

I N S I D E T H E G A S C H A M B E R S

Inside the Gas Chambers

**The Extermination
of
Mainstream Holocaust Historiography**

By Carlo Mattogno



**Castle Hill Publishers
P.O. Box 243, Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK
October 2016**

HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS, Volume 25:

Carlo Mattogno:

Inside the Gas Chambers:

The Extermination of Mainstream Holocaust Historiography.

Translated by Henry Gardner

Original Italian edition: “*Nuovi studi*” contro il revisionismo:

La storiografia olocaustica alla deriva

2nd edition with typographical corrections

Uckfield, East Sussex: CASTLE HILL PUBLISHERS

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

October 2016

ISBN13: 978-1-59148-161-4 (print edition)

ISBN10: 1-59148-161-9 (print edition)

ISSN: 1529-7748

© 2014, 2016 by Carlo Mattogno

Distribution worldwide by:

Castle Hill Publishers

P.O. Box 243

Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

<https://shop.codoh.com>

Set in Times New Roman

www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

Cover illustrations: top left: the fraudulent “homicidal gas chamber” at the Mauthausen Camp; top right: the fraudulent “homicidal gas chamber” at the Auschwitz Main Camp; center left: one of the fraudulent “homicidal gas chambers” at the Majdanek Camp; center right: the fraudulent “homicidal gas chambers” at the Dachau Camp; bottom: group of concentration-camp inmates.

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword	7
Introduction	23
1. The Lethal Gases	24
2. The Euthanasia Centers and “ <i>Aktion 14 f 13</i> ”	38
3. The “Gas Vans”	55
4. From Euthanasia to the Camps of “ <i>Aktion Reinhardt</i> ”	62
5. The Chelmno Camp	72
6. The Camps of “ <i>Aktion Reinhardt</i> ”	79
7. Van Pelt’s Auschwitz	87
8. The Gas Chambers of the Majdanek Camp.....	114
9. The Gas Chamber of the Mauthausen Camp.....	130
10. The Gas Chamber of the Sachsenhausen Camp	150
11. The Gas Chamber of the Ravensbrück Camp	180
12. The Gassings at the Neuengamme Camp.....	197
13. The Gas Chamber at the Stutthof Camp.....	199
14. The Gas Chamber at the Natzweiler Camp	205
15. The Mysterious Gas Chamber at Dachau.....	222
16. Holocaust-Propaganda against Revisionism	227
17. Conclusion.....	234
18. Appendix	245
18.1. Abbreviations	245
18.2. List of Tables.....	245
18.3. Documents and Photos.....	246
18.4. Bibliography.....	258
18.5. Index of Names	268

Foreword

By Jürgen Graf

1. The Definitive Establishment of Total Historical Truth

In reaction to the spectacular advances of revisionist historical research after the mid-1970s, an anthology entitled *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas*¹ (*National Socialist Mass Killings by Means of Toxic Gas*) appeared in Germany in 1983. (An English translation with the title *Nazi Mass Murder* followed ten years later.) Its main editors were

- Eugen Kogon (1903-1987), former Buchenwald detainee and author of the book *Der SS-Staat* (1946), which is steeped in coarse political propaganda of the early post-war period;
- Hermann Langbein (1912-1995), former communist combatant, Dachau and Auschwitz detainee and co-founder and activist of the International Auschwitz Committee, founded in 1974;
- Adalbert Rückerl (1925-1986), at the time head of the German Central Office of the State Justice Administrations for the Investigation of National Socialist Crimes (*Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen zur Aufklärung nationalsozialistischer Verbrechen*).

The introduction to this collection included a paragraph which could not but arouse suspicion in the mind of a non-partisan reader:

“People who attempt to clear the national-socialist system of any guilt are trying to profit from the incredible character of the events. Some will go so far as to deny outright the mass murder of a heretofore unimaginable degree. In order to fight such tendencies effectively and limit their propagation, the whole historical truth must be definitively stated once and for all. A group of 24 specialists from 6 different countries has consecrated itself to this cause.”

Historical research, just like any other discipline, is always open for revisions and thus can never be settled in a definitive way, and attempting to impose a certain vision, taken by some to be true, in such a dogmatic and unscientific manner, is proof of an unscientific approach. Such endeavors pave the way for an imposition of this dogma by means of the penal code. Revisions may be judged to be superfluous if we are dealing with matters that are clearly established by scientific proof and no serious objections can

¹ Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl *et al.* (eds.), *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt upon Main 1983; Engl.: *Nazi Mass Murder*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1993.

be raised. This would apply, for example, to the fact that the Battle of Waterloo took place in 1815, that Adolf Hitler became Germany's Chancellor on 30 January 1933, or that the US Air Force dropped nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August of 1945. Anyone asserting that the Battle of Waterloo did not take place in 1815 but in 1789, that Adolf Hitler was nominated Chancellor not on 30 January 1933, but on 9 November 1918, or that the atom bombs which struck Hiroshima and Nagasaki were a product of Japanese black propaganda would be generally ignored. Such theories might be mentioned as curiosities in newspapers, but no serious historian would waste his time refuting them. The mere fact that "a group of 24 specialists from 6 different countries has consecrated itself to this cause" of definitively proving "the mass murder of a heretofore unimaginable degree" would indicate that already in the early 1980s Holocaust revisionism had become so significant that the proponents of the orthodox version of history could no longer afford to ignore it.

2. A Brief Review of the History of Revisionism prior to 1983

The Frenchman Paul Rassinier may rightly be called the founder of revisionism. He was a socialist and a member of the resistance in occupied France during WW2; arrested in 1943 by the Gestapo, he was tortured, deported to Buchenwald and later taken to the Dora-Mittelbau camp. In his post-war book *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* ("Ulysses' Lie," 1950) Rassinier attacked the blatant exaggerations by former detainees about conditions in the German camps. For several years he carried out his own studies about homicidal gassings and came to the conclusion that such gassings had never been carried out or were attributable only to a few individual madmen. Three years before his death, in 1964, he wrote²:

"Over the last 15 years, whenever I heard of someone in a European country not occupied by the Soviet Union who claimed to have witnessed gassings, I travelled there to hear his account. Every time, though, things took the same course: on the basis of my file, I asked the witness a number of detailed questions only to hear the same obvious lies over and over again; in the end, he always had to admit that he had not seen the alleged scenes himself but had merely repeated the account given to him by a trustworthy friend who had died in a camp. I covered literally thousands of miles all over Europe."

In 1976, Arthur Butz, professor of electrical engineering at Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois, USA, published a study entitled *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*,³ which went considerably beyond Rassi-

² Paul Rassinier, *Le drame des juifs européens*, Les Sept Couleurs, Paris 1964, p. 79.

³ Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Historical Review Press, Brighton 1976; 3rd, exp. ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003.

nier's various works. Butz compared the scenario drawn up by leading Holocaust historians, such as Gerald Reitlinger and Raul Hilberg, concerning the alleged eradication of the Jews with war-time reports and concluded that, on the subject of the killing methods allegedly employed and at least partly also regarding the alleged locations, the story had fundamentally changed. He also raised the question as to whether it would have been possible to hide an industrial genocide in extermination camps over any length of time. His answer was unambiguous: for any number of reasons such a cover-up would have been impossible. If the Allies had presented the Vatican or the International Committee of the Red Cross with proof of systematic mass murder, these institutions would have reacted without hesitation. They did not, however. While criticizing severely the persecution of Jews, they never spoke of gas chambers or extermination camps.⁴ Butz concluded that the stories about gas chambers and exterminations were nothing but black propaganda which was continued after the war for political reasons.

The year 1978 saw the publication, in Germany, of a book entitled *Der Auschwitz-Mythos* (The Auschwitz Myth) by Wilhelm Stäglich.⁵ Stäglich dealt primarily with the two basic pillars of the orthodox Auschwitz edifice, viz. the account written by the erstwhile Auschwitz commander Rudolf Höß while detained in a Krakow prison, and the verdict of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial (1963-1965). He concluded that both elements were untrustworthy from any point of view: Höß's account was so full of contradictions and absurdities as to deprive it of any legal value, while the Frankfurt trial blatantly disregarded the elementary rules applying to a court of law, such as the precedence taken by factual or documentary proof over witness testimony.

Even more decisive than the books by Butz and Stäglich were the investigations of the French professor Robert Faurisson. Faurisson was convinced that any critical appraisal of alleged gassings at Auschwitz would have to begin with the weapon of the crime. He drew up a comparison between the rooms at Auschwitz which are labelled as "gas chambers" by orthodox historiography with rooms which have actually been used for executions with hydrogen cyanide in the United States since 1924. An execution using this poison was a dangerous and complicated act. The delinquent was strapped onto a chair, and then a certain amount of cyanide was dropped by the executioner from the outside into a container filled with

⁴ On the Vatican's attitude see esp. Robert Faurisson, *Le révisionnisme de Pie XII*, Graphos, Genoa 2002; Engl.: *Pope Pius XII's Revisionism*, Historical Review Press, Uckfield 2006.

⁵ Wilhelm Stäglich, *Der Auschwitz-Mythos*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1978; Engl.: *Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence*, 2nd ed., Institute for Historical Revisionism, Newport Beach 1990.

sulfuric acid. Fatal vapors of hydrogen cyanide were liberated in the process. The delinquent would lose consciousness within 45 seconds and died within 8 or 10 minutes. The gas chamber would then be ventilated for 15 minutes, another 30 minutes later a physician and two helpers, protected by gas masks, entered the chamber and removed the corpse.⁶ Faurisson compared this procedure with the description given by Rudolf Höß, according to which the *Sonderkommando* would enter the gas chamber – which was full of corpses – some 30 minutes after the death of the victims without any gas masks, for, as we know from Höß, the members of the *Kommando* used to smoke and eat while removing the corpses. Faurisson concludes that the *Sonderkommando* members would have died on the spot and that, furthermore, any gassings in the poorly sealed rooms at Auschwitz would have quickly caused a chemical catastrophe in the whole camp.

On 29 December 1978 and on 16 January 1979, Faurisson succeeded in publishing two articles in the French newspaper *Le Monde* expounding these arguments.⁷ Thereupon 32 French scholars published a reply in the same newspaper on 21 February 1979, declaring:

“We must not ask ourselves how such mass murder was technically possible. It was technically possible because it took place.”

In addition to Butz, Stäglich, and Faurisson, a number of high-caliber revisionist authors started speaking out toward the end of the 1970s. In Germany Udo Walendy started publishing his valuable journal *Historische Tatsachen*; in France, Faurisson received the support of revisionists like Serge Thion and Pierre Guillaume; in the US, under the leadership of Willis Carto, the *Journal of Historical Review* began to appear in 1979. The collection *Nazi Mass Murder* was obviously meant as the court historians’ rebuttal of this worrisome revision of the officially sanctioned scenario.

3. *Nazi Mass Murder: The Argumentative Structure of an Anti-Revisionist Anthology*

When reading through this collection one is struck by the almost unbelievable fact that no revisionist scholar is mentioned by name, that no revisionist work is quoted and no revisionist argument is addressed for any kind of scrutiny. This aspect by itself casts a glaring spotlight on the propagandistic and unscientific character of the book and reveals the absurdity of

⁶ A detailed description of the U.S. gas chambers can be found in: Serge Thion, *Vérité historique ou vérité politique?*, La Vieille Taupe, Paris 1980; see also: Fred Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005.

⁷ Robert Faurisson, “Le problème des chambres à gaz” ou “La rumeur d’Auschwitz,” *Le Monde*, 29 December 1978; *idem.*, “Droit de réponse,” *Le Monde*, 16 January 1979. Both articles are included in R. Faurisson, *Ecrits révisionnistes (1974-1998)*, private edition, Vichy 2004, pp. 123, 133.

its arrogant claim that “the whole historical truth must be carved in stone once and for all” – anyone claiming to search for “the whole truth” must not shy away from a dispute with his opponents and their arguments.

A large part of this volume dealt with the so-called *Euthanasia* – the killing of mentally ill persons by the authorities of the Third Reich, which is not denied by the revisionists. Their past and present doubts (but not outright denial) concern merely the allegations that the killings were carried out by means of carbon monoxide gas supplied in steel bottles – there is no documentary proof for this. As the historic fact of euthanasia is not put in doubt, the question of the means used (carbon monoxide or injections?) would as such appear to be of secondary importance. Seen from the point of view of the orthodox historians, however, its great significance becomes clear in that the alleged mass killings of Jews in the “Eastern extermination camps” such as Bełżec, Sobibór, and Treblinka are depicted as a logical sequel to the Euthanasia Action.

An alert reader of this collection will soon notice that no documentary evidence exists for the alleged mass killings of Jews in gas chambers or gas vans. In an effort to get around this predicament, the authors made use of a sleight-of-hand, already used at the Nuremberg Trials, which was characterized in the following way by Carlo Mattogno⁸:

“At Nuremberg the inquisitors invented this absurd method of proof which allows reading into any document a meaning which cannot be found explicitly. This method of interpretation is based on the arbitrary and unfounded axiom that even in the most secret documents the NS authorities had employed a kind of code language, the key to which the Nuremberg inquisitors obviously claimed to have found. Thus, even the most innocent documents could be falsely interpreted in the sense of a thesis of extermination.”

In *Nazi Mass Murder* this technique was taken to a new level: on pp. 5-12 Ruckerl provides us with a “decoding of the encoded notions.” Like his predecessors, he regards words like “*Auswanderung*” (emigration) or “*Evakuierung*” (evacuation) as euphemisms for “physical extermination.” He also distorts words which begin with “*Sonder-*,” like “*Sonderbehandlung*” (special treatment), “*Sonderaktion*” (special action), “*Sondermaßnahmen*” (special measures). These designations, while sometimes being used as synonyms for “execution,”⁹ could in other cases signify housing of famous enemy personalities in princely conditions and with additional food rations.¹⁰ The topic “Special Treatment in Auschwitz” has been dealt with by

⁸ Carlo Mattogno, *La soluzione finale*, Edizioni di Ar, Padua 1991, pp. 64f.

⁹ According to a decree of the RSHA as quoted on page 17 of the discussed anthology, severe crimes committed by foreign workers were to be punished by “special treatment by the rope.” 3040-PS.

¹⁰ IMT, vol. XI, pp. 338f.

Mattogno in a separate book, published in 2003, which presents a number of Auschwitz documents containing “*Sonder-*” composites. He proves that in not even a single case did these words have a criminal connotation, yet instead often referred to hygienic, life-saving measures.¹¹

Seeing the meagerness of such “documentary evidence,” the authors of this collection felt obliged to make use of a large number of testimonies as “proof” for the mass killings by means of gas, some of which could only provoke incredulity. (In his article about the gas chamber of Mauthausen Hans Marsalek, on p. 247, quotes the verdict of a U.S. court, according to which the “gas cell” was preheated with a hot brick and the gas was introduced “bound on shreds of paper”!) Judged superficially, most of the testimonies and confessions did not appear to be contradictory and could thus be taken to be convincing at first sight. There is a significant reason for that: The editors had carefully combed through the corresponding statements and removed any obviously absurd passages. A significant example is the brief paragraph from an account by the SS officer Kurt Gerstein on the subject of alleged gassings of Jews in the Belżec camp, quoted on pp. 171f. (German edition) by the Israeli historian Yitzhak Arad, where the author leaves out a line speaking of 700 to 800 victims herded into a 25 sqm chamber (*i.e.* some three persons per square foot!). Furthermore, the author omits Gerstein’s repeated references to a diesel engine being used as the murder weapon, which would have roused the suspicion of any reader with some basic knowledge of toxicology.¹²

There is hardly any need to mention that this collection never discusses the fantastic stories published during the war and in the early post-war years, which proffered the most outrageously varying accounts of killing methods. At the time, most witnesses spoke of electric current as having been the means used at Belżec. In 1945, a certain Dr. Stefan Szende asserted that “millions” of Jews met their death in gigantic subterranean water basins through high-voltage current.¹³ According to another key witness for Belżec, the non-Jewish Pole Jan Karski, the Jews were herded and locked into cattle cars whose floor was covered with unslaked lime which burnt the flesh off the living victims.¹⁴

¹¹ Carlo Mattogno, *Special Treatment. Origin and Meaning of a Term*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2004.

¹² Due to their high oxygen and low carbon monoxide contents, diesel exhaust gases are not at all suited for killing people; any gasoline engine would have been far more efficient. One year after the appearance of the German original edition of *Nazi Mass Murder*, U.S. revisionist Friedrich P. Berg published a well-founded paper about this (“The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth within a Myth,” *Journal of Historical Review*, vol. 5, no. 1, Spring 1984, pp. 15-46).

¹³ Stefan Szende, *Der letzte Jude aus Polen*, Europa Verlag, Zürich 1945.

¹⁴ Jan Karski, *Story of a Secret State*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston 1944, pp. 339-351.

In the case of Sobibór, the most important witnesses named chlorine as having been the killing agent, or an ill-defined “black fluid” which was poured into the death chamber through holes in its ceiling. Most witnesses state that the gas chamber had a moveable floor through which the corpses fell either into a pit or into a railroad freight-car.¹⁵

Passing on to Treblinka, we encounter a long report distributed by the underground resistance movement of the Warsaw ghetto, according to which two million Jews had been killed there by means of hot steam.¹⁶ Once the Red Army had liberated the Treblinka area, a Soviet commission asserted that the Germans had suffocated three million Jews to death in that camp by herding them into sealed chambers and removing the air.¹⁷ Later on, during the Nuremberg Trial, the Polish government revived the steam version; a document presented by Poland spoke of “several hundred thousands of people” having been murdered by hot steam in the Treblinka camp.¹⁸

The year 1946/47 saw the switch-over to chambers using toxic gases. As it was most incredible that in the three camps, all run by the same authority, such diverse methods of murder had been applied, all these variants were dumped into the trashcan of history and replaced by chambers using the exhaust gases of combustion engines. This version had been proposed by the confessions of Kurt Gerstein who claimed to have witnessed a gassing operation at Bełżec employing the exhaust gases from a diesel engine.

The case of Auschwitz is no less enlightening. In the period between 24 October 1941 and 7 July 1944, the Polish underground resistance published a total of 32 reports about this camp, depicting it as an extermination camp. The means used were described as having been poison gasses, an imaginary gas called “Kreuzolit,” “electric baths” as well as a “pneumatic hammer”; whereas “Zyklon B” was never mentioned. The gas chambers themselves, according to these reports, were not in the crematories but in “houses in a forest.”¹⁹

Very tactfully, the authors of *Nazi Mass Murder* treat these stories with complete silence.

The revisionists did not react with a comprehensive reply to this orthodox onslaught against critical, well-reasoned historiography. This is not really surprising, as revisionist scholarship was still in its infancy at that

¹⁵ Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues, Carlo Mattogno, *Sobibór. Holocaust Propaganda and Reality*, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010.

¹⁶ K. Marczewska, W. Ważniewski, “Treblinka w świetle Akt Delegatury Rządu RP na Kraju,” *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Hitlerowskich w Polsce*, vol. XIX, Warsaw 1968, pp. 136ff.

¹⁷ Gosudarstvenny Arkhiv Rossiskoj Federatsii, Moscow, 7021-115-9, p. 108.

¹⁸ Nuremberg Document PS-3311.

¹⁹ Enrique Aynat, “Die Berichte des polnischen Widerstandes über die Gaskammern von Auschwitz,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 8(2) (2004), pp. 150-166.

time. For reasons evident, the revisionists had concentrated almost completely on Auschwitz. There were as yet no revisionist works dealing with the “*Aktion Reinhardt*” camps (Bełżec, Sobibór, Treblinka) or with the gas vans. Over the years, there have been fundamental changes, though.

4. The Evolution of Revisionist Scholarship from the Late 1980s Onward

In 1988, the Toronto court of appeals handled the appeal lodged by Ernst Zündel, a German-Canadian revisionist.²⁰ During the appeal trial, Zündel and Faurisson called for an expert opinion by Fred Leuchter, a U.S. specialist employed in the installation and maintenance of gas chambers which were still in use for executions in some U.S. states at the time. The expert opinion was to cover the rooms labeled gas chambers at Auschwitz I, Birkenau and Majdanek. In February of 1988, accompanied by a small group of assistants, Leuchter flew to Poland, visited the sites and then wrote the first ever technical expert opinion on the “crime scenes” of the “greatest mass murder” in history.²¹ His conclusions covered three issues:

- The “gas chambers” were not designed as such and could not have been used for such a purpose.
- The capacity of the crematoria would have allowed for the incineration of only a fraction of the alleged victims.
- Chemical analyses carried out (not by Leuchter himself but by a chemist called Dr. James Roth) on samples taken from the walls of the “gas chambers” showed no or only insignificant traces of cyanic residues, whereas a control sample taken from a Zyklon B delousing chamber revealed enormously high cyanide contents.

The *Leuchter Report* had its undeniable weaknesses also in the eyes of revisionist researchers,²² but its function as an ice-breaker cannot be overestimated. In the years between 1990 and 1993, the German accredited chemist Germar Rudolf analyzed the *Leuchter Report* in detail. A considerably enlarged new German edition of his report was published in 2001,²³ while the latest English edition of 2011 has been greatly expanded and re-

²⁰ Cf. Robert Lenski, *Der Holocaust vor Gericht*, 2nd ed., Uckfield 2010.

²¹ Fred Leuchter, *An engineering report on the alleged “gas chambers” at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Toronto 1988; cf. Fred Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports. Critical Edition*, 2nd ed., Washington, DC, 2011.

²² For example, the cremation capacity claimed by Leuchter was too low, and he claimed erroneously that the “gas chambers” had no ventilation system. Just as flawed was his hypothesis that gas chambers could not have been located in the same building as incineration ovens due to the high explosivity of hydrogen cyanide. Such a danger would have existed only at extremely high concentrations of hydrogen cyanide. See apart from F. Leuchter, R. Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *ibid.*, also Carlo Mattogno, *Holocausto: Dilettanti allo sbaraglio*, Edizioni di Ar, Padua 1996, pp. 212ff.

²³ Germar Rudolf, *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2001.

vised.²⁴ Rudolf came to the conclusion that the mass gassings reported by the witnesses for Auschwitz could not have taken place for structural and chemical reasons:

- At the alleged time, the holes for the introduction of Zyklon B were missing; the granules could not have been introduced in the manner described by the witnesses.
- Hydrogen cyanide reacts with some of the substances contained in the brickwork. The most stable of the resulting compounds is the pigment Iron Blue or Berlin Blue, which originally provided the German name for hydrogen cyanide (“*Blausäure*,” *i.e.* blue acid). If mass gassings had taken place in the “gas chambers,” Iron Blue should have been found in quantities comparable to their presence in the brickwork of disinfestation chambers, but the walls of the “gas chambers” contain only non-reproducible amounts of cyanide, close to the detection limits.

The enormous upswing which revisionism experienced in the early 1990s was primarily due to Germar Rudolf and Carlo Mattogno. In 1994, Rudolf published the revisionist anthology *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*²⁵ under the pseudonym Ernst Gauss. In it, the essential aspects of the “Holocaust” topic were discussed. An enlarged English edition appeared later under the title *Dissecting the Holocaust*.²⁶ From 1996 onwards, Rudolf acted as the editor of the academically demanding *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (Quarterly Journal for Free Historical Research), regularly publishing his own articles there as well; he also supervised the publication of a large number of revisionist works by the publishing companies Castle Hill Publishers (England) and Theses & Dissertation Press (USA) which he had founded. In 2005, he summarized, in the form of dialogues, the most important revisionist arguments in a book entitled *Vorlesungen über den Holocaust*.²⁷ Lacking convincing counter-arguments, the Holocaust lobby had to be satisfied by a personal vendetta directed against Rudolf. In November of 2005, he was expelled from the USA, where he had been living with his American wife and daughter, and handed over to Germany where he was imprisoned until July of 2009. This persecution was too late, though, as Rudolf’s work had already been done by that time.

²⁴ G. Rudolf, W. Lambrecht, *The Rudolf Report*, 2nd, revised ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2011.

²⁵ Ernst Gauss (ed.), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1994.

²⁶ Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd. ed., Theses & Dissertation Press, Chicago 2003.

²⁷ Germar Rudolf, *Vorlesungen über den Holocaust*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2005; 2nd ed. The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010.

In contrast to the German citizen Rudolf, the Italian citizen Mattogno has so far enjoyed the benefits of living in a country which has not (yet) fettered historiography (although the Italian Holocaust lobby has been trying and keeps trying to change that; if they succeed, such a measure will come into force too late to be effective.)

In the years after 1985, Mattogno has devoted the better part of his creativity to the elucidation of the fate of the Jews during the Second World War. His impressive activity when it comes to Auschwitz, culminating in the gigantic two-volume work *Auschwitz—The Case for Sanity*,²⁸ has been complemented by research into the other alleged extermination camps. For his studies on Majdanek²⁹ and Treblinka³⁰ as well as Stutthof,³¹ labeled an “auxiliary extermination camp” by the Polish historical literature, I was able to assist him as a project initiator and co-author; the Bełżec³² und Chelmno³³ camps he has handled by himself. The final one of the “extermination camps,” Sobibór, we both covered together with the Swedish researcher Thomas Kues in a 500-page study.¹⁵ I regard my contribution to this work as the epitome of my work as a revisionist.

Today the most significant revisionist author next to Mattogno is Thomas Kues, who is presently conducting a thorough analysis of the fate of those Jews who were deported to the East by the Germans, aimed at depriving orthodox Holocaust historians of their last remaining argument: What happened to the deported Jews, if they were not gassed?

5. “New Studies” – or Old Wine in New Skins

The “democratic” system reacted to the progress of revisionism by increasing Holocaust propaganda and by intensifying repression. Muzzling laws were foisted upon one European nation after another, and subsequently many revisionists landed behind bars, some of them for many years. But there were some people in the Holocaust lobby who found that propaganda

²⁸ Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz. The Case for Sanity*, The Barnes Review, Washington 2010.

²⁹ Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *KL Majdanek. Eine historische und technische Studie*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 1998; Engl.: *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, 3rd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2012.

³⁰ Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, *Treblinka – Vernichtungslager oder Durchgangslager?*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2002; Engl.: *Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?*, reprint of 2nd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010.

³¹ Jürgen Graf, Carlo Mattogno, *Das Konzentrationslager Stutthof und seine Funktion in der nationalsozialistischen Judenpolitik*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 1999; Engl.: *Concentration Camp Stutthof*, 3rd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC (in press).

³² Carlo Mattogno, *Bełżec. Propaganda, Zeugenaussagen, archäologische Untersuchungen, historische Fakten*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2004; Engl.: *Bełżec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*, reprint, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2011.

³³ Carlo Mattogno, *Il campo di Chelmno tra storia e propaganda*, effepi, Genoa 2009; Engl.: *The Chelmno Camp in History and Propaganda*, Washington, DC, 2011.

and the terror of a police state were not enough. Something had to be done to counter the arguments of the “deniers.” Hence, on the 25th anniversary of the publication of the original German edition of *Nazi Mass Murder*, a meeting dealing with “New Studies on National Socialist Mass Killings by Poison Gas” was organized. Three years later, the lectures given there were published in an anthology (no doubt with the usual corrections and enlargements added later) bearing the same title, whose editors were Günter Morsch and Bertrand Perz.³⁴

Even a cursory examination of the book reveals the following points:

1. An over-emphasis on euthanasia

No less than six contributions (covering a total of 61 pages) are devoted to “euthanasia,” the historical truth of which has never been put in doubt by anyone. What might be discussed in this connection are the means employed and possibly the number of victims. Unqualified as I am to pronounce myself on this topic, I shall not comment on it. Therefore, my criticism below does not refer to these texts.

2. The “Aktion Reinhardt camps”: Ten pages and ten lines for 1.3 million “gassed” victims

In an article entitled “Mass killings by poison gas within the framework of ‘Aktion Reinhardt’” (“Massentötungen durch Giftgas im Rahmen der ‘Aktion Reinhardt’”), Dieter Pohl sets the number of Jews allegedly gassed at Bełżec, Sobibór, and Treblinka at “roughly 95% of at least 1,366,000” persons (S. 193). This group of 1.3 million alleged victims is discussed on ten pages and ten lines (pp. 185 to 195) out of a total of 477 pages. This corresponds to one sixth of the number of pages devoted to the victims of euthanasia (allegedly 70,273³⁵ according to official sources)!

It had to be expected that Pohl would not write a single word about the revisionist studies on Treblinka and Bełżec, which have been available since 2002 and 2004, respectively. What could he have replied? But the fact that he brazenly distorts the archeological findings on the Bełżec site takes the cake, as it were. On p.193, he writes:

“New findings have resulted from the archeological digs on the camp sites as well as from aerial photographs of the Luftwaffe taken in 1943 and 1944. A precise topography of the camp sites, especially the locations of the mass graves and of the gas chambers, can now be established with greater accuracy. For Bełżec in particular, this has led to a significant enhancement of what we know.”

³⁴ Günter Morsch, Bertrand Perz (eds.), *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, Metropol Verlag, Berlin 2011.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

Pohl's source is given here as follows: Andrzej Kola, *Belżec. The Nazi Camp for Jews in the Light of Archeological Sources. Excavations 1997-1999*, Warsaw-Washington 2000. Robin O'Neil, "Belżec – The 'Forgotten' Death Camp," in: *East European Jewish Affairs* 28 (1998), No. 2, pp. 49-62. It is, however, a fact that neither Kola nor O'Neil, in their soundings and digs at the Belżec site, discovered even the slightest trace of the two gas chamber buildings mentioned by "witnesses,"³⁶ and that O'Neil admitted this quite frankly:³⁷

"We found no trace of gassing barracks, neither for the first nor for the second construction phase of the camp."

It is obvious that nobody could be gassed at Belżec if there were no buildings housing the gas chambers!

3. A considerable rise in the alleged number of victims of gas vans compared to previous Holocaust writings

The total number of Jews killed in gas vans is given by Richard Evans as 700,000 (p. 9) and by Achim Trunk as 500,000 (p. 24). Out of these, some 250,000 are said to have met their death on the territory of the Soviet Union (*ibid.*) and 152,477 in Chelmno (p. 183). The authors don't explain what happened to the remaining ca. 100,000 to 300,000 victims. The reason for this strong increase beyond the traditional Holocaust figures is easy to comprehend: the alleged mass killings in stationary gas chambers are questioned by revisionists not only on the basis of historical but also technical arguments. On the other hand, it is obvious that people can be killed in a closed van by means of suitably introduced engine exhaust gases, and thus the tale of the gas vans cannot be refuted by technical arguments only. It is therefore in the obvious interest of the concerned circles to inflate the proportion of "gas van" victims within the total number of people allegedly gassed.

4. Playing up the alleged gassings at the Mauthausen, Sachsenhausen, Ravensbrück, Neuengamme and Stutthof camps

A total of 59 pages have been devoted to the alleged gassings in the Mauthausen, Sachsenhausen, Ravensbrück, Neuengamme and Stutthof camps, which is six times more pages than those discussing the three "Aktion Reinhardt" camps and two and a half times more than those dealing with the Auschwitz camp. At first sight this appears odd, all the more so as Raul Hilberg, in his standard treatise *The Destruction of the European Jews*, does not claim any gassings for these five camps, and because they would not be necessary at all in order to prop up the orthodox Holocaust

³⁶ See on this C. Mattogno, *op. cit.* (note 32), chapter 4.

³⁷ Robin O'Neil, "Belżec – The forgotten Death Camp," in: *East European Jewish Affairs*, 28 (2) (1998-1999), p. 55.

narrative in view of the small number of people allegedly killed there (a total of a few thousand).

There are two reasons for the authors' persistent occupation with these rather insignificant gas chambers, though: For one thing, an admission that nobody was gassed in these camps and that, hence, all testimonies to killings by gas at those sites are false, would lead an attentive reader to the question, why witness statements concerning gas killings at Auschwitz, Treblinka, Sobibór or Bełżec should be more trustworthy than those about Ravensbrück, Sachsenhausen or Mauthausen.

A second and very important reason for this state of affairs is underlined by Mattogno: The articles were written by historians and employees working at the various memorial sites who seem to possess a perverted sense of pride that "their" camp, too, could at least boast of a small gas chamber and thus contributed its share to the Holocaust. It is not enough for them that in "their" camp tens of thousands of people died from disease, malnutrition, or exhaustion. "Without any gas chamber of their own to boast of, these narrow-gauge historians feel excluded from the pack," states Mattogno in the present work.

For lack of any documentary evidence, these dodgy historians feel obliged to accept even the most foolish witness accounts and the most absurd confessions as legal tender. Morsch himself, who is working for the Sachsenhausen memorial, is the most daring of the lot. He reveals to his stunned audience that at Sachsenhausen, aside from Jews, Soviet PoWs and sick inmates, even German soldiers were gassed (p. 271).

5. The missing refutation of the "revisionist deniers"

In spite of the initial promise to unmask the "revisionists of history" who "disregard the fundamental rules of scholarly historiography and who present history selectively" and to provide "suggestions and concepts for dealing with revisionist denials" (pp. XI f.), an examination of revisionist arguments, as announced, does not take place. In the introduction, Morsch and Perz write (p. XXIX):

"The revisionist strategies of denial were reinforced with pseudo-scientific arguments and were disseminated widely in society. [...] But our concern cannot be to address pseudo-scientific arguments in order to refute them, as this would ultimately result in honoring their representatives and the abstruse theories they defend."

While mentioning some revisionists in his chapter "Killings by means of toxic gas in the Sachsenhausen concentration camp ("Tötungen durch Giftgas im Konzentrationslager Sachsenhausen"), Morsch strictly follows this procedure otherwise and keeps completely mum about the most detailed analysis of the alleged mass murders at Sachsenhausen, provided by

a German paper authored by Mattogno in 2003.³⁸ It's as simple as that for the court historians!

The only author who at least tries to refute this or that argument put forward by the revisionists is Achim Trunk, author of the chapter "The lethal gasses" ("Die todbringenden Gase") but he fails miserably, as Mattogno demonstrates in chapter 1 of the present volume.

Thanks to his profound knowledge, acquired over more than two decades of research, Mattogno relentlessly dissects the elements of "proof" advanced by the authors of this anthology and unmasks these historians for what they really are: at best incompetent and naïve amateurs, at worst blatant impostors. The total bankruptcy of orthodox historiography cannot be made any more devastating than by comparing *Neue Studien zu national-sozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas* with Mattogno's reply. The Great Lie can only be maintained by brainwashing, censorship and repression – for the time being.

As stated above, this merciless judgment does not apply to the authors of the chapters on "euthanasia." It may well be that what they say about this point does correspond more or less to the facts. Neither Mattogno nor I can assess this topic. We also have to exempt from this accusation the author of the chapter "The gas chamber in the Natzweiler concentration camp" ("Die Gaskammer im Konzentrationslager Natzweiler"). For me, who translated Mattogno's book from Italian to German, the conclusion that a gassing was "probably" perpetrated in the Alsatian camp at Natzweiler was very surprising. In August of 1943, 86 Jews were sent to the Natzweiler camp from Auschwitz and were subsequently murdered. The documents do not permit any doubt in this regard. The criminal deed was initiated by an SS professor who wanted to prepare a collection of Jewish skeletons. Without providing us with any clear documentary evidence, Mattogno believes that the murders were probably carried out by means of phosgene gas. By allowing such a hypothesis, the Italian researcher risks being rebuked by other revisionist historians. The fact that he accepts this risk proves that he does spread neither black nor white propaganda but is trying to do serious science.

Both the followers and the opponents of revisionism will wonder: if Mattogno, the leading revisionist historian, suspects that the gassing action at Natzweiler did in fact take place, could it not be that gassing actions also took place at other locations? The only answer which we, as revisionists, are able to provide in this respect is: if we are presented with proof or at least with circumstantial evidence pointing to such gassings, we shall take them into serious account. Passing over counter-arguments with complete

³⁸ C. Mattogno, "KL Sachsenhausen. Stärkemeldungen und 'Vernichtungsaktionen' 1940 bis 1945," *Vierteljahresshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 7(2) (2003), pp. 173-185.

silence is something the other side may practice. They have decades of experience in this field.

16 August 2011

Introduction

In 2008 an international meeting of historians took place at Oranienburg, a northern suburb of Berlin, Germany. Three years later, the papers presented there were published as a collection by Günter Morsch and Bertrand Perz (and assisted by Astrid Ley) under the title *Neue Studien zu nationalsozialistischen Massentötungen durch Giftgas* (*New Studies on the National Socialist Mass Killings by Poison Gas*). In his foreword, Thomas Krüger describes the contents and the structure of this book with the following words (p. XII):

“This anthology summarizes new findings resulting from the international scientific meeting devoted to the topic ‘Mass murder by means of poison gas.’ It describes the aims and structures of revisionist propaganda and presents suggestions and concepts for the treatment of revisionist denial.”

As early as 1983, an anthology with the title *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas. Eine Dokumentation*³⁹ had appeared, claiming to refute revisionism by way of scientific historical methods. Still, in the introduction to the book being discussed here, Morsch and Perz are forced to admit that “questions and denials did not decrease after the publication of the collection in 1983” (p. XV) and that a new effort has thus become necessary.

The new work has six parts:

1. “Mass killings by poison gas: Scientific appraisal and memory.”
2. “Technical and pharmacological aspects and the significance of remainders.”
3. “The killing institutions of *Aktion ‘T4’*.”
4. “Poison gas as a means of genocide in gas vans and extermination camps.”
5. “Murder by gas in the concentration camps located in the ‘*Altreich*’ at Mauthausen, Stutthof und Natzweiler.”
6. “The ‘gas chamber lie’ in the international revisionist propaganda.”

The significance of each contribution varies greatly. Some of them are so unimportant and have so little to do with the objectives of the Oranienburg meeting that they are hardly worth being discussed in any detail. This applies especially to the article “How unique was the murder of the Jews

³⁹ E. Kogon, H. Langbein, A. Rückerl *et al.* (eds.), *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas. Eine Dokumentation*. S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt upon Main 1983; Engl: *Nazi Mass Murder*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1993.

by the National Socialists?" by Richard Evans (*"Wie einzigartig war die Ermordung der Juden durch die Nationalsozialisten?"*; pp. 1-10), "Mass murder by poison gas as perceived by the survivors" by Moshe Zimmermann (*"Massenmord durch Giftgas in der Wahrnehmung der Überlebenden"*; pp. 11-20), "Technical aspects of the mass murder by poison gas as arguments in court" by Volker Bieler and Kurt Schrimm (*"Technische Aspekte des Massenmordes durch Giftgas als Argumente vor Gericht"*; pp. 50-63) as well as "Violence and death in concentration and extermination camps. Possibilities and limitations of archeology" by Claudia Theune (*"Gewalt und Tod in Konzentrations- und Vernichtungslagern. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Archäologie"*; pp. 64-73), although I will address Theune's paper later.

Finally, Detlef Garbes's contribution "The concentration camps as scenes of mass murder" (*"Die Konzentrationslager als Stätten des Massenmordes"*; pp. 316-334) has only a tenuous link with the objectives of the meeting. Notwithstanding this, I will of course examine individual arguments as presented in these contributions and where necessary.

In the following analysis of the book I shall maintain the sequence in which the individual papers appear in the book. From time to time, however, I will allow myself to assess as a group those articles which deal with the same topic. For that reason, a discussion of the articles attacking revisionism, devoid of substance as they are, appears only towards the end of this present analysis.

1. The Lethal Gases

The first article deserving attention was written by Achim Trunk and is entitled "The lethal gases" (*"Die todbringenden Gase"*; pp. 23-49). It deals with the various gases allegedly used for killing people in the National Socialist era. The first three are well-known from Holocaust literature:

Carbon monoxide which, as we are told, was allegedly applied in the euthanasia centers during the so-called "Aktion 14f13," in an experimental gas vans of "Sonderkommando Lange," as well as in the Majdanek concentration camp.

Engine exhaust gases, said to have been employed in the camps of "Aktion Reinhardt" (Belzec, Chełmno, Sobibór, Treblinka).

Zyklon B, claimed to have been used for killing people at Auschwitz, Majdanek, Mauthausen, Stutthof and Ravensbrück (as well as, maybe, Dachau).

Aside from these three gases, Trunk introduces a fourth and ill-defined compound into the debate: a “Hydrogen cyanide preparation” (“*Blausäure-Präparat*”), also labeled “*Blausäure*” or a “chemically related substance.”

In a paragraph of seven lines, entitled “Murders by means of carbon monoxide: No objections from the deniers” (“*Kohlenmonoxidmorde: Keine Einwendungen der Leugner*”), Trunk writes (p. 30):

“No chemically-oriented arguments concerning mass murder by means of pure carbon monoxide have been brought forward by the deniers.”

Aside from the silly use of the word “denier,” this is basically correct, but, as we shall see, far more important historical arguments exist against the alleged mass killings by means of pure carbon monoxide which render “chemically-oriented arguments” superfluous.

On the subject of the toxicological effects of carbon monoxide, Trunk explains (p. 28):

“As a rule, victims of carbon monoxide poisoning can be recognized by the red color of their mucous membranes due to the fact that hemoglobin loaded with carbon monoxide (and thus the blood in general) is cherry-red.”

We agree,⁴⁰ but then why do some witnesses assert that the corpses of the victims killed by means of carbon monoxide showed a blue discoloration? Trunk explains the matter as follows (p. 32):

“If diesel engines were used, agony surely extended over a longer period of time, because diesel engines produce appreciably less carbon monoxide. Furthermore, they also produce a considerable amount of irritants. In such cases, death could have been caused under certain circumstances by a combination of carbon monoxide (internal suffocation) and oxygen deficiency (external suffocation).”

In a footnote, Trunk adds the remark that “occasional accounts” exist, according to which the corpses had a bluish color, which would point to “lack of oxygen as a cause of death” (fn. 24 on p. 32).

Before we discuss this point, we must remember the context within which the questions discussed here are placed. In his argument against revisionists who point out that diesel engines are most unsuitable for killing people, Trunk surprisingly asserts (p. 32):

⁴⁰ On the skin discoloration of the alleged gassing victims at the Belżec, Sobibór, Treblinka and Chełmno camps see the detailed discussion by Kues in Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues, *The “Extermination Camps” of “Aktion Reinhardt,”* The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2013, pp. 856-868.

“This argument is irrelevant, as serious research does not believe at all that diesel engines were generally used at the ‘Aktion Reinhardt’ extermination camps.”

Trunk admits that in the earlier literature there are “indications attributing a considerable weight to the share of murders by means of diesel exhaust gas.” He mentions Raul Hilberg in this connection (p. 32). In fairness he should also have mentioned the prestigious *Enzyklopädie des Holocaust*, which explicitly mentions a 250 HP diesel engine for the Bełżec camp⁴¹ and postulates a diesel engine for Treblinka as well (for Sobibór it speaks merely of a 200 HP engine but does not indicate the type). It is of course possible that earlier Holocaust historians have erred, but anyone advancing such an argument must back it up by *new sources*.⁴² Trunk writes (p. 34f.):

“The fact that gasoline engines were indeed employed in the ‘Aktion Reinhardt’ extermination camp is substantiated by reliable sources. Rudolf Reder for instance, one of the very rare survivors of the Bełżec extermination camps, speaks of a gasoline engine standing in a small room near the gas chambers.”

This is correct, but either Trunk has not read Reder’s corresponding statements or disregards them on purpose. When questioned by Judge Jan Sehn, Reder clearly stated on 29 December 1945:⁴³

“The bodies in the chamber did not show any unnatural discoloration. They looked like live persons, most had their eyes open. Only in a few cases were the corpses bloodstained. The air in the chambers, when they were opened, was pure, transparent and odorless. In particular, there was no smoke from the exhaust gas of the engine. The [exhaust] gas was evacuated from the engine directly into the open air, and not into the chambers.”

Hence, for Reder, the corpses were colored neither red nor blue, and furthermore the gasoline engine was *not* used for killing the victims. Anyone willing to go along with Trunk and considering the “older” Holocaust literature as unreliable must not shy away from the question why, of the two most important witnesses on the subject of Bełżec, one – Kurt Gerstein

⁴¹ I. Gutman, E. Jäckel, P. Longenrich, J.H. Schoeps (eds.), *Enzyklopädie des Holocaust. Die Verfolgung und Ermordung der europäischen Juden*. Argon, Berlin 1993, vol. I, p. 176 (Bełżec), vol. III, p. 1428 (Treblinka), p. 1332 (Sobibór). The English edition of this encyclopedia, which appeared three years earlier, is rather badly edited: I. Gutman (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust*, MacMillan, New York 1990.

⁴² The issue is thoroughly discussed in Mattogno, Graf, Kues, *op. cit.* (note 40), points 95-111, pp. 815-838.

⁴³ AGK, OKBZN Kraków, 111, pp. 4-4a. See my study on *Bełżec: Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*, reprint, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2011, p. 38.

– speaks of a diesel engine as having been the murder weapon (something which Trunk accepts in his footnote 22 on p. 31), while the other, Reder, speaks of a gasoline engine whose exhaust gases, however, were *not* used to kill any victims. As a graduate engineer and mining expert,⁴⁴ Gerstein was no doubt able to tell a diesel engine from a gasoline engine!

Trunk may well believe that Gerstein was wrong. But in this case he must also explain why Gerstein claims to have seen blue corpses of persons⁴⁵ which, according to Trunk, were victims of a gassing with gasoline engine exhaust gas and thus would have had to exhibit a cherry red skin discoloration, because he claims that a bluish discoloration could have been caused only “under certain circumstances” during gassings with diesel engines! But then perhaps the engine was both a gasoline engine for gassings and a diesel engine for the discoloration...

Trunk confirms that diesel engines operate “with a great excess of oxygen” and that, for this reason, their exhaust gases contain a higher “concentration of oxygen sufficient for [potential gassing victims] to survive.” On the other hand, he states that diesel exhaust gases act faster “under higher loads.” Referring to tests run by American engineers in the 1950s, he writes (p.33):

“Idling, or without any special load, the motors investigated produced exhaust gases with a high concentration of oxygen and very little carbon monoxide. Under higher loads, the carbon monoxide values increased without in themselves reaching directly critical values. At the same time, though, the oxygen content dropped to 3 percent.”

This decrease in the oxygen concentration down to 3% hence becomes the basis for Trunk’s thesis mentioned above, according to which the death of the victims was possibly caused by suffocation as a consequence of a lack of oxygen.

The study mentioned by Trunk (in footnote 29 on p. 33) was done by John C. Holtz and M. E. Elliot and published under the title “The Significance of Diesel-Exhaust Gas Analysis.”⁴⁶ The results summarized by Trunk were obtained by means of a modified injection pump which allowed an increase of 60% in the fuel injected, thus resulting in an incomplete fuel combustion on account of the unfavorable air-to-fuel ratio. Furthermore, the engine was loaded by means of a brake dynamometer. Page 99 of this study shows “Table 3” which contains the relevant data for “Engine B.” For a total of eight runs, the highest concentration of carbon monoxide reached 6%, whereas the lowest oxygen concentration was as low as 0.3

⁴⁴ T-1310, p. 1.

⁴⁵ PS-1553, p. 4 of the “Gerstein confession.”

⁴⁶ In: *Transactions of the ASME*, vol. 63, February 1941, pp. 97-105.

Table 1: Concentration of Gasoline Engine Exhaust Gases, Vol. %

Conditions	Engine	CO ₂	CO	O ₂
Idling at 1000 rpm	Hanomag	7.7	5.2	1.6
	Adler	8.5	8.5	1.1
	Benz	9.2	6.3	1.0
Full load at 1500 rpm	Hanomag	13.2	0.2	1.4
	Adler	13.3	0.2	2.3
	Benz	13.5	1.7	1.1

percent. On the other hand, gasoline combustion engines will normally produce an even higher carbon monoxide concentration and a slightly higher oxygen level; this was observed during tests carried out by the German *Reichsgesundheitsamt* (Reich health agency) and the I.G Farben company.⁴⁷ On moving from idle to full load, the percentage of carbon monoxide showed a strong decrease with a corresponding sizable increase in the carbon dioxide content, while the oxygen content increased slightly. This can be seen from Table 1 which I have simplified by merely showing the three gases which interest us here.⁴⁸

This means that even the potential victims of a gassing procedure using gasoline engine exhaust gases would have died of “external suffocation.” Hence, it is not really clear why the SS would have manipulated a diesel engine and slowed it down in a cumbersome way in order to reach concentrations of carbon monoxide which were still lower than those produced by an idling gasoline engine under conventional conditions.

Trunk explains his criticism of the assertion in the “older” literature that diesel engines were used in the Reinhardt camps by saying that, for Sobibór, the use of a gasoline engine has been postulated (p. 35). While this is true, an SS man stationed at Sobibór during the war, Erich Fuchs, stated that, during the installation of the engine, a chemist entered the chamber with a measuring device to verify the gas concentration.⁴⁹ It may be postulated that corresponding measurements would have been carried out on the diesel engine at Bełżec as well (although no witness stated this explicitly⁵⁰) and that then the SS necessarily would have come to the conclusion that gasoline engines were more suitable for mass murder than diesel engines. But if that is so, it is not understandable why a diesel engine would once

⁴⁷ See on this C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka. Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?*, reprint, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010, pp. 123-125.

⁴⁸ E. Keeser, V. Froboese, R. Turnau *et al.*, *Toxikologie und Hygiene des Kraftfahrwesens*, Julius Springer Verlag, Berlin 1930, p. 4.

⁴⁹ Footnote 37 on p. 35; Interrogation of E. Fuchs of April 8, 1963. ZStL, 208 AR-Z 251/59, vol. IX, pp. 1784f.

⁵⁰ Although Fuchs declared he knew the chemist doing the test “from BELCEC”; see the text in Mattogno, Graf, Kues, *op. cit.* (note 40), point 48, pp. 749-753.

again have been opted for at Treblinka later on.⁵¹ Trunk mentions the fact that Holocaust historiography does assert the use of a diesel engine at Treblinka (p. 35), but he wiggles his way out by saying that the witnesses had mistaken the diesel generator used at Treblinka for the generation of electrical power with the gasoline engine employed for the mass killings.⁵² This limping explanation is followed by a no less dubious argument (p. 37):

“That these witnesses may be in error on this one aspect is quite possible; the details of the scenario of the killings as gathered from the sources can best be explained, both technically and toxicologically, by the use of a gasoline engine for the production of the deadly gases.”

The “sources” referred to by Trunk are nothing but assertions of self-styled eye-witnesses which “technically and toxicologically” explain nothing at all, not least because quite a few of them speak of the corpses having a bluish tint, which according to Trunk could “possibly” be caused only by the use of diesel exhaust gases for the killings.

Trunk’s conclusion is just as unfounded as the conjectures which form the basis of his thesis (p. 36):

“The revisionists’ assertion that it is not at all possible to kill groups of people by means of diesel exhaust gases is not correct. What is correct is that diesel engines are much less suitable for mass murder than gasoline engines – something which no serious Holocaust scholar would dispute.”

This is precisely what is asserted by serious revisionists. They ask, however, why the SS opted for diesel, even though such engines – to use Trunk’s own words – “are much less suitable for mass murder than gasoline engines.” In a study pertinently titled “Diesel Gas Chambers: Ideal for Torture – Absurd for Murder,” engineer Friedrich P. Berg comes to the conclusion:

“It would be hard to imagine a mass murder method more awkward and more inefficient. Even if some deranged minds had tried for a time to commit murder with diesel exhaust, after a few tries it would have become apparent to even the most demented fiend that something far better was needed.”

If we follow Berg, gasoline engines would have been “so much better” for mass murder – and especially gas generators, widely used by the Ger-

⁵¹ On this question see J. Graf, T. Kues, C. Mattogno, *Sobibór. Holocaust Propaganda and Reality*, The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2010, pp. 257f.

⁵² This objection has been thoroughly discussed several times in Mattogno, Graf, Kues, *op. cit.* (note 40). pp. 116, 750, 766, 780, 827-830, 834, 873, 883.

mans during WW2, because they could use wood or coke as fuel and yielded a gaseous engine fuel containing up to 35% of carbon monoxide.⁵³

In his discussion of Zyklon B, Trunk presents us with some well-known facts about the physical, chemical and toxicological properties of the disinfection agent, and adds (p. 40):

“The skin of victims of hydrogen cyanide often shows a pinkish discoloration, typical for carbon monoxide poisoning.”

This is absolutely true, but Trunk forgets to mention the many witnesses according to whom persons gassed with Zyklon B showed a blue discoloration.⁵⁴ He reminds us of the fact that hydrogen cyanide, in spite of being called “blue acid” in German, “is not really blue but colorless, in the liquid and gaseous state” (p. 37). He does not explain, however, why numerous witnesses speak of “blue crystals” and “blue vapors.”⁵⁵

Trunk touches only briefly on the use of Zyklon B as a killing agent. He asserts that a concentration of 10 grams per cubic meter was used in the disinfection chambers using Zyklon B (footnote 59 on p. 39). Referring to the statements made by Rudolf Höß, he writes that in the alleged homicidal gas chambers in crematoria II and III, which had a volume of 500 cubic meters each, 1,500 people had been gassed at the same time, with a corresponding “concentration of 10 up to a maximum of 20 grams of hydrogen cyanide per cubic meter” and that this, “hardly by accident, is the very concentration used for the elimination of insects” (footnote 60 on p. 39).

The modifier “hardly by accident” signifies, of course, that, in order to kill people, the SS had employed the same concentration of Zyklon B as was also needed for disinfection. If we look at the fundamental differences between human beings and insects, this idea becomes simply ludicrous. This is also underlined by Robert Jan van Pelt, considered by the orthodox side to be the leading Holocaust historian, who has contributed two papers to the work discussed here. On p. 210 he writes:

“Since Zyklon B had been developed as a disinfection agent, an evaporation time of 24 hours had been planned for the cyanide. Nits

⁵³ Friedrich P. Berg, “Diesel Gas Chambers: Ideal for Torture – Absurd for Murder,” in: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 26), pp. 435-469. Berg’s quote is on p. 469.

⁵⁴ I quote numerous witnesses reporting about blue corpses of gassing victims in my study *Auschwitz: The First Gassing*. 2nd ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2011, pp. 40, 61, 66, 86f.

⁵⁵ Among these witnesses is, for instance, the SS driver Richard Böck, who claimed to have seen a “blue mist” over the corpses after a “gassing” in one of the “bunkers” of Birkenau; see for this Germar Rudolf, “From the Records of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial, Part 4,” in: *The Revisionist* 1(4) (2003), pp. 470-472. The former Auschwitz inmate Filip Müller spoke of “bluish-violet Zyklon B crystals.” F. Müller, *Sonderbehandlung. Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz*. Verlag Steinhausen, Munich 1979, p. 111.

[the larvae of lice] are difficult to eliminate and must therefore be exposed to the cyanide for a long time. People, on the other hand, die quickly.”

Trunk’s assertions concerning the cyanide concentration used are also in fundamental disagreement with van Pelt’s views. According to the latter, a concentration of merely 100 to 300 parts per million was used, which would amount to 0.12 to 0.36 grams per cubic meter, or 0.24 grams per cubic meter on average. The concentration proposed by Trunk (15 grams per cubic meter) is roughly 62.5 times higher than van Pelt’s figure.⁵⁶

The chapters of this book dealing with the Natzweiler and Sachsenhausen camps contain a discussion of the other “hydrogen cyanide preparations” mentioned by Trunk and alleged to have been used for killing people in these two camps.

In the last section of his article, Trunk addresses the “chemical objection of the deniers.” He starts by criticizing Fred Leuchter’s thesis which labels hydrogen cyanide as explosive and hence cautions against its use in a crematorium (p. 45). Here Trunk preaches to the choir, since I have shown in detail as early as 1996 that Leuchter’s argument is indeed not cogent.⁵⁷ Trunk goes on to say (p. 46):

“Another argument concerns the allegedly overly slow evaporation of hydrogen cyanide from the Zyklon B carrier. It is based on a wrong extrapolation of data from the product sheets.”

In an effort to strengthen his thesis, Trunk refers the reader to the alleged refutation of the revisionists’ chemical arguments by Josef Bailer (“Die ‘Revisionisten’ und die Chemie”⁵⁸). In that article Bailer polemicizes against Germar Rudolf; he asserts that the slow evaporation of Zyklon B mentioned by Rudolf (90% of the hydrogen cyanide has evaporated from the granules after two hours) was “presumably” based on the “data sheets for commercial Zyklon as available today” which would mean that Rudolf’s interprets the values incorrectly.⁵⁹ Bailer mentions a patent issued on 27 December 1926 to DEGESCH (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Schädlingsbekämpfung*, German Society for Pest Control) and referred to by Rudolf, although it does not speak about Zyklon B but only in a general way about

⁵⁶ See about this my study *Auschwitz: ..., op. cit.* (note 28), chapter 14.1.: “HCN Concentration in the Alleged Homicidal Gas Chambers,” pp. 499-503.

⁵⁷ Carlo Mattogno, *Olocausto: Dilettanti allo sbaraglio. Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Georges Wellers, Deborah Lipstadt, Till Bastian, Florent Brayard et alii contro il revisionismo storico*. Edizioni di Ar, Padua, 1996, chapter V,5: “A titolo di esempio: una obiezione scientifica al rapporto Leuchter”, pp. 212-215.

⁵⁸ J. Bailer, “Die ‘Revisionisten’ und die Chemie,” in: B. Bailer-Galanda, W. Benz, W. Neugebauer (eds.), *Wahrheit und Auschwitz. Zur Bekämpfung “revisionistischer” Propaganda*. Deuticke, Vienna 1995, pp. 99-118.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

hydrogen cyanide adsorbed on a porous substance such as diatomaceous earth. The patent states *i.a.*:⁶⁰

“If the can’s contents are spread out in a thin layer, the hydrogen cyanide will evaporate with 10 minutes.”

On the basis of this sentence alone, and without referring to any other documents, Bailer concludes:⁶¹

“The idea that it would take hours for the product to release the active agent is absurd.”

This alleged refutation of Rudolf’s argument is openly contradicted by van Pelt, according to whom an evaporation time of the HCN of 24 hours was expected. It mainly fails to convince, however, if we take into account the results of experiments carried out in 1942 where the evaporation rate of hydrogen cyanide was evaluated. The corresponding study⁶² is also mentioned by Trunk, but only as proof of the fact that “even at temperatures below the freezing point, considerable amounts of gaseous hydrogen cyanide are released by the carrier” (p. 46) and that “even at temperatures as low as minus 6°C something like half of the hydrogen cyanide adsorbed is released from the Erco cube” (footnote 84 on p. 46; Erco mainly consisted of gypsum). Table 2 of this article does indeed permit the conclusion that, at a temperature of -6°C, some 45% of the hydrogen cyanide has been released from the pellets; on the other hand, the last column of this very table⁶³ gives also the data for a temperature of +15°C:

After one hour:	57.0%
After two hours:	96.4%
After three hours:	100.0%

When cardboard disks were used as a carrier for hydrogen cyanide, like wise at +15°C, the results were as follows:⁶³

After one hour:	77.0%
After two hours:	96.8%
After three hours:	100.0%

These experiments are vastly more significant than the claims made in the mentioned patent. Their conclusions were confirmed by two experiments which a Polish-Soviet commission carried out in the Majdanek camp

⁶⁰ Deutsches Reich. Reichspatentamt. Patentschrift Nr. 438818, Klasse 451 Gruppe 3. Ausgegeben am 27. Dezember 1926. *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Schädlingsbekämpfung m.b.H. in Frankfurt a.M.* Verfahren für Schädlingsbekämpfung. Patentiert im Deutschen Reiche vom 20. Juni 1922 ab.

⁶¹ J. Bailer, *op. cit.* (note 58), p. 110.

⁶² R. Irmscher, “Nochmals: Die Einsatzfähigkeit der Blausäure bei tiefen Temperaturen,” in: *Zeitschrift für hygienische Zoologie und Schädlingsbekämpfung*, no. 34, 1942, pp. 35-37.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

shortly after its occupation in August 1944. Two cans of 1,500 grams each of Zyklon B were opened and then exposed at a temperature of +28°C; after that, the remainder was weighed. The contents of one of the cans weighed 450 grams, the other 470 grams, which means that over the period of two hours about 70 and 69 percent, respectively, of the hydrogen cyanide had evaporated.⁶⁴

This leads us to the inexorable conclusion: If we follow Trunk, who cites witness statements to the effect that “the [homicidal] gassing procedure was normally terminated after 20 minutes by switching on the ventilation system” (p. 41), and if we follow Jean-Claude Pressac, who states that the ventilation in the morgues of the crematoria II and III, which were equipped with an aeration and a de-aeration unit, lasted 15 to 20 minutes,⁶⁵ we may conclude that the Zyklon B granules would go on releasing their deadly load for more than another two hours, *i.e.* during the removal of the corpses from the morgues. The situation in the alleged gas chamber of crematoria IV and V would have been much worse, as these chambers were not equipped with a forced ventilation system, to say nothing of the Birkenau “Bunkers”! Since the better part of the hydrogen cyanide would be released only after the victims’ demise, the gas chambers’ operating personnel would have been in constant mortal danger. We must realize here that there was a quick, efficient, easy and safe way of releasing the Zyklon B – by means of the DEGESCH circulation system developed in 1940, which I shall discuss later and about which no witness and no orthodox Holocaust historian has ever claimed that it has ever been employed for homicidal gassings.

These SS guys truly exhibited a very strange planning behavior: In the form of the DEGESCH circulation gas chamber they had at their disposal a highly efficient system for disinfestation, but they never used it for any killings. They possessed gasoline engines and gas generators, which were quite suitable for mass murder, but are said to have used diesel engines instead. What is most astounding, though, is that in the Forensic Institutes of the German Police, where it is claimed a host of wannabe Frankensteins were working at the development of effective killing systems, nobody ever had the idea to use the gases coming from gas generators for homicidal purposes before being fed into the engine. This method imposed itself outright. This is revealed in particular by a table published by the German chemists Flury and Zernik in 1931, which gave the carbon monoxide con-

⁶⁴ See on this J. Graf, C. Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, 3rd. ed., The Barnes Review, Washington, DC, 2012, p. 125.

⁶⁵ J.-C. Pressac, *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz. Die Technik des Massenmordes*. Piper Verlag, Munich Zürich 1994, p. 95.

tents of various gases. Engines of an unspecified type (probably gasoline engines) produced a maximum concentration of 12%, those from wood-fired gas generators, on the other hand, contained up to 34 percent.⁶⁶ Apparently, these SS technicians of death proceeded in accordance with the motto: “Efficiency is to be avoided at all cost”!

Towards the end of his contribution, Trunk raises a further question: The “absence of a compound called ‘Iron Blue’ in the remaining brickwork of the Auschwitz gas chambers” (p. 46). In doing so, he presents the results of the *Leuchter Report* and the *Rudolf Report* which set out, in simplified form, the extreme differences in cyanide content of samples taken on the one hand from alleged homicidal gas chambers and on the other hand from the Zyklon B disinfestation chambers at buildings 5a and 5b at Birkenau, and Trunk raises the following objection (pp. 46f.):

“To begin with, it is not at all certain that the Iron Blue of the disinfestation chambers was caused by the effect of hydrogen cyanide vapors. For example, its origin could also be faded paint; many wall paints in those days in fact contained this pigment. A lack of discoloration would then simply mean that, while the delousing chambers were painted in this manner, the gas chambers were not. But even if we accept that the Iron Blue of the delousing chambers was caused by exposure to hydrogen cyanide, it does not necessarily follow that similar stains would have developed in the homicidal chambers.”

Then Trunk lists the differences between the delousing chambers and the homicidal chambers and asserts that no Iron Blue could have developed in the latter “even if they had been exposed to hydrogen cyanide” (p. 47).

This argument fails on account of the following facts:

Rudolf utterly refuted the thesis of blue wall paint with eleven pertinent arguments in his expert report, which Trunk treats with silence, because the findings radically contradict his thesis.⁶⁷

Aside from this, Trunk’s reasoning is also refuted by hard facts. In addition to the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz, as I mentioned above, Zyklon B is asserted by Trunk to have been employed for homicidal purposes at Stutthof and Majdanek as well. He postulates 1,500 of such murders at Stutthof (fn. 5 on p. 25) but is cautious enough not to assign any figures to Majdanek. However, Tomasz Kranz, author of the article on Majdanek in the discussed anthology, mentions a maximum of 12,000 persons gassed there, either by means of Zyklon B or carbon monoxide (p.

⁶⁶ F. Flury, F. Zernik, *Schädliche Gase, Dämpfe, Nebel, Rauch- und Staubarten*. Verlag von Julius Springer, Berlin 1931.

⁶⁷ G. Rudolf, *op. cit.* (note 23), pp. 169f.; Engl. G. Rudolf, W. Lambrecht, *op. cit.* (note 24), pp. 269f.

227). Both the alleged homicidal gas chambers at Stutthof and at Majdanek show large Iron Blue stains, however, and this not only on the inside of the walls but on the outside as well. Jürgen Graf and I have pointed to this fact in our studies of these camps.⁶⁸ A strong blue discoloration is also shown on the outside of the southern wall of the Birkenau delousing chamber of BW 5b at Birkenau and – albeit to a noticeably lesser degree – on the outside of the western wall of BW 5a.

Hence, if the gas chambers at Stutthof and Majdanek were “homicidal chambers,” there are only two possibilities: Either, these chambers were all painted with Iron Blue paint patches⁶⁹ – but then, why in the world were the bricks on the outside painted patchy blue as well? – or the stains did result from homicidal gassings in spite of all of Trunk’s objections. This would mean that these stains should all the more appear in the homicidal chambers at Birkenau, which are said to have been used for considerably more gassings. If orthodox Holocaust historians maintain that a total of 13,000 people were killed by gassings at Stutthof and Majdanek (not all of them by means of hydrogen cyanide), and yet their walls show such a strong blue discoloration, then one should *a priori* expect to see such stains in the alleged gas chambers of crematoria II and III at Birkenau as well, as altogether 550,000 people were killed there by means of Zyklon B as affirmed by van Pelt.

The orthodox Holocaust historians have argued themselves into a corner, from which there is no way out. They must now choose: Either the gas chambers at Majdanek and Stutthof were “homicidal” chambers – then the blue stains should also be visible in the “homicidal” chambers at Birkenau; or it was impossible for Iron Blue to form in “homicidal” chambers – then the gas chambers at Stutthof and Majdanek were not “homicidal.”

Trunk concludes with the following argument:

“That the victims had been exposed to large amounts of hydrogen cyanide was shown [...] as early as 1945 by a toxicological analysis. It showed that e.g. the hair of the persons killed, which was destined to be used industrially, contained considerable amounts of cyanide residue.”

Let us first point out a lack of precision in Trunk’s wording. The assessment at the time was a qualitative, not a quantitative one, and it did not speak of “considerable” amounts of cyanide residues but only in general of

⁶⁸ J. Graf, C. Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Stutthof*, 2nd, revised ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2004, color images between pp. 110 & 111; J. Graf, C. Mattogno, *op. cit.* (note 64), pp. 341-344 (consult the online version, as the print version is b/w only); see farther below, chapters 8 & 13.

⁶⁹ Both the inside and the outside walls show patches of various hues and sizes, located only here and there, which precludes the use of paint, which would have covered the entire surface of the walls equally.

their presence. The expertise was presented on 15 May 1945 by the director of the Krakow forensic institute, Jan Z. Robel, and was accepted on 15 December of the same year by the investigating judge Jan Sehn as an element of proof for the prosecution in the trial against Rudolf Höß.⁷⁰ The conclusion of the opinion – based on three analyses – stated:⁷¹

“It has thus been ascertained that, into an aqueous solution [into which the hair had been immersed] at room temperature, the hairs have released hydrogen cyanide.”

Furthermore, it has never been shown that the hair in question, bags of which the Soviets had discovered at Auschwitz, was hair of persons killed – *i.e.* persons gassed. On 9 August 1942, SS-*Brigadeführer* Richard Glücks, Head of Office Group D of SS Economic and Administrative Main Office (SS-*Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungshauptamt*, SS-WVHA), had written a letter to the commanders of the concentration camps on the subject of “Utilization of hair cuttings.” In it he transmitted the order by SS-*Obergruppenführer* and WVHA-Head Oswald Pohl to collect the hair of detainees for the purpose of its industrial use:⁷²

“It is [...] ordered to conserve the hair removed from female detainees after disinfection. Hair of male detainees can only be used if longer than 20 millimeters.”

Orthodox historiography tells us that, at the time, homicidal Zyklon B gas chambers were operated only at Auschwitz, whereas the collection of hair applied to all camps. At Sachsenhausen, for example, German, Flemish, Dutch and Norwegian detainees were allowed to have hair of up to 20 mm length, while all other detainees were shorn completely.⁷³ We hardly need to mention that hair was cut from living detainees and not from the dead. After the liberation of the Natzweiler camp, the French authorities found some 27 kg of hair at that campsite.⁷⁴

It must be understood that “disinfection” actually meant “disinfestation,” because hydrogen cyanide is not a “disinfection agent,” as it cannot kill bacteria or viruses. The incorrect use of these terms is *i.a.* also found in the correspondence between the Majdanek camp administration and the firm Tesch & Stabenow concerning the supply of Zyklon B. For example,

⁷⁰ Höß Trial in Warsaw, vol. 11, appendix no. 12, pp. 72-74.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

⁷² URSS-511.

⁷³ Letter of the camp commander to the administration of the inmate hospital, 11 October 1944. GARF, 7021-104-8, p. 1.

⁷⁴ J.-C. Pressac, *The Struthof album: study of the gassing at Natzweiler-Struthof of 86 Jews whose bodies were to constitute a collection of skeletons: a photographic document*. The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York, 1985, p. 57.

the Majdanek camp physician addressed a memo to the camp administration on 11 September 1943 saying:⁷⁵

“It is requested to order disinfection gas in large amounts for the purpose of disinfection at the camp.”

It was standard practice to disinfest the hair clippings by means of Zyklon B before packing them and shipping them to the companies concerned.⁷⁶ After all, it was an urgent matter that lice from this hair, which were responsible for transmitting typhus in the camps, did not get transferred to the outside world and thus possibly causing epidemics there too. Therefore, any kind of analysis of a hair sample sent from any concentration camp to companies concerned would have shown traces of hydrogen cyanide. Hence, Trunk’s thesis that the analysis run at Krakow is proof of homicidal gassings at Auschwitz is completely untenable.

Let us conclude by raising a point on which Trunk is completely silent but which causes problems for other Holocaust historians: why did the alleged extermination of the Jews make use of so many vastly different methods of killings:

- pure carbon monoxide in gas cylinders
- “Gas vans” of the first generation (an ill-defined collection)
- “Gas vans” of the second generation (using diesel engines)
- Exhaust gases from diesel or gasoline engines in stationary gas chamber
- Zyklon B

The Holocaust historians claim that each of these methods had its own genesis; thus, it would be incorrect to speak of any kind of systematic “development of the technology.” This means that the execution of the alleged Hitler order or any alleged decision by Hitler was not at all centrally planned but implemented individually by local commanders and their staff in a clumsy and amateurish manner, resulting in a hodge-podge of wildly diverging and mostly inefficient killing methods!

⁷⁵ APMM, I.d.2, vol. I, p. 19.

⁷⁶ The Majdanek camp sent the hair to the Paul Reimann company at Bratislava; see Edward Dziadosz, “Stosunki handlowe obozu koncentracyjnego na Majdanku z firmą Paula Reimanna” in: *Zeszyty Majdanka*, II, 1967, pp. 171-204.