocaust Controversies members:

Nicholas Terry

Sergey Romanov

Roberto Muehlenkamp

Andrew Mathis

Michael Peters.”

⁸² www.deathcamps.org/gas_chambers/trebmuenzberger.html

Action Reinhard Camps Website Restoration Initiative

(cleanup after being vandalized)

As part of our ongoing effort to restore the Action Reinhard Camps website to its original state, [prior to it being vandalized back in 2006], we have identified this page as one of several forged/faked Holocaust documents created by the **Holocaust Controversies group**, and maliciously inserted into our pages by Michael Peters. We have removed the page and will replace it, and any other erroneous information with accurate historical data that is untainted by those "controversial bloggers" who seek nothing more than to sow the seeds of discord and malcontent amongst the historical community.

We sincerely apologize for these events that were outside of our control, and pledge that **Never Again** will the ARC website be subjected to such insidious activity from any individual or group.

Since the ARC website was put into archival state back in 2007 we have been diligently updating all of our pages (offline) in preparation for a re-launch of the site, complete with an updated look and feel, and cleansed of association with the vandals.

We hope that ARC has proved an invaluable resource over the past ten years and we strive to ever improve our ability to shed light on the dark period of history known as Action Reinhard.

★ *"Holocaust Controversies" is a controversial blog who's sole stated purpose is an insane dedication to manufacture dispute, and foster Internet-based altercation with Holocaust deniers and revisionist believers. However they have not limited their dispute to deniers, and are notorious for attacking Holocaust scholars, and websites as well. The Holocaust Controversies members are linked to the attack on ARC, as well as the fabrication of forged documents and photos. Their entire membership has since been banned from this website, and we would remind everyone that the Action Reinhard Camps website maintains no connection to the members of that disreputable blog.*

Holocaust Controversies members:

Nicholas Terry

Sergey Romanov

Roberto Muehlenkamp

Andrew Mathis

Michael Peters

Illustration 2.1: *Holocaust Controversy members banned from orthodox Holocaust website due to illegal activities.*

In another communication, the *ARC team* informs us that it “has unanimously agreed to bar indefinitely, the following individuals: Sergey Romanov and Nick Terry,” elaborating as follows (see Illustration 2.2):⁸³

“ARC maintains NO association or contact with these individuals, and while we appreciate the thousands of email reports we’ve received regarding their unsavory actions we must ask that you direct this information to the appropriate authorities.” (Emph. added)

⁸³ www.deathcamps.org/sergeyandnick.html

Moreover, the ARC team have expressly barred Muehlenkamp, Romanov and Terry from linking to their site (see Illustration 3).⁸⁴

*“Unauthorized links to our website from the controversial and **grossly inaccurate** hate blog postings of the following persons:*

Roberto Muehlenkamp – Sergey Romanov – Dr. Nick Terry

Are not condoned by ARC. We maintain no connection to Holocaust hate blogs, and would caution all to avoid being misled by these individuals.”

In spite of the above warning, our critics, with their typical effrontery, have created at least *six links* to the ARC site in their flailing polemic against us (p. 338, footnote 293; p. 396, footnotes 36, 40; p. 424, footnotes 60 and 61).

According to the ARC site, then, our critics are hate mongers, vandals and falsifiers, guilty of “unsavory actions” and the authors of “**grossly inaccurate** hate blog postings.” With such credentials, their attacks upon our credibility, expressed in the following terms:

“It does not mean that we regard deniers as equal debating partners on an intellectual or ethical level; instead, we proceed in the knowledge that deniers operate in ignorance and bad faith.” (p. 8),

appear simply grotesque: what a pulpit from which to deliver sermons on intellectual and moral honesty!

It should not surprise us, therefore, that the *Holocaust Controversies* group, despite its pretensions of forming the vanguard of anti-

www.DeathCamps.org

The Genuine ARC website
www.Deathcamps.Org

Barred indefinitely!

Sergey Romanov and Nick Terry

The ARC team has unanimously agreed to bar indefinitely, the following individuals: **Sergey Romanov** and **Nick Terry**

We will not publish the details surrounding their banning, yet suffice to say they are not welcome here at www.Deathcamps.org, nor at any of our associate organizations. Due to their activities they have also been barred from any access to the ARC libraries, photo archives, and all electronic resources maintained by the ARC team.

ARC maintains NO association or contact with these individuals, and while we appreciate the thousands of email reports we've received regarding their unsavory actions we must ask that you direct this information to the appropriate authorities.

Thank you
-ARC

© ARC <http://www.deathcamps.org> September 30, 2002 - 2010

Domain Registration & Official Copyright Information can be validated at the WHOIS website.

Beware of counterfeit ARC websites with hyphenated URL's, and avoid controversial hate blogs whenever possible.

Illustration 2.2: *S. Romanov and N. Terry permanently banned from orthodox Holocaust website due to illegal activities.*

*** Note to our viewers ***

Unauthorized links to our website from the controversial and **grossly inaccurate** hate blog postings of the following persons:
Roberto Muehlenkamp - Sergey Romanov - Dr. Nick Terry
Are not condoned by ARC. We maintain no connection to Holocaust hate blogs, and would caution all to avoid being misled by these individuals.

Illustration 2.3: *R. Muehlenkamp, S. Romanov, N. Terry are grossly inaccurate hate bloggers, according to orthodox Holocaust website.*

⁸⁴ www.deathcamps.org/contact/contact.html

revisionism, is not taken seriously by orthodox holocaust historians.

As is well known, an international historical conference was held in Oranienburg, Germany, in 2008, the papers of which were only published in 2011 – in a volume over 400 pages long bearing the title *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas. Historische Bedeutung, technische Entwicklung, revisionistische Leugnung*.⁸⁵ The object of the conference was on the one hand to publicise the most recent findings of orthodox historians in relation to the “gas chambers” in general, and on the other to critique revisionism in particular. The participants occupied themselves, both directly and indirectly, with the “Aktion Reinhardt” camps, among other things. In particular, Dieter Pohl contributes a paper on the topic of “Massentötungen durch Giftgas im Rahmen der ‘Aktion Reinhardt’” (Mass killings by toxic gas within the framework of the “Aktion Reinhardt”)⁸⁶ in which he explains that, in this context,

“[r]esearch is restricted, above all, by the lack of significant sources. In contrast to the concentration camps, there are almost no contemporary records on the ‘Aktion Reinhardt’ camps.”⁸⁷

Hence the fact that “historical scholarship” is based “almost entirely on interrogations of the defendants, the few survivors and Polish eye-witnesses.”⁸⁷ That much, of course, is just what we should expect – there’s simply no way around some facts. More interesting, for our purposes here, is Pohl’s endorsement in this context:⁸⁷

“One can gain a good overview [of the Aktion Reinhardt story] from the *deathcamps.org* internet site.”

This is the only website on the topic apparently considered serious enough to be worthy of mention. Nowhere in the book, totalling, as noted, more than 400 pages, is there any mention of the site *Holocaust Controversies* or its members.

Indeed, the fact that our critics’ site, amongst the near-infinite mass of Holocaust literature, is mentioned *exclusively* in a few articles on *Emory University’s Holocaust Denial on Trial* website and in a book by Pavel Polian and Alfred Kokh (p. 11) shows that authoritative Holocaust historians place no value on the claims of Muehlenkamp and associates. And the notice in Polian and Kokh’s book is indeed pathetic, because its nearly 400 pages contain only a single sparse mention, consisting of three whole lines, of Jonathan Harrison in relation to a criti-

⁸⁵ Published by Günter Morsch and Bertrand Perz, with the collaboration of Astrid ×, Metropol, Berlin, 2011.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 185-195.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

cism by Harrison of Walter Sanning’s *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*.⁸⁸

As to the Emory University website, the articles mentioning *Holocaust Controversies* there are obviously written by desperate people, prepared to grasp at any straw to “refute” revisionist arguments. The intellectual competence and honesty of these writers is made apparent, among other things, by the manner in which they present my article “The Crematory Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau”:⁸⁹

“Carlo Mattogno, an Italian denier, built his arguments on Leuchter’s amateurish speculations, in a 1994 monograph. To prove the ovens could not have cremated enough bodies he compared the operation of modern civilian ovens to the situation in Auschwitz-Birkenau.”

Both claims are false and simplistic: on the one hand, I stated in my original article that the crematory capacity cited by Leuchter “is actually far below the actual capacity,” and on the other I described the structure and functioning of civilian ovens to provide an understanding of the capacity of the ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau. I then fleshed out this description on the basis of documents from the *Zentralbauleitung* (Central Construction Office) of the Auschwitz camp, comparing them to Topf ovens of the same model, with 2 or 3 muffles, in other camps – a project of historical and technical analysis to which I later dedicated a volume of over 500 pages.⁹⁰

These two mentions of *Holocaust Controversies*, apart from being derisory in scope, are therefore anything but laudatory. Our critics assure us that they have received the “appreciation” of many historians and academics, in “emails and face to face,” but they fail to mention even a single one by name. Even if it is true that they have received “appreciation” from various quarters, it is clear that the persons involved are either not historians or academics or are otherwise ashamed to be publicly associated with the “hate bloggers” and have thus forbidden them from making their names public.

⁸⁸ Pavel Polian and Alfred Kohk (eds.), *Otritsanie otritsaniia ili bitva pod Aushvitsem. Debaty o demografii i geopolitike Kholokhosta*, Moscow: Tri kvadrata, 2008, p. 288 and footnote 196 on p. 317. English translation available under the title *Denial of the Denial, or the Battle of Auschwitz: Debates about the Demography and Geo-Politics of the Holocaust*, Academic Studies Press, Boston, 2012.

⁸⁹ “The crematoria ovens at Auschwitz couldn’t have disposed of the remains of the 1.1 million Jews,” www.hdot.org/en/learning/myth-fact/cremation1. My article can be found at www.codoh.com/node/921; this is an English translation of the German version as published in Ernst Gauss (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 70), pp. 281-320; published in print in English in a revised version in G. Rudolf (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 41), pp. 373-412.

⁹⁰ *I forni crematori di Auschwitz, Studio storico-tecnico con la collaborazione del dott. ing. Franco Deana*. 2 vols., Effepi, Genoa, 2012; vol. I.

But the issue of "appreciation" is most likely just a pretext for making an underhanded attack on my own person. In this regard, the "hate bloggers" remark as follows:

"without naming all of the historians who have expressed their appreciation, we are quite certain that they outnumber whatever praise Mattoigno himself has ever received from any academics." (p. 11)

Obviously, there is a certain difference between the fact that our self-proclaimed Holocaust "historians" are given no consideration whatsoever by their "colleagues," and the routine suppression of revisionist historians by orthodox academia. In the first case, the reason for exclusion can only be the historiographical ignorance of the snubbed "Controversial Bloggers"; in the second, ideological prejudice clearly is at work, the result of decades of demonization (see, in particular, P. Vidal-Naquet and D. Lipstadt), accompanied with copious accusations of anti-Semitism, Nazism, racism, etc. Notwithstanding this situation, I can personally cite a few exceptions. Prominent German historian Prof. Ernst Nolte, for example, has referred to me as being among "serious scholars."⁹¹ What is more, the prestigious documentary compendium *Standort- und Kommandanturbefehle des Konzentrationslagers Auschwitz 1940-1945*, published by the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* in München, mentions my study on the *Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz* (Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005) in its bibliography.⁹² Tomasz Kranz, director of the research department of the Majdanek Memorial Institution, considered our study on Majdanek worthy of mention in a short book, without praise to be sure, but without reproach either.⁹³ And finally our book *Treblinka. Vernichtungslager oder Durchgangslager?* (Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings, 2002) is present in the Polish National Library in Warsaw under the shelfmark II 2.182.986 A. It's not much, of course, but it is still more than the recognition obtained, in print, by our aspiring critics, which is . . . nothing.

In this context, it is easy to see why, after a few initial responses, I decided to refrain from continuing to reply to the claims of the "controversial bloggers" unless their claims were published in print, a condition which they, typically, interpreted as "desperation" on my part (p. 11). This condition was intended solely to establish substantially what on the

⁹¹ E. Nolte, *Controversie. Nazionalismo, bolscevismo, questione ebraica nella storia del Novecento*. Corbaccio, Milan, 1999, p. 13.

⁹² Edited by Norbert Frei, Thomas Grotum, Jan Parcer, Sybille Steinbacher and Bernd C. Wagner. *Institut für Zeitgeschichte*. K.G. Saur, Munich, 2000, p. 570.

⁹³ Tomasz Kranz, *Zur Erfassung der Häftlingssterblichkeit...*, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

web is only virtual, a fact obvious even to the bloggers themselves, since they state “internet links are ephemeral and tend to ‘decay’ as time passes.” (p. 1). In other words, in blogs one can write the most obvious nonsense and it may disappear after a few years, to the benefit of the authors of that complete nonsense. A printed text, on the other hand, remains in existence, fixing the author’s responsibility for a much longer period of time. In the second place, I am in no way interested in endless “online” disputes, fruitless by their very nature for the same reason. In the third place, I have no desire to debate with persons obviously motivated by hatred and bad faith – persons who do not hesitate to assert the most ridiculous absurdities as long as they contradict the arguments of revisionists in any manner whatsoever. How is it possible to engage in serious discussion with people who, for example, claim that it is possible to cram 20 persons into a single square meter? Among the more “scholarly” orthodox holocaust historians, everyone is prepared to admit that this is an obvious absurdity. Only the “controversial bloggers” adopt this same absurdity as a profession of faith.⁹⁴ And what can one say of people who attempt to calculate the combustible value of a human body based on the biogas produced by the decomposition of “animal waste,” particularly “cattle manure”?⁹⁵ If Muehlenkamp had published such an absurdity in a book, he would have been the laughing stock of every competent person for the rest of his life.

A single PDF file on the web approaches a printed book more closely, if only because it can be printed as a book without modification. For our part, we are glad that the “controversial bloggers” have finally decided to utilise a mode of communication which will commit them to their statements, we hope, for years, without the hope of any overly rapid “decay.”

And the relative permanence of the medium is all the more important in that it leaves our critics no way of effacing the evidence of their plagiarism. The PDF file authored by the “controversial bloggers” was posted on the Internet on 24 December 2011, and within days it was aptly renamed by persons well acquainted with the authors as the “Cut and Paste Manifesto.” For example, the user Blogbuster wrote as follows in the CODOH Forum at the time:⁹⁶

“My view on the HC manifesto:

I wasn’t overly impressed with the hodge-podge collection of “cut and paste” research compiled by Nick Terry, Sergey Romanov, Roberto Mueh-

⁹⁴ I shall return to this matter in Chapter 11.

⁹⁵ http://holocaustcontroversies.blogspot.com/2006/05/carlo-mattogno-on-belzec_28.html.

⁹⁶ <http://forum.codoh.com/viewtopic.php?f=2&t=6769>.

lenkamp and the rest. Having read through it I found a lot of information that was originally posted on other websites and tailored in the manifesto to suit the arguments of the HC compiler. I found it to be useless as an aid for debating revisionism either one way or the other. The focus is more on structure designed to emulate a white paper than to provide a substantial critique of revisionist belief.

Any grammar school student could just as easily assemble a body of work that is lifted from the research of others, arrange it to a desired theme just as this manifesto was specifically directed at Mattongo [sic], Grag [sic] and Kues. The problem is, that the original research this electronic argument is composed of was not designed for such purpose, and the way Terry, and Romanov have attempted to jam a square peg into a round hole is sloppy at best."

Taken by itself it is just the unsubstantiated opinion of a single, pseudonymous poster to an Internet discussion forum, true. But as this book shall show, it is also a remarkably accurate one, correctly identifying the vast pseudo-scientific pretense maintained by the "controversial bloggers" – a pretense which is obviously the result of whole days spent "cutting and pasting." In the chapters to follow I will show that historical, documentary and bibliographical plagiarism on the part of our "controversial bloggers" is indeed so extensive as to earn for them the title not of "controversial bloggers" but rather "plagiarist bloggers."

Appendix I contains a list of their most salient plagiarisms, and as impressive as it may appear, it is still incomplete. I recommend the reader to take a look through it before going on with the reading of our reply, so that he or she can immediately assess the degree of duplicity and misrepresentation of our dissembling critics.

The "new" sources adopted by our bloggers with regards to "our knowledge of Belzec, Sobibór and Treblinka" (pp. 20-24) are in fact precisely the same ones listed in summary form by Dieter Pohl in his paper "Massentötungen durch Giftgas im Rahmen der 'Aktion Reinhard'" mentioned above. As to our own sources, the analysis of them presented by the "hate bloggers" – as always, totally destitute of any sense of proportion – is ridiculously simplistic:

"Indeed, of the non-judicial files cited across the 'trilogy,' 11 relate to Auschwitz while 7 relate to other concentration camps, leaving only 7 that ostensibly relate directly to Belzec or Treblinka along with 18 to the Galicia and Lublin districts and 4 to the Lodz ghetto. 11 more files from the Moscow archives are quoted in relation to the Holocaust in the Soviet Union, while one file purportedly cited from the National Archives of Belarus is seemingly plagiarized from secondary sources."

They then conclude:

“Measured against the research efforts of serious historians, all these figures are risible.” (p. 28)

In reality, our “trilogy” presents previously unknown material, accompanied by critical analyses, on a scale and with a degree of thoroughness which had never before been attempted in the historiography of the Reinhardt camps. Without entering into too much detail, the book on Bełżec combines, for the first time, a vast collection of wartime and post-war propaganda sources relating to the origins and development of the assumed methods of mass killing, showing the manner in which, and why, the story of the “gas chambers” emerged from these propaganda fairy tales.⁹⁷ Similar compilations of sources were produced by us for Treblinka⁹⁸ and Sobibór.⁹⁹ In all three cases, extensive use was made of Polish sources not considered at that time to form part of Western historiography. The Bełżec book also offers a detailed critical analysis of the archaeological studies performed by Andrzej Kola on the grounds of the former camp.

One can argue about the exposition in these works as much as one likes, but they remain nonetheless the first effort on such an extensive scale ever to appear in printed literature.

Our study on Treblinka also presents a pertinent range of documentation which at the time of its publication was entirely unknown, even to Holocaust specialists. We refer in particular to material obtained by ourselves from the State Archive of the Russian Federation (GARF) in Moscow: for example, the testimonies of A. Kon and K. Skarzyński; S. Rajzman’s text *Kombinat Smerti v Treblinke* and his interrogation dated 26 September 1944; the Soviet report on the mass graves at Treblinka dated 15-23 August 1944; the TASS reports written immediately afterwards, dated 11 and 12 September 1944; the report of the preliminary investigation of Z. Łukaszewicz dated 29 December 1945; the Soviet diagram of Treblinka dated 24 September 1944 (published by ourselves as Document 11 in *Treblinka*); the diagrams of the presumed [homicidal] gas chambers of the camp drawn by First Lieutenant Jurowski (Documents 18 and 19), and other material. As we will see in the following chapters, Muehlenkamp and Company plagiarized even these sources!

Our work on Sobibór presents and analyses for the first time the results of the archaeological research work performed by A. Kola in the former camp of Sobibór, described, in particular, in the article “Badania archeologiczne terenu byłego obozu zagłady Żydów w Sobiborze w

⁹⁷ *Bełżec...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-50.

⁹⁸ *Treblinka*, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-76.

⁹⁹ *Sobibór*, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-76.

2001 r.," in *Przeszłość i Pamięć*, no. 4, October-December 2001.

All three of these books are illustrated by photographs personally taken by myself in the areas of the former camps. The book on Bełżec contains approximately 90 bibliographical references, that on Treblinka approximately 210, that on Sobibór approximately 310. Contrary to the insinuations of the "hate bloggers," the sources are all first hand and have been verified.¹⁰⁰

The bloggers thus begin their "critique" with a systematic distortion of the value of our work with the evident intention of discrediting it.

En passant, since our bloggers consider themselves "historians," why did they not begin by first presenting the enormous mass of historical research, documents and other materials relating to the concentration camps and homicidal gas chambers gathered and compiled by themselves? For example, they declare:

"Mattogno also claimed that none of the blog members ever visited an archive, a library, have seen an original document, or are aware of the documentary evidence of the camps. This is flat out false, as will be seen in the following pages." (p. 11)

A few pages further on, they add:

"Our own research into the materials from East European archives have included research trips to some of the relevant archives." (p. 29)

Yet these vague assurances shed little or no light on the fundamental questions: who among them visited which archives? What new material did they discover there? Who visited which former "extermination camps"? And if they really did perform profound research work as they claim, why waste their time "refuting" the alleged "falsifiers" instead of providing the academic world with the precious knowledge they gained in their studies, publishing specialist monographs on each of the three main "Aktion Reinhardt" camps? Why waste such a precious opportunity to sculpt their names in the prestigious annals of Holocaust historiography!

The tragic reality is that our bloggers are not even "paper historians" (a term rightly applied to Pierre Vidal-Naquet by Robert Faurisson), but mere "cut and paste bloggers."

The discredit which the controversial bloggers attempt to cast upon our own work seems all the more malevolent and unjustified in view of

¹⁰⁰ In this context, our bloggers claim that "one file purportedly cited from the National Archives of Belarus is seemingly plagiarized from secondary sources." (p. 28). The file is a list of the Jewish transport from Hamburg to Minsk dated 18 November 1941 which is before me as I write this; it begins with the name "Abramowicz Ruchla" and ends with "Wolffsohn Clara." Plagiarism is not our speciality.

the fact that Holocaust historiography itself, despite an immense deployment of specialist manpower and resources, has produced very little of significance on the three “Aktion Reinhardt” camps, as admitted by Pohl himself.

Obviously, we are very well aware that our “trilogy” might have possessed even richer, more extensive documentation than it did. Those wishing to reproach us on these grounds should consider that we have not enjoyed access to public archives for over a decade, since we are well-known – indeed “notorious” – revisionists, which precludes much further documentary research by us in this regard. And that is without even considering our financial resources, which are absolutely ludicrous compared to those available to orthodox Holocaust historians. In this – to say the least – unfavourable context, our goal has been to offer works of pioneering research, which we hope may constitute the basis for further, more in-depth research in the future.

Our “plagiarist bloggers” repeatedly and obsessively insist on the fact that the bibliography consulted by ourselves in the preparation and publication of these works is incomplete. That is true. This was in part the result of factors beyond our control and in part a deliberate decision. Since it was our intention to present introductory studies on the “Aktion Reinhardt” camps as soon as we could, we did without a systematic examination of the rich body of exterminationist literature (with the possible exception of our *Sobibór* study), since that would have delayed, perhaps indefinitely, the publication of our work. We focused, therefore, upon the “traditional” positions of Holocaust historiography, which are “dated” perhaps, but have not yet been superseded. The deliberate decision was made by asking ourselves: to what extent, in fact, are the recent developments of Holocaust historiography truly relevant to an understanding and demonstration of the “gas chambers”?

Morsch and Perz stress that at least 60 major texts were published on the topic of “Massenmord durch Giftgas” (mass murder with poison gas) between 1983 and 2010, but that little real progress had been made in the matter:¹⁰¹

“Against this background of missing sources, many of the restrictions on earlier research caused by the difficult source situation of the time still cannot be easily overcome even thirty years later. This is true in particular for the ‘Aktion Reinhardt’ camps for which, contrary to the situation for regular concentration camps, very few contemporary documents have been handed down to us.”

¹⁰¹ G. Morsch, B. Perz (eds.), *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas*. Introduction, pp. xvii-xviii.

Pohl, an author much cited by the “plagiarist bloggers,” makes the same assertion even more explicitly:¹⁰²

“Research on the extermination camps of the so-called Aktion Reinhard made great progress between the end of the 1970s and the mid-1990s, not least as a result of the ‘Nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas’ compendium. Since then we have, indeed, succeeded in gaining a great deal of new knowledge on the ghetto evacuations and deportations, but less on the actual extermination camps themselves, that is, Belżec, Sobibór and Treblinka.”

Pohl diligently lists “new sources,” but must then admit that “nevertheless we are still far away from an overall synthesis of all this knowledge; *the state of research has not fundamentally changed since the 1980s.*”¹⁰³ (Emph. added)

Pohl in fact observes disconsolately:¹⁰⁴

“Of course, there is still a lack of more detailed studies, particularly on Treblinka, the largest of the three camps, and on Belżec.”

Since we were essentially interested in the problem of the “extermination camps” and the “gas chambers,” and since this more recent literature has produced nothing new in this regard – as explicitly stated by Pohl, and as we shall see in detail in the chapters which follow – the reproaches directed against us by our detractors are only of marginal relevance. On the other hand, their obsessive-compulsive use of innumerable sources, most of them plagiarized, does not aim to fill this vacuum in Holocaust historiography, or even to present a summary of the existing literature, but merely to lure the reader into a dense thicket of inconclusive references through a puerile and ostentatious display of false learning.

2.2. Genesis of Holocaust Historiography and the Revisionist Method

Every time there is any discussion of revisionism among orthodox Holocaust advocates, the old canard of the “conspiracy theory” inevitably resurfaces. Our “plagiarist bloggers” put it this way:

“From its inception, Holocaust Revisionism has repeatedly asserted that we have been lied to about the fate of Europe’s Jews at the hands of the Nazis. However much it might be denied by some contemporary nega-

¹⁰² D. Pohl, “Massentötungen durch Giftgas im Rahmen der ‘Aktion Reinhard,’” in: G. Morsch, B. Perz (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 187.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

tionists, Holocaust denial is unthinkable without some form of conspiracy theory." (p. 38)

This claim, in turn, depends on a routine misrepresentation of the revisionist approach to documentary sources. This becomes clear early on in their book, in a passage in which they pretend to impart a lesson on the correct historiographical method:

"It is striking that in all of their work, MGK consistently act as if the only source that can be considered a 'document' is a German report. Yet such an attitude is quite frankly the purest gibberish when measured against all known standard practices of historical scholarship ever since they were codified in the 19th Century. Rankeanism has only one rule, namely to prefer where possible a source that is closer to the events, either in terms of chronology or proximity. Medievalists, after all, are often forced to rely on sources from long after the fact, written down by commentators who were nowhere near the events they describe. Military historians do not have a problem in making use of the records of both sides in a war or conflict. Many historians of the Holocaust have since the 1940s made good use of non-German contemporary documents, most especially the written records of Jewish councils and the Polish underground. Such sources are indisputably documents, and we have made use of some of them in what follows" (pp. 29f.)

It is obviously not the case, as Nick Terry insinuates, that non-German documents hold no value to us as regards German wartime activities (or, worse, are not "documents" at all!). Our position is indeed that with respect to Holocaust historiography "a German report" is the most valuable type of written document in that it can typically be considered true and accurate at face value (being based on more than mere witness stories or hearsay), whereas non-German wartime reports, while not disconsidered out of hand, are sources the value of which depends on many factors. Yet we obviously also consider photographs and material exhibits as valuable evidence, whether of German origin or not. All the rest, starting with the testimonies, possess only subordinate evidentiary value, or even none at all in the very frequent case of testimonies unsupported by any wartime document. We *do*, in fact, make use of non-German documentary sources throughout our works. Like all others (including German reports) they must be subject to criticism, and only upon being verified as legitimate and trustworthy can (and should) they be used, a process which annoys our "bloggers" intensely.

The correctness of this approach is even admitted by Holocaust historians such as Mathias Beer:¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ M. Beer, "Die Entwicklung der Gaswagen beim Mord an den Juden," in: *Vierteljahrshefte für*

"However historians are not permitted to accept court judgements without examination, since justice and scholarly knowledge are motivated by differing objectives. For historians, witness statements are of importance primarily because they assist to close gaps in the sources. But due to their own peculiar nature, witness statements can only be treated as ranking equally with documents and be usefully evaluated by historical researchers, if certain principles are respected. The basic condition is never to abandon, as far as is possible, the correlation of witness statements and documents already subjected to critical source examination, i.e., always to couple the probable facts with the proven."

To explain this position requires an examination of how and why Holocaust historiography arose in the first place. Our "controversial bloggers" describe the origins of Holocaust historiography without even realizing that they are undermining their own criticisms. For example, they discuss the history of the alleged "*Aktion Reinhardt* extermination camps" from its origins in the black propaganda issued by a variety of Jewish and Polish resistance groups:

"A growing number of reports reaching the Polish underground state, the Delegatura, as well as Jewish organizations such as the Oneg Shabes archive in Warsaw, led virtually all within Poland quickly to conclude that Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka were sites of extermination." (p. 15)

Much as our bloggers try to wave the problem away, however, it is just the circumstances surrounding this "growing number of reports" that call the whole story into question:

"Hearsay rumours of the use of electricity and steam circulated among the Polish and Jewish population of Poland as well as among German occupation officials and troops, but the majority of the reports in Poland converged on the use of gas chambers." (p. 15)

"Hearsay rumours" indeed. Belżec is a typical example. Historian Michael Tregenza has stressed "the fraternization between the camp staff and the Ukrainian village population": residents of the village of Belżec worked in the kitchens and laundries of the SS command; "four men were employed within the camp proper"; one of these, an electrician, "installed cables and lighting in the second gas building," and, it is said, occasionally witnessed gassings; two photographers from the village were moreover authorised to photograph the interior of the camp. In practice, "from the very beginning, every single villager knew what was going on in the camp."¹⁰⁶

Zeitgeschichte, Jg. 35, 1987, Heft 3, p. 404.

¹⁰⁶ M. Tregenza, "Das vergessene Lager des Holocaust," in I. Wojak, P. Hayes (eds.), "*Arisierung*" im Nationalsozialismus, *Volksgemeinschaft, Raub und Gedächtnis*, Campus Verlag, Frankfurt/Main, New York 2000, pp. 241-268. Summarized in Mattogno, *Belżec in Propagan-*

But in that case, why didn't the alleged “truth” of gas chambers using engine exhaust gases – the version of the story officially accepted today – arise “from the very beginning”? The birth of “hearsay rumours,” particularly those regarding fantastic mass electrocution installations, death trains and human soap factories, notwithstanding a whole village of eyewitnesses, can only be explained as the result of intentional atrocity propaganda.

This is also true of Treblinka. The report of 15 November 1942 on the “steam chambers at Treblinka” is so detailed that it could only have resulted from a deliberately falsified description of installations which actually existed, but which could in no case be “gas chambers”: so if our opponents are right, why would the author(s) of the report describe them as “steam chambers”? And why were the most improbable methods of extermination, starting with chlorine, initially attributed to Sobibór?

The belief that Bełżec, Sobibór and Treblinka were “extermination camps” is said to have resulted from the fact that “during the war, reports began to appear within a month of the opening of Bełżec that large numbers of Jews were entering the camp and not coming out.” (p. 15) But this is just the indispensable pre-condition of all black propaganda: the propagandists first spread about the notion of “extermination camps” and then only later seek to substantiate it (being, like our detractors, totally destitute of any sense of the ridiculous) with the most absurd fantasies.

These fantasies did, it is true, also include gas chambers, but it is false to state, as our critics have done, that “the majority of the reports in Poland converged on the use of gas chambers”; moreover, the few sources which mention them do not connect them with the use of engine exhaust gas. At the end of 1945, notwithstanding the various testimonies – indeed, precisely because of them – a variety of killing methods were all simultaneously contending for primacy as official “truth”: steam, vacuum pumps, electrocution and gas chambers. Notoriously, the electrocution installations at Bełżec and the “steam chambers” at Treblinka were accepted as officially established facts even at the Nuremberg Trial.¹⁰⁷

Only thanks to the testimony of Rudolf Reder and the “Gerstein report” (which are, however, mutually contradictory) did Polish investigators eventually settle, in 1947, on the theory that the Germans used en-

da...., op. cit., pp. 41f.

¹⁰⁷ USSR-93; PS-3311.

gine exhaust gas, as we have documented in the sections entitled "From Steam Chambers to Carbon Monoxide Chambers," "Origins of the Carbon Monoxide Version" and "Triumph of the Carbon Monoxide Version" in our book on Treblinka, and "The Struggle between Electric Current and Exhaust Gas" in that on Belżec. The solution thus excogitated was then applied, by analogy, to Sobibór as well.

Before proceeding further, I must answer a criticism relating precisely to the term "black propaganda." Our "controversial bloggers" write that in my view "'propaganda' necessarily implies its falsity" and that I use "black propaganda" with this meaning, while on the contrary they object that "the term 'black propaganda' has a very precise meaning," that is, simply, "propaganda purporting to come from the enemy side." (p. 43). If this were solely a question of terminology, we could speak of "propaganda lies" instead, but the core problem remains: call it what you like, the propaganda in question is intentionally deceptive, as is acknowledged, in effect, by current Holocaust historiography in its avoidance of it. How else should we describe the tales of mass electrocutions, steam chambers, human soap, and so on?

Nick Terry chides me for not using "black propaganda" as the precise term of art currently employed in studies of propaganda, in which it may be categorized as either white, gray or black. This is particularly true for *Sobibór*, where "Greuelpropaganda" (atrocities propaganda; colloquially, atrocity tales) in the German edition came to be translated as "black propaganda" in the English edition, a matter which we did not offer too much attention given the popular connotations of the term, and as there are no two ways to interpret this, especially if referring to a post-war witness statement. In *Treblinka*, on the other hand, "Greuelpropaganda" was more accurately rendered as "atrocities propaganda." It is known that the *Holocaust Controversies* group obsesses over our various different-language book editions to hunt for anomalies, so it is a safe bet they have looked this up as well and are contriving an issue, scarcely affecting anyone else, to be my "hysterical repetition."

Nevertheless, our opponents' definition seems to be simplistic, only governing the relationship between two parties, usually governments. It is inaccurate to claim that "black propaganda" is restricted to that "purporting to come from the enemy side" in the sense obviously meant by Terry in which the "enemy side" would be the German Government. Modern scholarly definitions of "black propaganda," a term always noted to have negative popular connotations despite more precise definitions, would include two key points: that (1) the information transmitted

is incorrect, usually on grounds of villifying some target or achieving some aim, and that (2) its true source and/or purported authority is either misrepresented, obscured or falsified.

To wit, we may look at the World War I “Corpse Factory” hoax. Aside from the mistranslation of “kadaver” to corpse, British propaganda had employed the use of blatantly false stories purporting to come from neutral groups or individuals. One example would be an English-language Shanghai paper reporting that the Chinese Premier was horrified over the boastful and increasingly ghoulish statements coming from Admiral Paul von Hintze, German ambassador, first telling the Premier that the Germans were prepared to send women to the trenches in order to win the conflict, then that they were manufacturing glycerin out of fallen soldiers.¹⁰⁸ Others could include statements of indignation falsely attributed to neutral parties over mere news of the story (Pope Benedict XV), or self-styled witnesses providing helpful hints as to the veracity of the tale, which can be safely assumed invented.¹⁰⁹

All examples given above are clearly “black propaganda,” even in the academic sense Terry is so keen of, albeit directed against the German side without the “propaganda purporting to come from” the Germans. They are certainly not gray propaganda, which has no identifiable source, authority or importance of label, or white propaganda which is typically based on persuasion and whose source is truthfully identified. A good tell of “black propaganda” tends to be its basis on “insider information” in authority or capacity to know the message, which is just the situation we face with resistance or interest groups pretending to relay accurate eyewitness statements of extermination installations.

In this context, our critics mention the Polish underground courier Jan Karski who “engaged in ‘black propaganda’ among German soldiers.” (p. 43). This is in fact an excellent example for establishing the real significance of “black propaganda.” Karski is introduced as follows on p. 15 of the book:

“A further crucial report, combining information compiled by Oneg Shabes with Polish underground sources, was brought out by the Polish underground courier Jan Karski in November 1942.”

The “plagiarist bloggers,” however, are careful to avoid mentioning the actual content of this “crucial report.” In it, Karski in fact claims to have infiltrated the Bełżec camp, but found no gassing installation there. Instead, according to Karski, the deported Jews were killed in

¹⁰⁸ “China’s Issue with Germany. How Feng Kuo-Chang Was Converted. Informal Messages from Berlin,” *The North-China Daily News*, February 26, 1917, p. 7.

¹⁰⁹ TNA FO 395/147.

"death trains" sprinkled with quicklime, the trains being loaded at the camp and then driven to a location eighty miles away where the victims were left for several days until they all died. I have described Karski's various "eyewitness testimonies" in the section "From Electrocutation to the 'Train of Death'" in my book on Bełżec. This story, from the orthodox Holocaust point of view, is obviously untrue (from the revisionist point of view, it could be a distortion of reports of transports which actually left the camp for other destinations). This explains the embarrassed silence of our critics, who clearly know full well that "black propaganda," starting with the propaganda spread by Karski himself, consists precisely of intentional lies.

Returning to the main thread of the argument, our "controversial bloggers" next trace the phases through which this mendacious propaganda, filtered and reinvigorated by the various Soviet, Polish-Soviet and Polish "war crimes investigation commissions" and the "findings" of examining magistrates, entered the courtrooms of the various post-war Military Tribunals, whence it would soon emerge newly clad in the garb of "juridical truth."

The decisive ingredient in this process was no doubt the "Declaration of the United Nations" of 17 December 1942, which on the one hand elevated this propaganda to the status of official truth while determining, on the other, the criteria of punishment for the alleged crimes depicted in it, thus laying the foundation for the creation of the future Military Tribunals:¹¹⁰

"From all the occupied countries Jews are being transported in conditions of appalling horror and brutality to Eastern Europe. In Poland, which has been made the principal Nazi slaughterhouse, the ghettos established by the German invaders are being systematically emptied of all Jews except a few highly skilled workers required for war industries. None of those taken away are ever heard of again. The able-bodied are slowly worked to death in labor camps. The infirm are left to die of exposure and starvation, or are deliberately massacred in mass executions.

The number of victims of these bloody cruelties is reckoned in many hundreds of thousands of entirely innocent men, women, and children."

The declaration concluded with the threat that the United Nations "reaffirm their solemn resolution to ensure that those responsible for the crimes shall not escape retribution, and to press on with the necessary practical measures to this end."

The draft of this declaration had been discussed at the Foreign Office in London by the beginning of December, following the arrival of a

¹¹⁰ IMT, vol. XII, p. 364.

great many propaganda reports, the last of which was one by none other than Jan Karski, dated 25 November.¹¹¹ A note dated 26 November summarizes the discussion to that point:¹¹²

“Extermination of Jews in Europe.

Mr. Law records a conversation with Mr. Silverman^[113] and Mr. Easterman^[114] regarding the extermination of Jews in Europe. Mr. Silverman pressed that His Majesty’s Government should take some action to relieve these atrocities and suggested that a Four Power Declaration be made by the United Nations declaring that the perpetrators would be duly punished, and also that use should be made of broadcasting to encourage non-Jews to aid the Jews under persecution.”

In a handwritten note dated 27 November, Denis Allen, an official from the ministry’s Central Department, advised that the upcoming U.N. declaration should, “in the absence of clearer evidence, avoid too specific reference to the plan^[115] of extermination,” and restrict itself to condemning the “German policy” with regards to the Jews.¹¹⁶ Another Foreign Office official, Frank Roberts, noted in the same vein:¹¹⁷

“A statement on the above lines would have to be somewhat vague, since we have no actual proof of these atrocities, although I think that their probability is sufficiently great to justify action on the above lines, if this is considered essential with a view to satisfying Parliamentary opinion here. The propagandists could then take statements on the above lines as their cue. Without such statement it would, I think, be dangerous to embark upon a propaganda campaign lacking a foundation of quotable and proved facts.”

A Foreign Office note composed by Anthony Eden on 2 December relates to a conversation between himself and Soviet ambassador Ivan Maisky on the upcoming U.N. declaration. After expressing warm approval for the speech that he had just made in the House of Commons,¹¹⁸ intimating that Stalin would feel the same, Maisky reportedly continues:

“His Excellency went on to say that I had referred to the position of the Jews in Europe and to the systematic attempt which appeared to be being made now by the Germans to exterminate them. The Jews had been to see him as they had been, he understood, to see me in the matter, and their

¹¹¹ See in this regard *Bežec...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-25.

¹¹² TNA FO 371/30923 XP004257, p. 62. The note was received in registry on 1 Dec. 1942.

¹¹³ Sydney Silverman, a Labour Member of British Parliament.

¹¹⁴ Alexander Easterman, at that time Political Secretary of the World Jewish Congress, British Section.

¹¹⁵ Underlined in the original.

¹¹⁶ TNA FO 371/30923 XP004257, pp. 64f.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 66f. Also dated 27 Nov. 1942.

¹¹⁸ <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1942/dec/02/reconstruction>.

suggestion, as he understood it, was that the three Powers, ourselves, the United States and Russia, should join in a condemnation of these atrocities and state that those who perpetrated them would be punished when the day of retribution came."

The admission as to who lobbied for the declaration, on both sides, is certainly revealing. The note closes with Eden describing on his own – i.e., not relating Maisky's words – the Great Powers' declaration as "the statement for which the Jews were asking."¹¹⁹

The document establishing the future Allied Military Tribunals was not, therefore, based on any "actual proof," but rather on a mere "probability" of German "atrocities." But the United Nations had now committed themselves before the entire world in such a manner that their Courts had to "prove" German crimes in some way.

The sort of love of justice and truth that animated these Tribunals was explicitly revealed by Justice Robert H. Jackson, the American chief prosecutor, during the 26 July 1946 session of the First Nuremberg Trial:¹²⁰

"In interpreting the Charter, however, we should not overlook the unique and emergent character of this body as an International Military Tribunal. It is no part of the constitutional mechanism of internal justice of any of the signatory nations. Germany has unconditionally surrendered, but no peace treaty has been signed or agreed upon. The Allies are still technically in a state of war with Germany, although the enemy's political and military institutions have collapsed. As a military tribunal, this Tribunal is a continuation of the war effort of the Allied nations. As an International Tribunal, it is not bound by the procedural and substantive refinements of our respective judicial or constitutional systems, nor will its rulings introduce precedents into any country's internal system of civil justice" (Emph. added)

Indeed, the *Charter of the International Military Tribunal* explicitly stated that the court was not created for the purpose of ascertaining the truth or seeing that justice was done, but, rather, "for the just and prompt trial *and punishment* of the major war criminals of the European Axis."¹²¹ (Emph. added)

For the purpose of obtaining this desired result, the victorious war-time powers created conducive juridical instruments. Article 19 of the *Charter of the Tribunal*.¹²²

¹¹⁹ TNA FO 954/25 (SU/42/345), Eden to H.L. Baggallay, 2 Dec. 1942. Also two copies in TNA FO 371/30923, 113f., 115f.

¹²⁰ IMT, vol. XIX, p. 398.

¹²¹ IMT, vol. I, p. 10.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 15.

“The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence. It shall adopt and apply to the greatest possible extent expeditious and non-technical procedure, and shall admit any evidence which it deems to have probative value.”

And Article 21:¹²²

“The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge but shall take judicial notice thereof. It shall also take judicial notice of official governmental documents and reports of the United Nations, including the acts and documents of the committees set up in the various Allied countries for the investigation of war crimes, and the records and findings of military or other Tribunals of any of the United Nations.”

As a finishing touch, the documents upon which the trials were based were selected beforehand based on their perceived prosecutorial value; defense attorneys were only permitted to draw documentation from this pre-selected pool, and so, in practice, there were no defense documents.

British historian A.J.P. Taylor once gave a marvellous description of this situation in an attempt to explain “the almost universal agreement among historians” on the origins of the Second World War, an explanation which applies equally to Holocaust historiography:¹²³

“If the evidence had been sufficiently conflicting, scholars would soon have been found to dispute the popular verdict, however generally accepted. This has not happened; and for two apparently contradictory reasons – there is at once too much evidence and too little. The evidence of which there is too much is that collected for the trials of war-criminals in Nuremberg. Though these documents look imposing in their endless volumes, they are dangerous material for a historian to use. They were collected, hastily and almost at random, as a basis for lawyers’ briefs. This is not how historians would proceed. The lawyer aims to make a case; the historian wishes to understand a situation. The evidence which convinces lawyers often fails to satisfy us; our methods seem singularly imprecise to them. But even lawyers must now have qualms about the evidence at Nuremberg. The documents were chosen not only to demonstrate the war-guilt of the men on trial, but to conceal that of the prosecuting Powers. If any of the four Powers who set up the Nuremberg tribunal had been running the affair alone, it would have thrown the mud more widely. The Western Powers would have brought in the Nazi-Soviet Pact; the Soviet Union would have retaliated with the Munich conference and more obscure transactions. Given the four-Power tribunal, the only possible course was to assume the sole guilt of Germany in advance. The verdict preceded the tribunal; and the documents were brought in to sustain a conclusion which had already been settled. Of

¹²³ A.J.P. Taylor, *The Origins of Second World War*. Athäneum, New York, 1983, p. 13.

course the documents are genuine. But they are 'loaded'; and anyone who relies on them finds it almost impossible to escape from the load with which they are charged."

Reginald T. Paget, who defended *Feldmarschall* Erich von Manstein, described the difficult documentary situation faced by defense counsel for German defendants:

"The entire walls were covered with files and a number of rows of files six feet high ran across the room. The difficulties imposed upon the defence are obvious. The only documents available were those which had been selected because they might help the prosecution, the German documents had never been screened for those that might help the defence. We had access to only a tiny part of the documents seized. Our staff was wholly inadequate to examine even a tiny portion of the documents actually in Hamburg, and it was only at the very last moment that we discovered several documents vital to the defence. We shall never know how many other such documents existed."

Before describing his own predicament, however, Paget goes back to the initial document screening for the IMT. He relates that in July 1945 a special branch of the US Army had been tasked with "collecting, evaluating and assembling documentary evidence in the European Theatre for use in the prosecution of the major war criminals before the International Tribunal." This work was done through so-called document centers. The documents so selected were then given to the prosecution staff to be sifted again for the purpose of ascertaining "whether or not they should be retained as evidence for the prosecutors." Finally, the documents thus re-selected were photocopied and made available to the tribunals. The defense essentially had to select the documents which they would use from among them.¹²⁴

It is useful to investigate the documents forming the basis of Paget's assessment. Colonel Robert G. Storey, Executive Trial Counsel to Justice Robert H. Jackson, prepared a statement dated 20 November 1945 outlining the gathering and handling of documentary evidence. It explains that the documents to be presented to the court had been "examined, re-screened, and translated by expert US Army personnel, many of whom had been born in Germany and thus possessed excellent language and background qualifications."¹²⁵

¹²⁴ R.T. Paget, *Manstein: His Campaigns and His Trial*, Collins, London, 1951, pp. 106f. Paget quotes Coogan's affidavit discussed below, adding an emphasis. Also in R.T. Paget, *Manstein. Seine Feldzüge und sein Prozeß*. Limes Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1952, pp. 128f.

¹²⁵ "Outline Of Method Of Capture, Processing And Assembling Documentary Evidence, And Plan Of Presentation To The Tribunal" by Robert G. Storey, 20 Nov. 1945, PS-001(a). IMT, vol. XXV, p. 3.

Perhaps aware of the too compromising hint as to the ethnic identity of “many” of his personnel, Storey amended this sentence in his verbal statement before the Tribunal on 22 November 1945, during the course of which he also explained his decisive role in organizing the selection of documents for the trial.¹²⁶

“Beginning last June, Mr. Justice Jackson [Chief US Prosecutor at the IMT] requested me to direct the assembling of documentary evidence on the continent for the United States case. Field teams from our office were organized under the direction of Major William H. Coogan, who established United States liaison officers at the main Army document centers. Such officers were directed to screen and analyze the mass of captured documents, and select those having evidentiary value for our case. Literally hundreds of tons of enemy documents and records were screened and examined and those selected were forwarded to Nuremberg for processing. I now offer in evidence an affidavit by Major Coogan, dated November 19, 1945, attached hereto, describing the method of procedure, capture, screening and delivery of such documents to Nuremberg.” (Emph. added)

After reading a long extract from Coogan’s affidavit to the Tribunal, Storey continued:¹²⁷

“Finally, more than 2,500 documents were selected and filed here in this Court House. At least several hundred will be offered in evidence. They have been photographed, translated into English, filed, indexed, and processed. The same general procedure was followed by the British War Crimes Executive with regard to documents captured by the British Army, and there has been complete integration and cooperation of activities with the British in that regard.” (Emph. added)

The aforementioned Major William H. Coogan was appointed Chief of the Documentation Division of the Office of United States Chief of Counsel in July 1945. On 26 October 1945, Storey wrote a Prosecution memo which advised submitting a general affidavit in lieu of individual authentication of captured documents.¹²⁸ In his affidavit submitted to the Tribunal, Coogan described the personnel employed for the task and their aims in gathering and evaluating German documents:¹²⁹

“The Field Branch of the Documentation Division was staffed by personnel thoroughly conversant with the German language. Their task was to search for and select captured enemy documents in the European Theater which disclosed information relating to the prosecution of the major Axis war criminals.” (Emph. added)

In the chambers of the Military Tribunals, the presumed extermina-

¹²⁶ IMT, vol. II, p. 157.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

¹²⁸ Online: http://library2.lawschool.cornell.edu/donovan/pdf/Batch_8/Vol_XVIII_55_03_01.pdf.

¹²⁹ “Affidavit of Major William H. Coogan,” 19 Nov. 1945, PS-001(a). IMT, vol. XXV, p. 5.

tion of the Jews, particularly with regards to "extermination camps" and "gas chambers," suddenly became a "fact of common knowledge" requiring only the taking of "judicial notice" – that is, a dogma not subject to dispute. The defendants' defense strategy naturally adapted itself to this situation. In this context, a "confession" held out incomparably more hope for the accused than a "denial"; pursuing the latter course would have only increased the punishment for the recalcitrant defendant who, presumed guilty, would necessarily have been considered an impenitent and hardened Nazi as well. Prosecution witnesses, understandably embittered due to the sufferings they endured under the National Socialists, eagerly pushed themselves forward to demand vengeance. The Tribunals proved themselves highly accommodating in this regard, guaranteeing these self-styled witnesses total impunity. Thousands of testimonies offered in dozens of trials never resulted in a single prosecution for perjury, although there was no shortage of obviously and absurdly false statements among them.

The example of the Belsen trial is typical in this sense. Belsen was the first major post-war trial, held by the British from 17 September to 17 November 1945. The principal defendant was *SS-Hauptsturmführer* Josef Kramer, who had been commandant of Auschwitz-II concentration camp (Birkenau) between October 1942 and May 1944, then commandant at Bergen-Belsen. For this reason, the trial involved both Auschwitz and Belsen. In his first statement, Kramer ingenuously told the truth.¹³⁰

"I have heard of the allegations of former prisoners in Auschwitz referring to a gas chamber there, the mass executions and whippings, the cruelty of the guards employed, and that all this took place either in my presence or with my knowledge. All I can say to all this is that it is untrue from beginning to end."

But he soon came to understand the ideological and political function of the trial. The only permissible defense strategy consisted of complete accordance with the dogma of the "gas chambers"; even his defense attorney could not help but accept it:¹³¹

"The gas chamber existed, there is no doubt about it."

"It [is] clear that thousands of people [were] killed in the gas chambers at Auschwitz..."

For this reason, Kramer was compelled to retract his denial as the

¹³⁰ *Trial of Josef Kramer and Forty-Four Others (The Belsen Trial)*. Edited by Raymond Phillips. William Lodge and Company, Limited. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, 1949, p. 731.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 150, 512, resp. Both statements were taken by Major Thomas Claude M. Winwood, defense counsel for Kramer and three other defendants.

trial proceeded. Thus emerged the strategy which was soon to become standard practice for the defense in the post-war courts: the defendant “knew,” but was not directly “responsible.” In this specific case, Kramer declared:¹³²

“I received a written order from him [Rudolf Höss] that I had nothing to do with either the gas chambers or the incoming transports.”

The Belsen trial is also typical as regards the testimonies of the former inmates. While the defense team consisted of eleven British officers and one Polish, even they could not help but repeatedly object to the unreliability of the witnesses, as recorded in both direct transcript and in summary.¹³³

“I am suggesting that the whole incident is imaginary.” (on Ada Bimko)

“I suggest that your account here to-day is exaggerated and untrue. [...] I suggest that the same thing applies to the rest of your evidence and that you are a thoroughly unreliable witness?” (on Sophia Litwinska)

“I put it to you that this incident only occurred in your imagination and that the whole thing is a tissue of lies?” (on Dora Szafran)

“We object to the whole of these affidavits, which are contained in this book and elsewhere, being put before the Court as evidence. In our submission the whole of the evidence contained in this book is completely unreliable, and we invite the Court, having considered the statements which are in the book of those witness who have already given evidence, to judge from these, and say that the remainder should not be received by the Court as they are completely worthless and of so little value that the Court should not make such an enormous departure from what is the normal practice of Criminal Courts and Field General Courts-Martial.”

“Counsel asked the Court to consider the story of Bimko and Hammermasch with regard to killing of the four Russians as a pure invention by two witnesses who had appeared in quick succession in the court for the sole purpose of having a go at Kramer, their former Kommandant, and that further it was for this reason that these two witnesses had accused him of taking an active part in the selections at Auschwitz.”

“Counsel submitted that this witness had come to court and made this wild accusation against Kraft, and further wild accusation against Kramer, without any regard for the truth. [...] Counsel asked the Court to accept Kraft’s story in toto and to reject Sompolinski’s description of Camp No. 2, which could not conceivably be considered a true description.”

“Major Munro submitted that the whole story was pure nonsense...”

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 157.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 76, 82, 89, 141, 518, 519, 524, 524, p. 535, resp. But A. Bimko’s visit to the “gas chamber” was a “stupid and unreal story” as well. *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity*, *op. cit.*, pp. 599-601.

(on Helen Klein)

"The whole story was fantastic." (on Charles S. Bendel)

"What Litwinska had said was inconceivable when compared with the evidence of Dr. Bendel. Where had she got it from? In Counsel's view she had first of all heard from her friend Bimko what she, Bimko, had seen when she went over the gas chamber; then she had heard the story about the girl having been saved from the gas chamber by Hoessler; and she put the two together and had produced this stupid and unreal story."

As defense counsel Major L. S. W. Cranfield noted, it was not difficult to guess the motivation behind all these lies:¹³⁴

"The Nazis have aroused racial passion all over the earth, and I do not think it is unnatural or surprising that those young Jewesses should be vindictive towards their former warders, or to seek to avenge themselves upon them."

The Belsen trial, alas, was no exception. Indeed, I have dwelled at length on it here precisely because it provides a perfect illustration of the prevailing atmosphere of the times, the dogmatism of the Tribunals, the concessive strategies of the defense, and the vengeful motivations of the witnesses.

By means of a powerful mobilization of the communication media, the new judicial dogmas soon developed into a kind of atmosphere of mass consensus which permeated and infected all the parties to the case, judges and witnesses, ex-inmates and ex-SS, journalists and "public opinion."

That which the enemies of revisionism call "conspiracy theory" is in reality simply this all-pervasive atmosphere: all the parties to the case had implicitly agreed, for differing reasons, to support the dogma of the "gas chambers," not as the result of a "conspiracy," but because the gas chambers were now judicial and media "truth," and not subject to argument. As to the witnesses, there is no need to presuppose that they were all deliberate liars; indeed the number of deliberate liars is numerically insignificant. The overwhelming majority of witnesses simply repeated and embellished what they had heard elsewhere, in a process which historian David Irving has called "cross-pollination."¹³⁵ Nor is this merely a matter of pure hearsay, for witnesses may sincerely believe their own corrupted testimony, having interpreted events, the real meaning of which they could not know, in the light of subsequent "knowledge," in a sort of self-delusion aptly described by Italian anti-

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

¹³⁵ D. Irving, "David Irving's Final Address in the London Libel Trial," *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 19 (2000) no. 2, pp. 9-46. (www.ihr.org/jhr/v19/v19n2p-9_Irving.html)

revisionist writer Valentina Pisanty.¹³⁶

"These writers [that is, the witnesses] often interweave their observations with fragments of 'hearsay,' the dissemination of which was omnipresent in the camps. The majority of the inaccuracies to be found in these texts are attributable to the fact that the witnesses confuse what they have seen with their own eyes with what they merely heard of during their period of internment. Then, with the passing of time, to the memory of events actually experienced is added the reading of other works on the subject, with the result that autobiographies published in recent years lack the immediacy of recollection in favour of a more consistent and complete vision of the process of extermination." (Emph. added)

Starting in the early 1950s, the growing Holocaust historiographic industry, through the efforts of such personages as Léon Poliakov, Gerald Reitlinger, Lord Russell of Liverpool, Artur Eisenbach and others, gradually transformed the "judicial truth" of the court rooms into established "historical truth." Earlier trials supplied material for later ones in a perverse, self-perpetuating spiral in which each new sentence served to consolidate the "judicial truth" which had always been presumed from the outset. And this new "judicial truth," in turn, consolidated the resulting "historical truth." Aside from strictly political factors, the numerous trials held in the former Federal Republic of Germany seem to have been intended not so much to administer justice as simply to supply additional "factual" details for the purposes of Holocaust historiography. A few defendants, like Wilhelm Pfannenstiel, were conscious participants in this process and were duly awarded with acquittals or legal impunity.

A book like *NS-Verbrechen vor Gericht* (National Socialist Crimes Before the Court) by Adalbert Rückerl¹³⁷ visibly demonstrates the dependence of Holocaust historiography upon the process of "judicial historiography" inaugurated by the Allied Military Tribunals, which acted as the fertile soil in which the entire process germinated in the first place.¹³⁸ In their introduction to the collective volume *Neuen Studien* discussed above, Morsch and Perz declare candidly:¹³⁹

"Without the investigatory activity of juridical bodies like the Polish Main Commission in Warsaw or the Central Office of the State Justice Ad-

¹³⁶ V. Pisanty, *L'irritante questione delle camere a gas. Logica del negazionismo*. Bompiani, Milano, 1998, p. 183.

¹³⁷ C.F. Müller Juristischer Verlag, Heidelberg, 1982.

¹³⁸ In his treatment of the subject, Rückerl inverts the cause-and-effect relationship of the process, describing the "NS-Verbrechen" [National Socialist crimes] first, and then the trials which established the "judicial truth" of the matter.

¹³⁹ G. Morsch, B. Perz (eds.), *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas*. Introduction, p. xvi.

ministrations in Ludwigsburg, historical research on the mass killings with poison gas would be very difficult to do today.”

One must also add that these trials, as a rule, did not even attempt to make a legally plausible case matching the standards of normal murder trials for the “judicial truth” which they served to promote. The example of the Auschwitz Trial in Frankfurt (20 December 1963 to 20 August 1965) is representative in this regard. In their written verdict the judges stated as follows:¹⁴⁰

“Apart from a few not very productive documents, the Court, in reconstructing the acts of the accused, disposed almost exclusively of witness statements. One of the experiences of criminology is that witness statements are not one of the best methods of proof. All the less so when the testimony of the witness relates to events that took place twenty or more years before, observed by the witness under circumstances of indescribable pain and suffering. Even the ideal witness who wishes only to tell the pure truth and who makes an effort to search his memory suffers from many gaps in his recollections after twenty years. Such a witness runs the risk of projecting onto other persons things which he has actually experienced, and regarding as his own experiences things vividly described in the same context by other people. In this way, he runs the risk of confusing time and place in his recollections. [...]

On the contrary, one need only recall, once again, the endless painstakingly detailed work required in an ordinary murder trial in our own day, the vast number of tiny pieces of the jigsaw puzzle that must be put together to reconstruct the true circumstances at the time of the murder. First of all, the actual corpse is available for examination by the court; there are the autopsy records, the expert reports as to the cause of death; we know the approximate date of death, and the effects upon the victim from which death resulted. The murder weapon is available, there are the fingerprints of the perpetrator, left behind in entering the victim’s house, as well as many other details providing the court with a sense of certainty as to the causes and circumstances of death suffered by the victim at the hands of a given perpetrator. All these things are absent in the present trial.”

This admission alone is sufficient to demonstrate that Holocaust historiography has nothing in common with normal historiography. Medieval history, to return to the allusion of the “controversial bloggers” (p. 29), is not the dependent by-product of military tribunals set up to punish some (presumed) guilty party, and the same is true of any other branch of historiography. Holocaust historiography, an obvious anomaly, is the only exception. That the Holocaust is “unique” is, of course,

¹⁴⁰ Bern Naumann, *Auschwitz. Bericht über die Strafsache gegen Mulka u.a. vor dem Schwurgericht Frankfurt*. Athäneum Verlag, Frankfurt am Main-Bonn, 1965, pp. 523f.

perfectly true, but only with reference to the related procedures of historical writing. What is “unique” is the exterminationist method of writing history itself, the “findings” of which constitute the only form of “truth” not open to discussion in public debate – by law in many countries, by social taboo almost everywhere on this planet. Hence we deal with a sort of metaphysical “truth” here: above reason, above discussion, above objection, to be accepted on pain of various social costs, often those being vindictively lengthy terms of imprisonment. The politicians who promote and defend the various anti-revisionist laws in place around the world are, in so doing, merely admitting that Holocaust historiography is an essentially ideological and political construct built around a “truth” incapable of withstanding objective scrutiny. By contrast, no one has ever demanded anti-“denier” laws with regards, for example, to the witchcraft trials, or any other aspect of the history of the Middle Ages.

One of the writers of the present volume, Jürgen Graf, has felt the force of this inviolable, ideological, “higher” truth on his own person, as is well known.

Considering the framework of ideologically-interested court historiography described above – one based from the outset on the selective corruption of the German documentary record through the objectives and procedures of the Military Tribunals – it is nothing less than astonishing to read that we supposedly hold that “the only source that can be considered a ‘document’ is a German report,” as Nick Terry claims, as if there were no gaps to fill. Still, the issue merits further discussion all the same. It is useful in this regard to first examine and keep in mind a foreword to Whitney R. Harris’s *Tyranny on Trial* penned by none other than Robert G. Storey in April 1954:¹⁴¹

“The purpose of the Nuremberg trial was not merely, or even principally, to convict the leaders of Nazi Germany and affix a punishment upon them commensurate with their guilt. Of far greater importance, it seemed to me from the outset, was the making of a record of the Hitler regime which would withstand the test of history.^[142] I set about, therefore, to assemble the maximum number of German documents which had relevance to the

¹⁴¹ Whitney R. Harris, *Tyranny On Trial: The Trial of the Major German War Criminals at the End of World War II at Nuremberg, Germany, 1945-1946*. Southern Methodist University Press, Dallas, 1999, pp. xi-xii.

¹⁴² A related goal is bluntly stated by an undated OCC plan on PR organization: “One of the primary purposes of the trial of the major war criminals is to document and dramatize for contemporary consumption and for history the means and methods employed by the leading Nazis in their plan to dominate the world and to wage an aggressive war.” Online: http://library2.lawschool.cornell.edu/donovan/pdf/Batch_8/Vol_XVIII_54_02_03.pdf.

crimes charged to the defendants. [...]

We were greatly aided by teams of the United States Army in the collection and preliminary screening of these documents. But it was necessary for us to establish our own records center to which were assigned analysts and translators. The documents which we considered useful, upon final screening, were translated and duplicated for use by the teams of lawyers assigned to the preparation of the several aspects of the affirmative case. In the few weeks we had to work before the commencement of the trial we were able to assemble a surprising number of documents establishing criminality of the Hitler regime. This was partly the result of the maintenance of records by all German offices and departments, and partly due to the fact that when the war drew to a close no general order was issued for the destruction of documents, decisions in that regard no general order was issued for the destruction of documents, decisions in that regard being left up to individuals, offices, and departments. Not infrequently attempts were made to hide, rather than to destroy, important documents. And sometimes we were able to recover entire caches of invaluable written evidence."

As we have seen earlier, the collecting and sorting of German documents performed by the victors after the Second World War represented "a continuation of the war effort of the Allied nations" that was to impress an indelible legacy on the cultural, political and judicial shape of post-war Europe. It was, in fact, performed for the sole purpose of locating material capable of use for meting out "punishment" for crimes whose reality was assumed *a priori*.

Holocaust historiography is unique in this sense as well. All the documents preselected and introduced into evidence at the various post-war trials are prosecution documents; defense counsel had to select documents for their own use exclusively from among this prosecution collection such that, in practice, there are no defense documents on the record. More generally, all the archive material currently available to researchers is also, effectively, prosecution material. Our "plagiarist bloggers," for their part, gloat sarcastically over the fact that, in the course of our research in various eastern European archives, Graf and I have found no documents relating to the destination of the Jews, who, in our opinion, were transferred to the East from the alleged "extermination camps." But when one considers that these archives consist solely of documentation gathered by the Soviets, can one seriously expect to find documentation on transfers that would refute the same Big Myth they found advantageous to maintain as true?

In truth, the fundamental question is now insoluble from a documentary point of view, regardless of the historiographical position from

which it is examined: if the "extermination camps" really existed, the National Socialists must have destroyed the related documentation on the "gas chambers" and exterminations (for indeed there is none); if the "extermination camps" did *not* exist as such, then the Soviets must have destroyed the related documentation on prisoner transfers and resettlement. In view of this dilemma, those asserting the existence of the homicidal "gas chambers" suffer from the equal disadvantage of having to prove their accusations without documents, relying instead solely on "testimonies" and "confessions," which, as I have explained above, have no evidentiary value without valid documentary support, even from the point of view of *these* anomalous historiographical procedures.

Nevertheless, while the dilemma is real, the revisionist position is more reasonable. It is well-known that the Germans left undestroyed large quantities of documents relating to the shootings of Jews, particularly on the Eastern Front, documents written in blunt and open language. Why, then, should they have needed to systematically destroy all documents relating to the "Aktion Reinhardt extermination camps" and Chelmno? This alleged exhaustive yet highly selective destruction of documents makes no sense. Nor can one seriously believe that the documents on shootings were saved by some fortuitous accident (which in this case would require a whole multitude of fortuitous accidents), as was hypothesized nonsensically by Jean-Claude Pressac for the archives of the *Zentralbauleitung* (Central Construction Office) of Auschwitz, which were left practically intact by the retreating SS to be found by the Soviets.¹⁴³

It is known with certainty that the National Socialists issued clear and precise directives on the destruction of documents which they considered important, a process which can be traced in numerous dossiers found in the Military Historical Archive of Prague. For example, the documents classified "*geheime Sache*" (secret matter) and "*geheime Reichssache*" (secret state matter) belonging to the *Einsatzgruppe VII* of the *Organisation Todt* were destroyed starting in January 1945 by superior order, as recorded in a *Vernichtungsprotokoll* (destruction protocol) which lists in detail all the destroyed documents.¹⁴⁴ But with regards to the "Aktion Reinhardt" camps, no trace of even such "destruction protocol" records has ever been found. As a result, in practice there is no way to tell which documents were really destroyed by the National Socialists and which documents the Soviets may have found but chosen

¹⁴³ *Auschwitz: The Case for Sanity, op. cit.*, pp. 32-34.

¹⁴⁴ VHA, Fond OT, 25/7, pp. 299-303.

to suppress.

The essential task and function of revisionism is not to "deny" the claims of Holocaust historiography concerning alleged installations or events, but rather to subject those claims to critical evaluation and verification. From a strictly methodical point of view, the fundamental problem is not whether or not the "gas chambers" existed, but *whether or not the proofs proffered by orthodox Holocaust historiography are justifiable or unfounded*. From this point of view, revisionists are positively interested in what really happened, and this is the principal direction of our research.

We are also inclined to believe that the wartime propaganda which sublimated first into judicial "truth" and later into an all-pervading atmosphere of historical and media "truth" has had a deleterious influence on the great majority of Holocaust historians. No doubt most of these historians have been working in good faith, at least from the point of view of their own overall historical vision, and we are glad to acknowledge as much even if, like Raul Hilberg, they do at times create an obvious tissue of deliberate lies.¹⁴⁵ But they build on false foundations: Holocaust historiography has been corrupted by opportunism and bad faith from the very outset.

Notwithstanding the "hundreds of tons of enemy documents and records" examined by the Americans alone immediately prior to the post-war trials, as Samuel Crowell has astutely noted,¹⁴⁶ the 72 volumes of the three most important collections of trial transcripts¹⁴⁷ altogether contain only *three* documents regarding the alleged (stationary) gas chambers, two relating to Auschwitz and one to Gross-Rosen (NO-4473, NO-4465 and NO-4345). Of these, one, the well-known letter from Karl Bischoff of 29 January 1943, was subject to a mistranslation whereby the term "Vergasungskeller" was rendered as "gas chamber."¹⁴⁸ The second, a letter from the *Zentralbauleitung* (Central Construction Office) of Auschwitz dated 31 March 1943, is the source of an even more serious error, as the term "gasdichte Türme" (gas-tight tow-

¹⁴⁵ J. Graf, *Riese auf tönernen Füßen. Raul Hilberg und sein Standardwerk über den "Holocaust," op. cit.*; C. Mattogno, *Raul Hilberg e i "centri di sterminio" nazionalsocialisti. Fonti e metodologia*, available online at www.vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres8/CMhilberg.pdf

¹⁴⁶ Samuel Crowell, *op. cit.*, pp. 87f.

¹⁴⁷ *Trials of the Major Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal. Nuremberg 14 November 1945-1 October 1946*. Published at Nuremberg, Germany, 1947, (IMT) 42 volumes; *Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals*. Nuremberg, October 1946-April 1949 (NMT), 15 volumes; *Law Reports of War Criminals*; Published for the United Nations War Crimes Commission by His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1947, 15 volumes.

¹⁴⁸ NMT, vol. V, p. 620. NO-4473.

ers) – the latter word clearly a typographical mistake for “Türen” (doors) – was translated as “gas-tight chambers.”¹⁴⁹ And the last of course is simply a grotesque falsification, for in this letter from the firm Tesch and Stabenow to the camp at Gross-Rosen, dated 25 August 1941, the two disinfection chambers equipped with *Degesch-Kreislauf* circulation systems ordered from this firm by the camp *Bauleitung* (construction office) are referred to ominously in translation as “two extermination chambers,”¹⁵⁰ while the subsequent letter of this office to the *Hauptamt Haushalt und Bauten* (Central Office, Administration and Buildings) of 28 August, which refers to the Tesch and Stabenow letter, clearly had as its subject “Delousing plant!”¹⁵¹ As to Bełżec and Treblinka, there were only fantasies of “electrocution installations” and “steam chambers,”¹⁵² while of Chełmno and Sobibór, practically nothing was known at all.

And yet despite all this, it has never occurred to our Holocaust historians to doubt whether the story of the “gas chambers” may be unfounded. Like the Military Tribunals before them, they aprioristically assumed it as a “fact of common knowledge,” a “certain fact” requiring no discussion, only presentation and endorsement. In almost seventy years, they still haven’t found any documentary evidence to support the claim, yet they obsessively persist in their vain task.

The “plagiarist bloggers” are a sort of precipitate of the corrupted historiography we have described above – a sort of slimy sediment in which all of the worst elements are found in concentration. Their method (if we can use the term) is grossly over-simplistic, for it arises from an attitude not of critical detachment but of fundamentalist faith. They believe that the “Aktion Reinhardt” camps were “extermination camps,” and so for them all professed witnesses to that claim are truthful *a priori*. This, in turn, entails a program of systematic distortion, on the one hand of the testimonies, subject of a painful and ridiculous sequence of attempts made to explain or justify the innumerable contradictions they present, and on the other hand of the National Socialist documentation, misrepresented with a multiplicity of lies and impostures in support of the “extermination” thesis.

We, by contrast, start from a foundation of certainty built on a great number of indisputable facts, as we shall see below.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 622. NO-4465.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 363. NO-4345.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 362. NO-4344.

¹⁵² See following chapter.

2.3. Auschwitz: First Example of Holocaust Schizophrenia

The "controversial bloggers" demonstrate their bad faith from the very outset of their "critique":

"From the earliest days of their movement, Holocaust deniers have largely centered their arguments on the Auschwitz death camp. Surveying the literature which makes up so-called Holocaust Revisionism, the obsession with Auschwitz is undoubtedly one of its defining features." (p. 6)

This is a beautiful example of the manner in which our bloggers, with their customary impudence, turn reality completely on its head. A bibliography drawn up by the Auschwitz Museum listing publications about the camp which appeared in the years 1942-1980 contains 1,950 titles, of which barely ten are revisionist in nature.¹⁵³ Here is all the proof one needs that any "obsession with Auschwitz" lay and still lies with orthodox Holocaust historians and the devotees of "Holocaust Memory." Nor has the flood let up in the years since Jean-Claude Pressac focused the attention of historians and the communications media on Auschwitz with his fundamental studies on the camp in 1989 and 1993.¹⁵⁴ In 1994, Michael Berenbaum, in the preface to another classic of Holocaust literature, wrote: "Auschwitz was the largest and most lethal of the Nazi death camps."¹⁵⁵ A voluminous study by Debórah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt¹⁵⁶ appeared only two years later. The Auschwitz Museum published its own history of the camp in five volumes in 1999.¹⁵⁷ A further massive tome by Robert Jan van Pelt – *The Case for Auschwitz* – saw the light in 2002... and so on – and that is to cite only the most important works of scholarly intent. Revisionist scholars have simply replied to this flood of Holocaust literature, a task all the more right and proper in view of the fact that the existing documentation on this camp is well-known to be enormous.

As for the "controversial bloggers," it is only too easy to show that they themselves display a genuine "obsession" – with myself and my

¹⁵³ Anna Malcówna, *Bibliografia KL Auschwitz za lata 1942-1980*. Wydawnictwo Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, 1991.

¹⁵⁴ J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation...*, *op. cit.*; *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz*, *op. cit.*

¹⁵⁵ Yisrael Gutman, Michael Berenbaum (eds.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1994, p. vii.

¹⁵⁶ D. Dwork, R. J. van Pelt, *Auschwitz 1270 to the present*. W.W. Norton & Company. New York-London, 1996.

¹⁵⁷ *Auschwitz 1940-1945. Studien zur Geschichte des Konzentrations- und Vernichtungslager Auschwitz*. Published by Waclaw Długoborski and Franciszek Piper. Publishing House of the State Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau. Oświęcim 1999.

co-authors – as is evidenced by the contents of their blog. And an obsession makes it hard to see clearly sometimes. A few lines beneath their silly insinuation about revisionism’s supposed “obsession” with Auschwitz, the “controversial bloggers” declare:

“After arguing for so long over Auschwitz, and losing those arguments in open court during the Irving vs Lipstadt libel trial of 2000, deniers began to turn their attention to the so-called Aktion Reinhard camps of Belzec, Sobibor and Treblinka.” (p. 6)

Clearly our “controversial bloggers” suffer from some kind of Holocaust schizophrenia which cuts them off from reality. The reality, as far as I am concerned, may be summed up as follows: it was *after* the verdict in the Irving libel trial (11 April 2000) that I published the eight fundamental studies on Auschwitz listed above in section 2.1, including my systematic demolition (published in English in 2010) of van Pelt’s expert report whose arguments were used by Justice Gray in his decision against Irving!

2.4. Scope and Significance of Our Response

In their puerile arrogance, our “plagiarist bloggers” make the following ridiculous prediction:

“Given that deniers seem incapable of reading a book from front to back, we anticipate that many denier readers will start with the gas chamber chapter and then respond with personal incredulity. They will ignore the long sections on discovery and wartime knowledge (chapter 1), overwhelming proof of extermination decisions (chapter 2) and the twisted road to Belzec (chapter 3). They will refuse to accept any burden of proof to show that there was a hoax (chapter 1) or to show systematic evidence of resettlement, not the cherrypicked hearsay crap that Kues hypocritically parades as evidence (chapter 4). All these things would be mistakes. The critique is intended to be read as a whole, and the arguments advanced in each chapter have not been put forward independently of each other.” (p. 36)

Apparently our bloggers really do think they have produced an unassailable work of historical research, a symptom which fully confirms the diagnosis of Holocaust schizophrenia. In reality, what they have constructed is an intellectual sand castle which dissolves with the first wave of revisionist criticism. Our critique, presented in the chapters that follow, is both radical and total: our response covers every chapter of the “Cut and Paste Manifesto” and answers all the arguments of the “controversial bloggers,” even the most fatuous (of which there is no

shortage).

The object of our response is not so much to refute their fallacious "historical reconstruction," though we shall indeed do so, demonstrating the falsehoods, the impostures and the flights of delirium it contains. But we would not have the attention we thus give their "work" misconstrued as a mark of scholarly respect: spreaders of hatred and vandals and falsifiers do not merit respect, let alone a patient reply. Our interest, rather, lies in the opportunity for comprehensive refutation which our opponents have unwittingly supplied by producing their "Cut and Paste Manifesto." For with their unprecedented plagiarisms, they have created a sort of *Summa holocaustica*, piling up, as best they can, all the possible or imaginable arguments in favour of the existence of the homicidal "gas chambers" and all the possible and imaginable criticisms of our arguments against it.

Our response thus aims above all to show the total vacuity of orthodox Holocaust historiography's claim that Bełżec, Sobibór and Treblinka were "extermination camps" equipped with homicidal "gas chambers." In this sense, the "plagiarist bloggers" have made a decisive contribution, on the one hand rendering obvious the total historical inconsistency of such a claim, while on the other stimulating us to extremely profitable new discoveries. This latter point relates in particular to the introduction of a conspicuous mass of new documents, brought together in our presentation of many new arguments still more solid than those published by ourselves in the past. The result is the end of the legend of the "Aktion Reinhardt extermination camps."

In this regard, Robert Muehlenkamp's contribution is fundamental. His two chapters on the "forensic and archaeological evidence about the mass graves" ("Mass Graves" pp. 382-439) and "fuel requirements, cremation time and disposal of cremation remains" ("Burning of the Corpses" pp. 440-515; capsule descriptions on p. 35) are characterised by raving flights of delirium which in themselves demonstrate the total absurdity of the whole Holocaust scenario. By virtue of a sort of boomerang effect which the "controversial bloggers," in their arrogant self-congratulation, could scarcely have imagined, their "critique" has induced us to lay the foundations for an entirely new, exhaustive study on the "Aktion Reinhardt" camps, to be published as soon as we have completed more urgent tasks postponed for the purpose of drawing up this response. The time spent on the present response and the postponement of our principal commitment will not have been in vain, however, since they will have resulted in a new book in paper format,

far better-documented than the three books which preceded it. This is the principal object of the present response.

In their “Cut and Paste Manifesto” the “plagiarist bloggers” present a “historical reconstruction” based on a mass of distorted documents, pseudo-arguments and futile chattering. To gain some idea of the total historiographic inconsistency of their approach and to gain a better understanding of the significance and value of our own response, one must start out from a factual basis. The facts of the “Aktion Reinhardt” camps will be documented in detail in the study that follows, but let’s review them here briefly:

There are no documents on the gassing of Jews in any of the “Aktion Reinhardt” camps.

There is no German order to exterminate Jews in these camps.

There is no German order to build these camps as “extermination camps.”

The archaeological investigations conducted by Polish authorities at Bełżec and Sobibór have found no trace of any homicidal “gas chambers.”

It would have been impossible to bury the bodies of the alleged victims at Bełżec and Treblinka; some 281,200 and 654,800 bodies would have remained unburied in these two camps respectively. Hence the killing and burial of 434,508 persons at Bełżec and of 758,400 at Treblinka cannot have happened.

For these two camps, the volume of ashes produced in cremating the claimed number of corpses would have exceeded the volume of the “officially certified” mass graves by 109% and 305%, respectively, while at Sobibór it would have occupied more than 50%. But these quantities find no confirmation in archaeology, and thus the claimed cremations cannot have taken place.

In none of the three camps would it have been possible to acquire the quantities of wood needed to cremate the alleged number of bodies within the allowed time frame. To supply all three camps, the inmates assigned to this duty would have required 9,716 days, more than 26½ years! Hence the supply of such a quantity of wood cannot have occurred.

Finally, the cremation of the alleged number of corpses would have been impossible within the asserted chronological limits and would have lasted for another 592 days. For this reason, the cremation of the alleged gassing victims cannot have occurred.

In the face of such evidence, the pathetic attempts of the “plagiarist

bloggers” to sustain the thesis of mass extermination vanish like so much exterminationist fog under the sun of revisionism.