

THE “EXTERMINATION CAMPS” OF “AKTION REINHARDT”
PART ONE

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
PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

October 2013

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

Uckfield, East Sussex: CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

PO Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

Part One of Two. Sold as a set only

October 2013

ISBN: 978-1-59148-035-8 (short print version)

978-1-59148-036-5 (long PDF version)

ISSN: 1529-7748

Published by CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

Manufactured in the United States of America and in the UK

© 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.

Editor’s Note: On request of the authors, this book was rushed through the translation and editing process in order to make it available as swiftly as possible. Any flaws in layout, style, grammar, translation accuracy and syntax are hence the authors’ responsibilities.

The book exists in two versions: a “short” printed version which does not include most of the foreign language quotes, and an extended PDF version which includes all foreign language quotes (see at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com). We strive to improve this PDF version constantly. Any help for this is appreciated.

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 costumers’. 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*, Metropol 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 Gernar 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, Gernar 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 Bełżec, 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 Bełżec 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 Rückerl, *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 Belzec, 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 Belzec 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 Belzec "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 *Belżec, 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 denier 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