

**The Auschwitz Museum's
Misrepresentations,
Distortions and Deceptions**

Carlo Mattogno

CURATED LIES: THE AUSCHWITZ MUSEUM'S MISREPRESENTATIONS, DISTORTIONS AND DECEPTIONS

Curated Lies

The Auschwitz Museum's
Misrepresentations,
Distortions and Deceptions

Carlo Mattogno



Academic Research Media Review Education Group Ltd

January 2024

HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS, Volume 38:

Carlo Mattogno:

*Curated Lies: The Auschwitz Museum's Misrepresentations, Distortions
and Deceptions*

2nd, revised and expanded edition

Carlo Mattogno's section was translated by Germar Rudolf

Published and distributed by:

Academic Research Media Review Education Group Ltd

86-90 Paul Street, London, EC2A 4NE, United Kingdom

Published under a license granted by Castlehill Publishing LLC

January 2024

ISBN: 978-1-911733-46-1

ISSN 1529-7748

www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

© by Carlo Mattogno for the main part

Set in Times New Roman

Cover Illustration: The main entry to the Auschwitz Main Camp, with artwork by Eric Hunt.

Table of Contents

	Page
Editor's Foreword.....	7
Part One: How the Auschwitz Museum Dupes Millions of Visitors	11
The Auschwitz Crematorium I Gas-Chamber Hoax	13
Introduction.....	13
Faux Zyklon-B Holes.....	15
Majdanek: An Admitted "Hole Hoax" Precedent.....	24
The "Victims' Entrance"	26
The Doors	30
Part Two: How the Auschwitz Museum Lies about Documents in Its	
 Archives	39
Introduction	41
Chapter One: The Documents – Critical Comments	45
I. Section "The Crematorium and Gas Chamber in the Auschwitz	
I Main Camp".....	45
II. Section "Provisional Gas Chamber Bunkers I and II in	
Birkenau"	56
III. Section "The Barracks for Undressing at Bunkers I and II"	89
IV. Section "The Railroad Ramp (<i>Alte Judenrampe</i>)"	124
V. Section "The <i>Sonderkommando</i> "	127
VI. Section " <i>Sonderaktionen</i> " (Special Operations)	132
Chapter Two: Critical Analysis of the "Introduction"	154
1. The Historical and Documentary Context.....	154
2. Euthanasia at Auschwitz	156
3. Injections with Phenol.....	157
4. The "First Gassing" in the Basement of Block 11 at Auschwitz ..	157
5. The "Gas Chamber" in Crematorium I at Auschwitz.....	158
6. The "Bunkers" at Birkenau	167
7. Documents on the "Bunkers" at Birkenau	171
8. " <i>Sonderkommando</i> ", "Cremation Pits" and Barracks Near the	
"Bunkers"	178
9. The Genesis of the Crematoria at Birkenau	181
10. " <i>Sonderaktion</i> ," " <i>Aktion Reinhard</i> " and Open-Air Cremations	185
11. " <i>Sonderkommando</i> " and "Bunkers"	190
12. When Did the Activity at the "Bunkers" Stop?.....	193
Conclusions	200

Appendix201

 Bibliography201

 Archives.....206

 Documents.....207

 Index of Names.....244

Editor's Foreword

The title and subtitle of this book are a provocation. The Auschwitz Museum is one of the most-renowned *and* most-frequented museums in the world, with well over 2.3 million visitors in 2019 according to Wikipedia. How dare we revisionists say that they lie to millions of visitors and deceive them with their exhibits?

The answer to this question is very simple, because the museum officials themselves have already admitted that they lied to every single visitor in the past, because they had been forced to do so by the Polish authorities. This memorable event occurred in 1998, when then-Curator of Research of the Auschwitz Museum Wáclaw Długoborski explained to Germany's most-renowned daily newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (FAZ) what methods were used before the collapse of the Soviet Union to uphold the lie that four million inmates had died in the Auschwitz Camp during the war – instead of the roughly one million currently claimed:

“Up until 1989 in eastern Europe, a prohibition against casting doubt upon the figure of 4 million killed was in force; at the memorial site of Auschwitz, employees who doubted the correctness of the estimate were threatened with disciplinary proceedings.” (FAZ, Sept. 14, 1998)

But that situation hasn't actually changed, because today it is illegal in Poland, under threat of imprisonment of up to three years, to dispute any significant detail of the camp's narrative currently told by the Auschwitz Museum. Many other countries in Europe have enacted similar laws. Hence, the Auschwitz Museum officials – and any other scholar involved in this topic – face a very simple alternative: Lie and retain the chance of a comfortable, prestigious career, or forsake all that and go to prison as well. It's that simple.

Which choice will they make? Which choice would you make?

However, it actually doesn't even require criminal laws to keep people from challenging the officially ordained narrative. Anyone stepping out of line even in countries without such legislation will quickly see their reputation tainted, their career destroyed, their social network shredded. This is so because the “Holocaust” is a third-rail topic where dissent is not tolerated by any society.

The question therefore is not whether museum officials at Auschwitz and elsewhere are lying, but whether we can expect them to tell any kind of unwelcome truth, and consequentially become a sacrificial lamb on the altar of the Holocaust religion.

We kick off the present study in Part One with a review of a lie that survived the collapse of the Eastern Bloc for more than a decade: the claim that

the Auschwitz Museum's most-prized exhibit – the camp's crematorium with its claimed homicidal gas chamber – is in its original state as it was used by the evil Nazis for mass murder during the war. That claim was repeated by the Museum's tour guides until around the turn of the millennium, although it can be shown that the Museum's officials responsible for instructing these guides knew better: that building had been completely restructured in 1947 following not solid evidence but Holocaustic propaganda scripts. Hence, although the Soviet Union was gone by 1991 and could no longer serve as an excuse for these officials to perpetuate their lies, they nevertheless kept spreading them – for some ten more years.

Then they changed the narrative a little, without ever admitting having done anything wrong – and without ever apologizing to their millions of deceived visitors.

Yet the current narrative is just as much a lie. They tweaked it a little to patch up some jarring contradictions in the old narrative which had become too obvious to many, but when we look at the details of what they tell visitors today, it's still a pack of lies.

Hence, Part One of this book addresses issues directly affecting millions – the millions of tourists lied to at Auschwitz every year – and could thus potentially benefit both them and countless additional millions of readers.¹

Part Two of this study, on the other hand, may be of interest only to a select few scholars specializing in the details of archival research on Auschwitz. However, since the orthodox narrative told to millions of tourists rests on the foundations of that archival material, it indirectly affects the whole story more profoundly than anything else. If the Museum's scholars are shown to lie, then the emperor is shown to be naked.

For that reason, the second, much-longer part of the present study is a thorough analysis of the Auschwitz Museum's latest attempt at pulling the wool over the eyes of specialized historians and aficionados interested in the Auschwitz narrative.

Ever since the end of the war, the museum has been desperate to find documentary evidence for the claim that people were mass murdered at Auschwitz in huge chemical slaughterhouses called “gas chambers.” They have been utterly unsuccessful with this. Yet they keep on claiming the contrary, while at the same time ignoring all publications refuting their claims. These museum publications, the most-recent of which Carlo Mattogno will cite copiously in his analysis, have been repeatedly revealed as being littered with mistranslations, distortions, inconsistencies, logical fallacies, contradictions and absurdi-

¹ Part One of this edition is a combination of text passages taken from the Introduction to the first, 2016 edition of this study, from a chapter contributed to that edition by Eric Hunt (revised and rewritten), and from a paper by Germar Rudolf first published in early 2020 (Rudolf 2020b). Since Eric Hunt prefers not to be associated with this study anymore, we removed his name, although some text passages and ideas contained in Part One were originally his.

ties. Mattoigno's devastating analysis laid out in the present book proves these accusations to the point where one is tempted to say: *Enough! Are these Auschwitz scholars insane?*

Probably not. But the mindboggling deficiencies of the latest publication by the Auschwitz Museum left me wondering: How can this be explained? Can the threat of imprisonment in case they decide to dismantle the orthodox narrative really be that powerful that they all fall in lockstep and parrot the same absurd lies without anyone ever disagreeing? Considering that the scholars at the Auschwitz Museum are the High Priests of the Auschwitz Gospel, if they mustered the courage to stand up and say: "Enough is enough, we can't take it anymore!", who could stop them? After all, telling the truth about Auschwitz is a crime primarily and foremost *because* of the utterly immoral lies perpetrated by the "scholars" at the Auschwitz Museum for more than seven decades and counting. Take those "scholars" out of the equation, and the whole thing should collapse.

Of course, these Auschwitz scholars would not merely risk criminal prosecutions, even if they were acquitted at the end of a certainly excruciating, drawn-out procedure. They'd also lose their jobs. They'd end their careers right there. Neither the mass media nor the politicians in Poland or any other nation deeply invested in the myth – first and foremost Germany, the U.S. and Israel – would forgive such iconoclastic heresy.

And then there is what the Germans call *Raubversicherungspolitik* – securing the spoils of a robbery through politics. After World War II, Poland annexed large swaths of Germany and expelled its roughly eight million ethnic-German inhabitants in what constitutes the largest ethnic cleansing in the history of mankind. There is nothing in international law that can ever turn this crime against humanity into a legal, acceptable act. Except, of course, the Holocaust, a sin for which Germany and the Germans must endure any kind of punishment, no matter what. What Poland did right after the war and has been doing ever since, is a simple act of securing her spoils by focusing on German war crimes, by exaggerating them, even by inventing them. Similarly to Israel, Poland's post-war identity is to a large degree based upon her self-promoted image as Germany's victim. And many Poles feel it is important to keep any potential German demand for territorial restitution at bay by constantly waving the Holocaust in everyone's face.

But Poland's existence does not depend on the orthodox Holocaust narrative. Poland existed before the Second World War, and it will keep existing even after the orthodox Holocaust narrative has been cut down to its actual size as supported by verifiable evidence. In addition, Poland has nothing to fear from Germany today. Germany's population is experiencing a demographic collapse. Germans aren't even able to populate what was left to them after the war, let alone any other territories. Ironically, the same is true of Poland, whose demographic trends run pretty much parallel to Germany's. Both

countries are tied to each other by geography, ethnicity, history, culture, and by their current fate of an impending societal collapse triggered by their populations going extinct, plain and simple.

So why bickering about the Holocaust? Why lie about it?

All the more-so since the orthodox Holocaust narrative is the most-important weapon used against any European identity movement trying to prevent or rather revert the collapse of Europe's 4,000-year-old civilization.² By simply calling any European identity movement "Nazis" (say: potential gas-chamber mass murderers), any such movement is doomed to fail, and has been failing for decades.

I therefore dare say that those promoting the orthodox Holocaust narrative are the main perpetrators in wiping out European civilization as we know it. And among them, the scholars at the Auschwitz Museum, the holiest of all temples of Holocaustianity, bear the heaviest responsibility.

If Europe's civilization is to become a matter of the past within this or the next century, you can all point at the scholars at the Auschwitz Museum. They did it! Provided anyone is left who might still be interested in knowing who did it.

Germar Rudolf
Red Lion, 29 April 2016,
revised on June 6, 2020

² Look at the 3,600-year-old "Nebra sky disk" to realize the age and early sophistication of European civilization; https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nebra_sky_disk

Part One:

How the

Auschwitz Museum

Dupes Millions of Visitors

The Auschwitz Crematorium I Gas-Chamber Hoax

Introduction

After the former Polish military barracks south of the Polish city of Oswiecim had been converted into a concentration camp by German authorities following the Polish defeat in September 1939, the old munitions bunker on the grounds of that camp was converted into a crematorium for the incineration of the remains of deceased or executed inmates. In war-time and post-war literature, this building is alternately referred to as either the old crematorium or Crematorium I. Subsequent to an initial test gassing conducted in the camp's gaol in early September of 1941 (see Czech 1990, pp. 84-87; Mattogno 2005b), the morgue of this crematorium is said to have been converted into a homicidal gas chamber (Czech 1990, p. 90).

Tourists entering the Auschwitz Museum's main exhibit, which used to be called the Auschwitz *Stammlager* or Main Camp during the war, pass under the infamous "Arbeit macht frei" sign and usually end their tour on the grand finale – Crematorium I with its alleged homicidal gas chamber and cremation furnaces.

For decades, tour guides and historians insisted Crematorium I was in its original state. However, a modern sign acknowledges now that Crematorium I existed in a number of layouts throughout the war, and was again modified after the war. This is very much thanks to revisionist researcher Dr. Robert Faurisson who uncovered the original plans of the structure in the Auschwitz archives and shared them with the world.

Figure 2 shows a sign which was set up next to Crematorium I only in recent years. On it, we can see some of the differences between the building in its state at the time of alleged gassings (on the left), and after numerous post-1942 and post-war modifications (on the right).

The museum sign shown in Figure 3, located right next to the one shown in Figure 2, admits:



Figure 1: "Reconstructed" Crematorium I at the Auschwitz Main Camp. The SS Hospital is located directly behind it.



Figure 2: Sign acknowledging Crematorium I was modified post-war.




Figure 3: Museum sign explaining a few of the post-war "reconstructions."

“After the war, the Museum partially reconstructed the gas chamber and crematorium. The chimney and two incinerators were rebuilt, using original components, as were several of the openings in the gas chamber roof.”

It is therefore indisputable that this building was modified post-war under Soviet occupation and direction to represent a homicidal gas chamber.

Faux Zyklon-B Holes

The only sinister feature of this alleged homicidal gas chamber are four openings in the ceiling, framed by wooden boards and closed by equally wooden lids. For decades, the Auschwitz Museum has claimed through its tour guides that these four openings were used by the evil SS to pour Zyklon B onto inmates trapped in that room in order to asphyxiate them swiftly. Revisionist researchers, such as Robert Faurisson (who called that facility “a ‘reconstructed’ room” – note his quotation marks; Faurisson 1980) and Ditlieb Felderer (1980), were suspicious early on about the museum’s claim that what we see in that building is authentic. However, it took a young Jewish activist to bring this entire problem center stage:

In the summer of 1992, the U.S.-American atheist Jew David Cole went to Auschwitz and recorded on video tape what the attractive young Polish tour guide there was telling him about the alleged gas chamber inside Crematorium I at the Auschwitz Main Camp. She claimed that everything David was seeing there was indeed authentic, genuine and in its original state (Cole 1993, starting at 9:47).

Later during his tour, David managed to interview Franciszek Piper, at that time curator of the museum’s historical archives. He confirmed in front of David’s camera that what tourists are seeing to this day is neither authentic nor genuine nor original. It was all “reconstructed” shortly after the war to look similar to what the Auschwitz Museum’s authorities claimed back then it would have looked when this place was allegedly used by the SS to mass murder Jews and other inmates with poison gas.

In particular the four holes in the ceiling of the purported gas chamber, through which the SS murderers ostensibly poured in the lethal Zyklon-B pellets, were confirmed by Dr. Piper to have been put into place after the war on orders of the museum authorities. Yet Piper insisted that they were put at exactly the same spots where the old, SS-made holes had been, as traces of these holes, which were supposedly filled up by the SS in 1943 or 1944, were allegedly still visible after war’s end (Cole 1993, 28:38-28:51).

Fact is, though, that until the turn of the 20th to the 21st Century, Auschwitz Museum officials told their tour guides to tell tourists a claim of authenticity which the officials knew was not true. So they had their tour guides convey a lie to the millions of tourists visiting that most-revered, holy shrine of

Holocaustianity every year. They lied, plain and simple, though the guides may not have known it, or cared.

That changed later, though. After having been deeply embarrassed by David Cole's revealing exposé, the museum officials finally mustered the decency to own up to this deception and put up some signs openly admitting these post-war changes. On another sign, the Museum juxtaposes the building's layout as shown in blueprints of the year 1942 (when the building's morgue was allegedly used as a homicidal gas chamber) with today's layout, although without explaining much of anything. (See the illustrations in Part One of the present book.) It's up to the visitor to make sense of it all.

For the critical investigator, the first pivotal question is: what evidence exists for the Auschwitz Museum's claim that right after the war there were traces of former openings visible on the ceiling of that building's former morgue? Because if there weren't any such traces, then any claims to the contrary would be yet another Auschwitz lie by the museum officials. If there weren't any traces of holes, then the claimed holes never existed in that ceiling. And if those holes never existed, then no SS man ever poured Zyklon B through that roof, as many witnesses have claimed. And in inexorable consequence, this morgue then could not have served as a homicidal gas chamber as claimed by the museum.

This question is therefore at the very center of the entire issue.

Do we have to simply take Dr. Piper's word at face value, who was merely a small child at war's end (he was born in 1941), and thus cannot possibly know from his own experience what he is telling us about the state of the building at war's end? Or do we have to take at face value the statements of any other person who has claimed to have seen these holes during the war?

As Carlo Mattogno has shown elsewhere (2005a, 89-97; 2017, pp. 355-372), these witness statements are highly contradictory not only regarding the number and shape of these holes. They are actually unreliable for many different reasons: internal inconsistencies, conflict with material and documentary evidence, physical and technical impossibilities, obvious absurdities, and clearly propagandistic overtones, to name only a few. Hence relying on those statements does not comport with an investigator's claiming to be critical.

Insofar as reliable documentary or physical evidence is concerned, it is therefore unknown in what exact condition this building was in early 1945 when it was taken over by the Soviets. The late French orthodox historian Jean-Claude Pressac, who has thoroughly investigated the Auschwitz Museum's archives with the full support of the museum authorities, wrote about that (1989, p. 133):

"It would appear that the photos of the interior showing the state of the premises were not taken at the beginning of 1945, which is a pity because the restructuring of the building back into a Krematorium began immedi-

ately after the liberation. [...] Because of the lack of original documents and the transformations that have been made (see the drawing of the present state of the premises at the end of this chapter), it was not possible before to materially demonstrate the existence of a homicidal gas chamber in the former morgue of Krematorium I."

But we didn't want to take Pressac's word at face value either, so a friend of mine, unsuspected of harboring any iconoclastic views, managed to get a well-established academic involved in research of a similar nature to approach the current director of the Auschwitz-Museum, Dr. Piotr Setkiewicz, with two simple questions asked in a letter dated March 14, 2016:

"1) Did Soviet or Polish authorities document, or photograph, the interior of the crematorium, before any alterations were done? I would like to know about the layout of the interior, ceiling openings, and so on. Are there any photographs, drawings, or descriptions? If so, can I obtain copies?"

2) It is clear that Soviet/Polish authorities made significant post-war modifications to the building. Is there any documentation about this? Any description or documents showing the work performed—that is, anything about cost estimates, blueprints, work orders, materials, etc? And again, if so, can I obtain copies?"

Here is what Dr. Igor Bartosik from the Museum's Research Center answered in a letter dated March 31, 2016 (see reproduction on p. 38):

"Dear Sir

In response to the letter from 14 March, I would like [to] inform [you] that unfortunately we can not help you. Our museum does not have any documents on matters that interest you.

From the memories of former employees (very often ex-prisoners) we know that the work on the reconstruction of furnaces, chimney etc., [were] made in the second half of 1947.

Best regards

dr Igor Bartosik"

So, now we have it from the horse's mouth: There is no evidence at all as to the exact condition this building was in at war's end, and the changes made to turn that building into the museum's most-prized exhibit were not documented either.

Asked which "memories of former employees" contain information about the reconstruction, Dr. Bartosik referred to the testimony of Adam Żłobnicki dated 18 November 1981. Żłobnicki had been interned at Auschwitz during the war with the inmate number 165010, and had worked as a guard at the Auschwitz memorial since 13 June 1946.

If we follow Żłobnicki's statement, he remembered that right after the war Krematorium I had no chimney, and that the interior of the gas chamber

looked different from what it looked like later. On the holes in the ceiling of this room, Żłobnicki stated the following:³

“I remember exactly that the introduction holes for the Zyklon-B gas, which used to be in the roof of the crematorium, were also reconstructed. The task of those charged with this reconstruction was facilitated by the fact that distinct traces of the cement patches of the earlier openings were left in the spots of the old introduction holes. Hence new openings were broken through at the same spots, and little chimneys [i.e. introduction shafts] were built with bricks [domurowano]. This work was also done in the years 1946-1947.”

The first question that comes to mind, how a guard not involved in the reconstruction could know any details of what was going on inside the building during the reconstruction? This is all the more disturbing as what he says about the newly built introduction shafts is wrong: they were and still are merely lined with wooden boards, not made of bricks.

The next question is: If the museum authorities never had any documentation on the exact state of that building before its “reconstruction”, and none about the changes made during that process either, why didn’t they approach anyone involved in that reconstruction to have their testimony recorded, such as any former museum official in a position of responsibility back in 1947, or any person involved in the actual work, such as architects, engineers, construction workers, you name them. Why, of all possible people, did they ask a non-involved memorial guard?

Fact is that all we have is an inaccurate account from a bystander, who may or may not have adjusted his account to what those recording it – the Communist museum officials of the early 1980s – wanted to hear from him.

Any assertion by any employee of the Auschwitz Museum that the current holes were opened at exactly the same locations as they had been during the war is therefore based not on solid, reliable evidence at all. They may or – considering what is at stake for them – they actually *must* be convinced that what Żłobnicki stated is true, yet that doesn’t make it true.

But what *is* true?

We know that the Polish legal authorities initiated large-scale criminal investigations against the former camp commandant Rudolf Höss and against the entire staff of the Auschwitz camp garrison right after the camp’s occupation by the Soviets. To this end, they collected all kinds of evidence in support of mass-murder claims. Photos of the claimed mass-murder sites as found right after the Soviet occupation would have been of the utmost importance, in particular if they could support any mass-murder claims.

The fact that no such photos of the ceiling of the alleged former gas chamber in Crematorium I exist raises the suspicion that such photos would not

³ APMO-B, Statements, vol. 96, p. 60.

have shown what the Soviet and Polish authorities wanted the world to believe. This suspicion is supported by the fact that no document exists regarding the changes made to this entire building in 1947. This indicates that the motivation behind those changes was *not* to meticulously restore something as accurately as possible, but to cover up manipulations.

Today we can infer these postwar changes only by comparing the current state with German construction blueprints of the wartime.

The undocumented manipulation of evidence that is central to a criminal investigation is itself a crime, by the way. Wikipedia writes in its entry on “Spoliation of evidence”:

“The spoliation of evidence is the intentional, reckless, or negligent withholding, hiding, altering, fabricating, or destroying of evidence relevant to a legal proceeding. Spoliation has three possible consequences: in jurisdictions where it is the (intentional) act is criminal by statute, it may result in fines and incarceration [...].

The spoliation inference is a negative evidentiary inference that a finder of fact can draw from a party’s destruction of a document or thing that is relevant to an ongoing or reasonably foreseeable civil or criminal proceeding: the finder of fact can review all evidence uncovered in as strong a light as possible against the spoliator and in favor of the opposing party.”

In most countries, Poland included, tampering with evidence is illegal and can thus be prosecuted. We are therefore not dealing merely with a case of sloppiness here, but with a potential crime of the Soviet and/or Polish officials involved in “reconstructing” Crematorium I right after the war, whoever they were.

The Orthodox Position

As explained by Piper, the Auschwitz Museum’s position is that these holes were “re-made” in the exact locations of the pre-existing, genuine holes, which were allegedly used in 1942 and 1943 to drop Zyklon B on the heads of those inside. In the fall of 1944, when the Germans converted the section of the old crematorium that contained the morgue/“gas chamber,” the washroom and the laying-out/dissecting room into an air-raid shelter for the nearby SS hospital,⁴ they allegedly filled in these holes with some concrete.

The Revisionist Position

However, the four holes in the roof of the morgue of Crematorium I at the Auschwitz Main Camp do not “fit” the original configuration of the building. In fact, they are centered over the *current* post-war-modified configuration of

⁴ This conversion results from a letter dated August 26, 1944, by Heinrich Josten, head of the Auschwitz air-raid protection department, to the camp commandant, RGVA 502-1-401, p. 34.

the expanded room. The first to point this out was Germar Rudolf in the first, 1993 German edition of his expert-witness report on the chemistry of Auschwitz (in Chapter 1.2.). In the current English edition of 2020, this slightly expanded passage can be found in Chapter 5.3. (Rudolf 2020a, pp. 101f.):

“If the SS had put these holes in the concrete during the war, one must assume that they would have taken care to evenly distribute these holes in the ceiling of the original(!) morgue in order to ensure an even distribution of the Zyklon B inside the room. The shafts today, however, are only evenly distributed in the ceiling of this room if one considers the washing room, which was only incorporated after the war(!), as an integral part of the morgue (‘gas chamber’) [...].

Thus, the arrangement of today’s introduction holes only makes sense if they were created especially for its present status as a falsely dimensioned ‘reconstruction for Museum purposes’ after the war. This becomes even more evident from Figure 55, which shows the same section of Crematorium I as in Figure 54 as a 3D model, yet in the current state. This shows that the holes’ locations were chosen with precision in order that crossing pairs are equidistant to the nearest transverse wall, leading to all four holes being somewhat evenly distributed over this room. This is the decisive evidence that these holes were created with regard to the measurements of the accidentally enlarged morgue/‘gas chamber,’ and have nothing to do with the original morgue.”

Carlo Mattogno expanded on that theme in three studies by investigating this issue more deeply (2004c; 2005a, 89-97; 2017, pp. 355-372).

The 3-D model of Figure 55 mentioned by Rudolf in the above quote – not contained in the original 1993 edition of his work – was actually taken from the first, 2016 edition of the present book. A 3-D representation of the relevant section of Crematorium I is indeed useful to understand this “hole hoax.”

For these basic 3-D representation, the “roof” of the building (dark grey) has been lowered so the interior walls can be seen. The rear half of the building is devoted to the furnace room and additional smaller rooms, and has not been represented in this 3-D rendering.

Figure 4 shows Crematorium I at the time of alleged mass gassings. The four claimed, square-shaped Zyklon-B-insertion holes are represented in the roof. The large rectangular room designated as a morgue on the original German plans is the alleged gas chamber. This of course raises the question: what part of this building was used as a morgue instead, if the actual morgue was used as a gas chamber?

As we can see, the placement of the holes seems wrong, and they are not centered over the long rectangular morgue, the alleged gas chamber. Wouldn’t any sensible engineer and construction worker place these holes in such a way that they are somewhat evenly distributed over the entire ceiling in order to




Figure 4: Configuration at time of alleged mass gassings (but see fn 11 on p. 37).




Figure 5: Hole close to original wall separating morgue and washroom (white square).

make sure that the poisonous fumes get evenly distribute throughout the entire “gas chamber”?

Figure 5 shows the location of an oddly placed hole, highlighted by a white square, which is very close to the location of both an original wall separating the morgue from the washroom next to it, and the door to the furnace room. This hole is shown in Figure 6. The beam coming from the left was once a wall. This wall was removed during the 1947 “reconstruction.”

After the larger purpose-built crematoria at the nearby Birkenau Camp started operating in early 1943, Crematorium I was first retired, then, in late 1944, converted into an air-raid shelter for the SS hospital located across from



Figure 6: Photograph of hole near original dividing wall and door.

it. In Figure 7, we can see the many interior walls added, as well as an additional entrance/exit and air lock on the right. The doorway between the morgue/alleged gas chamber and the furnace room was walled up.

The current configuration, shown in Figures 8 and 9, is highly revealing. The museum knocked down one wall too many – the one originally separating the morgue from the washroom during the time of alleged gassings. They also created a new opening allowing tourists to walk from the morgue/“gas chamber” directly into the furnace room, although they created that opening at the wrong location (and with a larger and asymmetrical size; plus they didn’t install any door at all into this opening...).

Note that now, all of a sudden, those four Zyklon holes appear to “fit,” meaning they are somewhat evenly distributed across the ceiling of the current, accidentally(?) enlarged “gas chamber” tourists walk into.

According to Carlo Mattogno’s measurements, the holes in the upper left and lower right are 5.1 meters away from the current walls. But during the war, when the room is said to have been use as a gas chamber, the hole in the upper left was barely a meter away from the now-removed dividing wall to the washroom.

The other two holes are 7.1 meters away from currently existing walls. One of the walls, however – the one on the right separating the morgue from the air lock – didn’t exist at the time of alleged gassings, because it was added only in 1944 during the building’s conversion to an air-raid shelter! The actual distance in 1942/43 would therefore have been some 9 meters, not 7.1 meters. In 1942/43, the distance between the other hole and the closest wall to the left – the now-removed washroom wall – would have been some 3 meters only.

The placement of the holes in the roof of Auschwitz’s Crematorium I are centered over a building configuration which only existed after the post-war modifications.




Figure 7: Air-raid shelter configuration of late 1944/early 1945.




Figure 8: Current Configuration as “reconstructed” in 1947 by the Auschwitz Museum.




Figure 9: Distances of holes from currently existing walls.

In early 1945, the Soviets found in that building an air-raid shelter for the SS Hospital equipped with an operating room and a set of toilet stalls. This served no use for propaganda. Hence, when “reconstruction” began in 1947, the Polish authorities added a chimney on about the same spot where it was located previously. They rebuilt two of the three furnaces in the furnaces room, albeit in a rather flawed way. Furthermore, they removed all but one of the interior walls dividing up the air-raid shelter, making a big mistake by removing one too many – the original separation wall between the morgue and washroom which existed at the time of alleged gassings. The air-raid shelter’s toilet stalls were also removed.

If there had been traces of holes in that ceiling in 1945 that the SS had closed up, then they should never have been “re-opened” in the first place. This would have been tampering with a crime scene of alleged mass murder! And if there weren’t any such traces, the whole thing is nothing short of a giant, criminal hoax!

The placement of the currently existing four holes, however, points to a crude mistake on the part of the hoaxers, who centered the supposedly “re-opened” holes not over the morgue as it was in 1942/43, but over the morgue + washroom + 1944 air-lock entrance, *a configuration which did not exist at the time of the alleged mass gassings.*

Majdanek: An Admitted “Hole Hoax” Precedent

Although the scope of this book is focused on the Auschwitz Museum’s lies, tricks and obfuscations, Auschwitz is only one part of the larger Holocaust myth. Most people hear for the first time about revisionist claims regarding Auschwitz through the mass media which, with their deceitful rhetoric, make the common reader believe that revisionist claims have no basis in reality and are merely outrageous, absurd and utterly untenable.

However, there is a precedent where a “hole hoax” is today generally admitted to have been committed by the Soviets at war’s end. It concerns the Majdanek Camp, and more specifically, a room in this camp’s “new” crematorium which served as a morgue during the war. For decades after the war’s end, this morgue was alleged to have served as a homicidal gas chamber. To that effect, Zyklon B was allegedly thrown through an opening in the ceiling (see Figures 10-12).

In 2005, however, in a sweeping revision, the director of the Majdanek Museum, Tomasz Kranz, drastically revised the Soviet-derived propaganda death toll down to a mere 78,000 – not even 5% of the original number of 1.7 million as claimed at war’s end! (See Graf/Mattogno 2016, pp. 9 and 260-281.) In this radical process of shedding propagandistic ballast, Kranz also jettisoned five of the seven originally claimed homicidal gas chambers at Maj-

danek, thus indirectly admitting that at least $\frac{5}{7}$ of the original Majdanek gas-chamber story was a fraudulent propaganda hoax.

For the crematorium's morgue, this revision was quite inevitable, because the room had no means for ventilation, and even had two openings in a wall with no means for closing them (see Figure 11). Ever since, this morgue has no longer been alleged to have served as a homicidal gas chamber. Yet the room's reinforced-concrete ceiling still has the hole which was obviously cut through after the war, probably by Soviet forgers. The Majdanek Museum remains absolutely silent about it, hoping that visitors won't see it or, if they do, won't ask any embarrassing questions.



Figure 10: Morgue in the New Crematorium of the Majdanek camp, prior to museum revisions. A crudely cut hole in the ceiling was for decades alleged to have been used to drop Zyklon B pellets into the room to gas trapped victims – although those pellets would have fallen directly into a floor drain below. This sign, now removed and revised, deceitfully claimed this was a homicidal gas chamber.



Figure 11: Morgue inside the "new crematorium" at the Majdanek Camp with two openings in one of its walls. Top right: the hole in the ceiling (© 1995 Carlo Mattogno.)

These drastic revisions of the death toll and the claimed homicidal gas chambers are thanks primarily to Jürgen Graf's and Carlo Mattogno demolishing of the Majdanek "death-camp" claims in their book *Concentration Camp Majdanek: A Historical and Technical Study*, which Kranz read, remarked on, and must have been influenced by.

Those new to revisionist research need to understand and recognize the lies about the above-mentioned Majdanek morgue with its "hole hoax," and similar lies about various other rooms once claimed to have served as homicidal gas chambers throughout the German camp system. A multitude of rooms have fraudulently been

alleged to have served as gas chambers, yet these claims have been silently dropped in later years. These falsely labeled rooms range from morgues (Majdanek), kitchens (Breendonck, Belgium), clothing-drying facilities (Majdanek), fumigation rooms (Majdanek), shower rooms (Majdanek) to clothing steamers (Natzweiler, France). "Holocaust" claims such as these are truly absurd, quite in contrast to revisionist analysis of the physical evidence, documentation and eyewitness errors and falsehoods.

The false claims about the Auschwitz morgue/"gas chambers" belong in the dustbin of history, along with the previously abandoned claims of the Majdanek morgue/"gas chamber."

The "Victims' Entrance"

In their post-war remodeling of Crematorium I, the Polish authorities left the air lock with the second entrance added in 1944 in place. Despite revisionists pointing out the fact that this entrance was created after the time of alleged gassings, the museum authorities passed it off to visitors for the entire rest of the 20th Century as the "victims' entrance."

As recently as 1999, and according to available information even many months if not years afterwards, tourists would first walk past the gallows allegedly used to hang Rudolf Höss. A sign shaped as an arrow pointed to "Crematorium I's" air-raid-shelter door as the "victims' entrance" (see Figure 13). However, neither the gallows nor the air-raid-shelter door existed at the time of mass gassings! Clearly both add to the theatrics. Yet for decades, tourists were told by tour guides that this was the way the victims entered the



Figure 12: Close-up of the Soviet-made hole in the ceiling of the morgue inside the "new crematorium" at the Majdanek Camp. Note that the forgers did not even bother removing the reinforcement bars.
(© 1997 Carlo Mattogno.)



Figure 13: A composite of two photographs taken in 1998.

1: "Victims' Entrance"; 2: Sign shaped as an arrow designating air-raid shelter door as "Victims' Entrance"; 3: The gallows built post-war to hang Rudolf Höss

Photographs courtesy: Scrapbookpages.com

death chamber. The museum tour guides, again improperly instructed by the museum's officials, told a lie, whether they were aware of it or not.

The anti-revisionist film *Mr. Death* directed by Jewish filmmaker Errol Morris used the air-raid-shelter door to great effect. Using tilted, also known as canted or "Dutch" camera angles, along with Halloween horror music, the air-raid-shelter door is shown as proof of sinister Nazi-gas-chamber doors (Figure 14).

As Morris shows the rusty air-raid-shelter door at Auschwitz filmed like a B-grade horror movie, Jewish "Holocaust expert" Robert Jan van Pelt claims revisionists sicken him. Next, a composite shot using fake special effects is a truly shocking low for the Holocaust industry. For that footage, Errol Morris used a different-aged steel door with a peephole, and composited a shot of the inside of the "gas chamber." All this is an attempt to trick viewers into thinking that the steel door at Auschwitz was centered on, and looked right directly into, the "gas chamber." Van Pelt even looks through the Hollywood prop door peephole, mimicking an SS officer watching Jews being gassed (Figure 15a-c).



Figure 14a-c: Screenshots from *Mr. Death* (1999), the "victims' entry."



Figure 15a-c: Fake footage in Errol Morris's film *Mr. Death*.

However, the actual air-raid-shelter door at Auschwitz is not grey but simply rusty brown, as it consists of a mere wooden door with a piece of sheet metal nailed to it to make it gas-tight. Furthermore, in the 1980s, David McCalden pointed out that this air-raid-shelter door opens right into another wall within arm's reach (Figure 16a-d)! Hence the SS could not have watched Jews getting gassed through that peephole for two reasons: first because one would have looked right into another wall, and second because this door wasn't even installed until after the alleged gassings had ended! Morris and van Pelt are forced to use cheesy Hollywood special effects to con their viewers.

According to surviving German documentation, this gas-tight door was ordered and put in place to protect lives in case of poison-gas attacks from *outside* the building (from aerial bombing)! Every viewer of *Mr. Death* was conned by a total inversion of reality.

In more-recent years, the Auschwitz Museum changed its narrative while being absolutely unapologetic for the fact that they had been lying to visitors for decades. The entranceway fitted with the air-raid-shelter door is now no longer used by tourists to enter the building. In fact, this entrance is physically closed to tourists by a chain and sign saying "No Entrance" (Figure 17). In addition, from layout drawings shown on a sign displayed in front of that crematorium, tourists *can infer* that this entrance did not exist when the place was said to have been used to mass murder people – although it is not expressly stated in the drawings' caption. But how many tourists actually look thoroughly at those drawings and make inferences about construction details?

Nowadays, the Auschwitz Museum instead herds gullible tourists through the entrance on the opposite side of this building. They are now told that the




Figure 16a-d: First three images: stills of the air-raid shelter entrance from the revisionist documentary "*The Holocaust Revisited*." Last image: section from today's museum sign with an arrow added pointing in the line of gaze of Figure 16b (rusty air-raid shelter door with peephole, closed) and c (door opened, wall behind it visible).

supposed victims had to walk through two separate rooms in order to enter the “chamber.”

It is clear why the Auschwitz Museum for all of last century herded tourists through the air-raid-shelter entrance. The entrance’s sloping, claustrophobia-inducing walls and its sturdy steel door with the sinister myth surrounding its peephole were a great choice for traumatizing visitors. The air-raid-shelter entrance also makes more sense than the current tourist path, because had it existed at the time, the supposed victims could have walked almost directly into the “gas chamber.”

The current tourist pathway through Crematorium I, which would also have been the victim’s pathway during the war, goes through two rooms (labelled a and b on the museum’s map), whose wartime function would have made it impossible to hide from inmates that prisoners were dying in masses in that building. One of these rooms (b), a “washroom” according to wartime blueprints, was supposedly “used to store the ashes of incinerated corpses,” if we believe the map’s caption, while the other is labeled as a “laying-out room” in the blueprints, that is to say: this is where corpses were stored, prepared for and subjected to autopsies. The other theoreti-



Figure 17: No more “victims’ entry”: photo of the air-raid shelter access door of winter 2012. Image courtesy auschwitz-2012.blogspot.com



Figure 18: The 20th-century tourist entrance (top) through the air-raid shelter’s access door is now closed. Tourists are instead herded into this building through an entrance pointed to by the white arrow at the bottom of this map.

cally possible pathway is even dumber: victims would have been forced to walk right past the cremation furnaces! Either of these victims' pathway choices, "newly revised for the 21st Century," would have made any intended victim aware that they were in a veritable "death building", with corpses and their ashes stacked everywhere for them to see. And yet, they are claimed to have walked calmly into the death chamber, presumably blissfully ignorant of what was coming, just like sheep to the slaughter...

The Doors

The two doors which allowed access to the room within Crematorium I that is said to have been used as a homicidal gas chamber in 1941-1943 are of pivotal importance, because they would have been used to securely trap poisonous fumes and hundreds of potentially panicking victims inside. The questions to ask in this regard are:

1. What kind of doors would have been needed for such a task?
2. What kind of door did the room actually have?

Door Type Needed

Keeping a potentially panicking crowd locked inside a room, and at the same time preventing toxic gases from seeping through the door, requires a tightly sealed, massive steel door that is firmly anchored into a sturdy wall. Such doors were mass-produced in Germany during the war for use in Germany's thousands of air-raid shelters.

Doors Claimed by Witnesses

The orthodox narrative does not rely on material traces or documents, but solely on accounts given by witnesses. One of the first documents based on such eyewitness claims is the report by a combined Polish-Soviet investigative commission, which stated already two months prior to the end of World War Two the following about the doors leading into the claimed gas chamber:⁵

"In early 1941, a crematorium, designated as Crematorium #1, was started up in the Auschwitz camp. [...] Next to this crematorium there was a gas chamber, which had, at either end, gas-tight doors with peep-holes and in the ceiling four openings with hermetic closures through which the 'Ziklon' [sic] for the killing of the persons was thrown. Crematorium I operated until March 1943 and existed in that form for two years."

In preparation for the 1947 Polish show trial against former Auschwitz Camp Commandant Rudolf Höss, Polish engineer Dr. Roman Dawidowski compiled

⁵ GARF 7021-108-15, pp. 2f.

an expert report on evidence supporting homicidal gassing claims at Auschwitz, where we read on this topic:⁶

“One now [in late 1941⁷] began to poison people regularly with Zyklon B and to use for that purpose the Leichenhalle (morgue) of Crematorium I [...]. This chamber [...] on both sides had a gas-tight door.”

Jan Sehn, the Polish judge who led the investigation leading up to the Polish post-war show trials against former members of the German Auschwitz Camp staff, wrote the following about this in his 1960 book on Auschwitz (Sehn 1961, p. 125):

“The mortuary (Leichenkeller)^[8] of the first Oswiecim crematorium [...] was fitted with two gas-proof doors.”

Claims about gas-tight doors in that morgue originate from witness testimony. Among them is Stanisław Jankowski, who stated regarding the doors in that room in a deposition October 3, 1980 (Pressac 1989, p. 124):

“The two thick wooden doors of the room, one in the side wall, the other in the end wall, had been made gas-tight.”

The post-war autobiography of Rudolf Höss, written while in Polish custody awaiting his execution, contains little information about the doors of this alleged gas chamber, only that they must have been very sturdy, because (Bezwińska/Czech 1984, p. 93):

“When the powder [sic; Zyklon B] was thrown in[to the gas chamber], there were cries of ‘Gas!’, then a great bellowing, and the trapped prisoners [Russian PoWs to be gassed] hurled themselves against both the doors. But the doors held.”

Höss moreover speaks repeatedly of the doors being “screwed” shut (*ibid.*, pp. 96, 115, 134), which points to a door with massive steel fixtures not found on usual doors.

In his post-war declaration writing in the summer of 1945, former SS man Pery Broad was a little more specific about the doors of this claimed homicidal gas chamber, making it clear that this was a heavy, gas-tight, panic-proof door (*ibid.*, p. 176):

“Suddenly the door was closed. It had been made tight with rubber and secured with iron fittings. Those inside heard the heavy bolts being secured. They were screwed to with screws, making the door air-tight. A deadly, paralysing terror spread among the victims. They started to beat upon the door, in helpless rage and despair they hammered with their fists upon it.”

⁶ AGK, NTN, 93. The report entered the files of the Höss Trial in its Volume 11. The quoted passage is on pp. 26f.

⁷ Danuta Czech set the date of the first gassing in that morgue to September 16, 1941; Czech 1990, p. 90.

⁸ That should be *Leichenhalle*, as it was above-ground, while “Keller” means basement/cellar.

While interrogated in preparation of the first Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial, defendant Hans Stark made the following statements in his deposition about the doors of that room:⁹

“As early as the autumn of 1941 gassings were carried out in a room of the small crematorium, the room having been fitted for that purpose. It could take in some 200–250 people, was higher than a normal living room, had no windows, and only one door that had been made [gas] tight and had a lock like the door of an air-raid shelter.”

We conclude from this that heavy, gas-tight, sturdy doors must indeed have been installed in that facility, if we are inclined to believe these witness reports.

Doors According to Material Traces and Documents

The Current Situation

As mentioned before, for several decades after the war, tourists visiting the museum entered the building using an opening that has a wooden door clad in a sheet of iron and equipped with an ominous-looking peephole. Superficially seen, this door looks like the kind of door that could have been used in a homicidal gas chamber, although it was made merely of wooden boards and was therefore hardly panic-proof. The problem is that this door was added to this building only in late 1944 when it was converted to an air-raid shelter. Hence the door we see there today is an absolutely innocuous air-raid-shelter door.

The second door contained in this room on display as a “gas chamber” that leads into the former laying-out room is an even flimsier wooden door which even has a thin, easily breakable window pane. In addition, there is no door at all in the wall opening connecting that morgue/“gas chamber” with the furnace room. It goes without saying that no room thusly equipped could have operated as a gas chamber. However, since it is admitted today that this is not what the place looked like originally, basing an argument on these doors would be rather pointless. Hence I abstain from illustrating these doors and the wall opening to the furnace room. It just emphasizes the fact that what we are shown there today does not merit the term “reconstruction.”

The Door between Furnace Room and Morgue

The only original door of that room about which we have any revealing information – gleaned from original wartime blueprints – is the one connecting the morgue a.k.a. “gas chamber” to the furnace room. On all extant blueprints showing doors, this opening is shown as having had a swing door (see Figure 19 with a plan of 1940, and Figure 20 with a plan of 1942).

⁹ Minutes of interrogation of Hans Stark, Cologne, April 23, 1959. Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen, Ludwigsburg, ref. AR-Z 37/58 SB6, p. 947.




Figure 19: SS blueprint of Crematorium I drawn on November 30, 1940 clearly showing a swing door (inside added rectangle) between the morgue (bottom) and the furnace room (top). See section enlargement in Figure 19a.

Such a swing door, quite like doors commonly seen in restaurants, leading to the kitchen, was very convenient for crematorium workers whose hands were tied up carrying corpses – or corpse stretchers with corpses – from the morgue to the furnace room. Their hands tied up holding their heavy load, they could easily push open the door when approaching it, and the door would also automatically close behind them, thus preventing too much warm air from getting from the furnace room into the morgue.

A door designed to open in both directions is utterly worthless as a gas-tight homicidal-gas-chamber door, however. Such a swing door could not be properly braced against dozens of panicking gassing victims attempting to bash down the door. More importantly, a swing door of this type would by necessity contain a large gap between the door and the door frame to allow such a swinging action to occur. Such a door would also have gaps above and below the door. These big gaps mean that this swing door could not be gas-tight whatsoever, rendering it unfit for use in a location where large amounts of poison gas are said to have been used.




Figure 19a: Section enlargement of Figure 19.




Figure 20: SS blueprint of Crematorium I drawn on April 10, 1942, while the morgue was allegedly being used as a homicidal “gas chamber,” again clearly showing a swing door between the morgue (bottom, inside added rectangle) and the furnace room (top).

See section enlargement in Figure 20a. (Source: RGVA, 502-2-146, p. 21)

Evidence of this swing door existing unmodified inside Crematorium I before, during, and after homicidal gassings are said to have occurred there is additional strong evidence against the museum’s current homicidal-gas-chamber claims.

It is conceivable that what we see in those blueprints actually consists not of *one* swing door but of two doors, one opening into the morgue, the other into the furnace room. Although possible and well-suited for thermal insulation, such a layout would be cumbersome to deal with for moving corpses to and fro. What matters in the present context, however, is that a door opening *into* the morgue could not have been opened up if hundreds of corpses had piled up in the morgue after a claimed gassing, because when suffocating, people tend to congregate near doors, hence they pile up and die in front of them. So either way, that door design as shown on the blueprints was no good for a homicidal gas chamber.



Figure 20a: Section enlargement of Figure 20.

While these blueprints prove that they do not reflect any outfitting of the morgue for homicidal purposes, it can be argued that such deception was in fact intentional, meaning that the floor plans were simply not updated in this

regard, in particular regarding the swing door, in order to conceal the criminal changes made. Maintaining this argument becomes close to impossible, however, if we consider the other door in that room.

The Door between Morgue and Washroom

What remains to be discussed is the door which separated the former washroom from the morgue/“gas chamber”. Since that wall was removed in 1947 during “reconstruction,” all we have is again war-time blueprints.

In a long 1998 article, German architect Willy Wallwey, writing under the pen names of Hans Jürgen Nowak and Werner Rademacher, summarized what the extant documentation accessible in various Moscow archives reveals about gas-tight doors offered to, delivered to and installed in the various buildings at Auschwitz. Wallwey concluded that the Auschwitz camp authorities did indeed request cost estimates for sturdy, gas-tight, and probably also panic-proof steel doors, but they were never delivered. These doors even had so-called wedge locks used to close them in an air-tight fashion, a closing mechanism that could be called “screwing” the doors shut as described by witnesses, see Figures 21f.¹⁰

The two existing air-raid-shelter doors made for Krematorium I in 1944 during the building’s conversion to an air-raid shelter are made




Figure 21: Gas-tight steel door, type “air-raid shelter”, offered to the Auschwitz Camp, but never delivered.




Figure 22: One of the eight wedge locks of a gas-tight steel door, type “air-raid shelter”, offered to the Auschwitz Camp, but never delivered. The wedging of these levers into the lock position could rightly be called “screwed shut”.

¹⁰ RGVA 502-1-354-8; July 9, 1942; see Rudolf 2019, p. 326.

of wooden planks covered by thin sheet metal, see Figure 23. Although these doors were probably built by the local inmate workshop, so far no documentation about them has been found. This proves that not everything that was constructed at the Auschwitz Camp left a trace in the documental record, or if it did, it didn't survive. Hence, it is conceivable that sturdy gas-tight doors similar to those shown in Figures 21f. were in fact delivered to Auschwitz and were subsequently installed there without leaving a documental trace.

While it cannot be ruled out categorically that panic-proof, gas-tight steel doors were indeed delivered to Auschwitz and may have been installed elsewhere, it can be ruled out, based on war-time floor plans, that any such door could have been installed in the relevant door openings of the morgue of Krematorium I.

First, we need to be aware that the frame of a massive wooden or even a steel door designed to withstand a panicking crowd needs to be anchored firmly in the wall. Figure 24 shows a hoop steel anchor with a so-called dovetail going some 14 cm (5.5 inches) into the wall.¹⁰ Needless to say, the wall itself had to be considerably thicker than 14 cm in order to firmly accommodate such an anchor.

Turning to the war-time floor plans of this morgue, we see that the wall separating the morgue from the adjacent washroom and the wall separating the morgue from the furnace room were both very thin: 15 cm, which is the width of a standard brick plus some plaster on both sides of it



Figure 23: Makeshift air-raid-shelter door of Krematorium I made of wood with a thin sheet-metal cover, probably built by inmates in the camp's workshop.




Figure 24: Blueprint of the wall anchor for a frame of a sturdy, gas-tight steel door.

(see Figure 25). Hence, these walls consisted only of one row of bricks set lengthwise. The wall separating the morgue from the furnace room consisted of two such walls with a gap of some 30 cm in between (for thermal insulation).¹¹

It is not possible to set a steel anchor into bricks. In such a case, bricks have to be removed, and then the anchor placed into a block of cement/concrete. However, since these walls consisted only of one row of bricks – unless they consisted only of a wooden framework of 2-by-5s plus some boards, in which case we need no longer discuss this issue – removing a brick to place an anchor embedded in cement in its stead would have left this chunk of cement held in place by nothing more than the bricks on top and at the bottom of it. Such a chunk would have become loose very quickly. Any forceful shaking of the

door would have dislodged those anchors, bent the frame, and made the frame including the door fall out of the wall sooner or later.

In other words, the meager thickness of these walls proves that no sturdy, panic-proof door of any kind could have been installed in them.

The only option left for the traditionalists is to claim that these walls were reinforced to a much thicker width at the very moment the morgue is said to have been converted into a homicidal gas chamber, meaning in September 1941. Yet evidence for this exists neither in the documental record nor in witness testimonies known to me.

As the late Dr. Robert Faurisson put it aptly:

“No doors, no destruction.”





Figure 25: Section enlargement of the inventory plan of Krematorium I from Figure 20, showing the washroom with adjacent walls with grey circles added to highlight the walls' width of 15 cm.

¹¹ This reveals a flaw in the 3-D drawings shown in Illustrations 4f. depicting the internal walls prior to the conversions to an air-raid shelter. These walls were much thinner than depicted in these drawings.



Letter by Dr. Igor Bartosik, head of the Auschwitz Museum's Research Center, confirming the lack of any documentation about the condition of Crematorium I at war's end and any subsequent alterations.

Part Two:

How the

Auschwitz Museum

Lies about Documents

in Its Archives

Introduction

In 2014 the Auschwitz Museum published a bilingual (Polish and English)¹² book edited by Igor Bartosik, Łukasz Martyniak and Piotr Setkiewicz titled *The Beginnings of the Extermination of Jews in KL Auschwitz in the Light of the Source Materials*. I subsequently give the page numbers in parentheses.

Right at the beginning of the book, in its introduction, it contains a clumsy attempt at disinformation:

“For many years, the beginning of the extermination of Jews in the gas chambers has been one of the least-researched issues in the extensive literature on the history of KL Auschwitz. Numerous monumental works by historians devote only a few pages to the question.” (p. 23)

A footnote refers to:

“Franciszek Piper, The Bunkers – Temporary Gas Chambers in Auschwitz 1940-1945 (Oświęcim, 2000), vol. III, pp. 134-143; Jean-Claude Pressac, Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers (New York, 1989), pp. 161-182; Robert Jan van Pelt, The Case for Auschwitz (Bloomington, 2002), pp. 72, 180.”

The authors can only speak for themselves and for other orthodox historians. As they know well but prefer to hush up, I have written three studies on this topic of together almost 600 pages:

- *Auschwitz: la prima gasazione*. Edizioni di Ar, Padua, 1992; most recent English translation: *Auschwitz: The First Gassing. Rumor and Reality*. 3rd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield, 2016, 190 pp., 15 documents and 33 photographs;
- *Auschwitz: Crematorium I and the Alleged Homicidal Gassing*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005, 138 pages, 35 documents; 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield, 2016;
- *Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz: Black Propaganda versus History*. Most recent edition: Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016, 264 pp., 26+7 documents and 21 photographs.

The authors explain this lack of attention by orthodox Holocaust historiography mainly by “the lack of source materials, basically limited to collections of accounts, memoirs, and testimony delivered during the trials of Nazi criminals following the end of the war.” But that changed, as they explain:

“Only at the beginning of the 1990s, with the declassification of the records of the SS Central Construction Board that had been held until then in

¹² In the present study I rely on the English text, but in case of necessity fall back on the Polish version.

Moscow, did it become possible to access German documentation making it possible to fill in to a considerable degree the historical knowledge about the functioning of the first gas chambers in Auschwitz.” (p. 23)

All this documentation has finally been cataloged and studied by historians of the Auschwitz Museum:

“As a result of extensive searches conducted in both the Zentralbauleitung collection and the other archival resources, a range of interesting and previously unknown documents has been identified.” (p. 24)

This implied claim of historical discovery is disingenuous, since of the 74 documents published by them, I had already published nine, Pressac had published three, and another 19 had previously been mentioned and discussed by me.

The authors have divided these documents into six sections (p. 24):

1. “the history of the gas chambers at crematorium I in the Auschwitz I camp”: Documents 1-7. The title of this chapter is “The crematorium and gas chamber in the Auschwitz I Main Camp” (p. 41).
2. “the functioning of the provisional gas chambers in Birkenau, known as bunkers I and II (‘The Little Red House’ and ‘Little White House’)”: Documents 8-20. Chapter title: “Provisional gas chamber bunkers I and II in Birkenau” (p. 63).
3. “the wooden barracks used as undressing rooms for the people murdered in bunkers I and II”: Documents 21-42. Chapter title: “The barracks for undressing at bunkers I and II” (p. 103).
4. “the history of the unloading ramp where Jews deported to Auschwitz underwent selection”: Documents 43-51. Chapter title: “The railroad ramp (Alte Judenrampe)” (p. 173).
5. “the establishment of the Sonderkommando and its first year of existence”: Documents 52-58. Chapter title: “The Sonderkommando” (p. 199).
6. “the mass murders, known as ‘special operations,’ carried out in the camp”: Documents 59-74. Chapter title: “Sonderaktionen (Special operations)” (p. 215).

Excluding the nine documents on the “*Judenrampe*,” which are insignificant for the Holocaust, 31 of the 65 documents, almost half of them, are not new at all.

I will defer a detailed examination of the authors’ “Introduction” to Part Two of this present study, because only after a critical analysis of the documents cited in their book will the reader be able to full understand my critical examination of the authors’ allegations.

Note on references to Documents

When referring to documents reproduced in the Appendix to this present study, the word DOCUMENT is set in SMALL CAPS. In all other cases, where another authors' documents are referred to, they are set in plain text.

Chapter One: The Documents – Critical Comments

I. Section “The Crematorium and Gas Chamber in the Auschwitz I Main Camp”

[1] Document 1 (p. 43)

This is a letter by the head of the Main Office Budget and Construction (*Der Chef des Hauptamtes Haushalt und Bauten*) of 4 June 1940, with the subject “Camp Occupancy” (“*Belegstärke*”), addressed to the SS New Construction Office (SS-*Neubauleitung*) Auschwitz. The text merely states:

“According to a communication by SS-Oberführer Glücks of June 1, [19]40, the Auschwitz camp is to be expanded in such a way that it will later be able to accommodate 30,000 inmates and a guard detail of 6 companies.” (p. 43)

The authors comment on this as follows:

“This document thus attests that even in mid-1940 plans for the significant expansion of KL Auschwitz were in existence. This would make the planned camp the largest one in the Third Reich, capable of holding more prisoners than all the concentration camps then in existence combined.” (p. 42)

In the context of the examined section, this documents is absolutely irrelevant, for it refers neither to a crematorium nor to an alleged “gas chamber” at the Auschwitz Camp. It would have made more sense to refer here to other documents, like for instance to the budget for the Auschwitz Camp as drafted by SS-*Obersturmführer* Fritz August Seidler on 30 April 1940, which provides for the construction of a new crematorium (“*Neubau Krematorium*”) at a cost of 15,000 RM.¹³

The authors also ignore that the “Report of Office II – Constructions of the Main Office Budget and Construction for 1941” (“*Bericht des Amtes II – Bauten des Hauptamtes Haushalt und Bauten im Jahre 1941*”) provided for the construction of a camp at Lublin and another one at Auschwitz for 150,000 prisoners of war,¹⁴ which means that no particular priority or importance can be attributed to the latter.

[2] Document 2 (p. 45)

This is an “Activity Report” (“*Tätigkeitsbericht*”) of June 20, 1940, for the period of June 14-20.

¹³ “Kostenaufstellung für das Lager Auschwitz bei Kattowitz.” RGVA, 502-1-176, p. 37. See Matogno/Deana, vol. I, p. 212.

¹⁴ RGVA, 502-1-13, p. 4.

The authors highlight the final lines of the document:

“The situation maps were compiled for the projected SS barracks building, and the implementation of the development for the new state of construction was commenced. The preliminary drafts for a new crematorium building were developed and finalized.” (p. 45)

The authors briefly summarize this passage and add that this crematorium made

“[...] Auschwitz the first German concentration camp in which – surely because a high future death rate was envisioned – a stationary installation for burning the bodies of prisoners was planned from the moment of its founding.” (p. 44)

This is a simple insinuation denying the fact that, as early as 18 June 1938, and with respect to the *Buchenwald* concentration camp, a request for an “emergency crematorium” (*Notkrematorium*) was presented to SS-Gruppenführer Theodor Eicke, who at that time was the head of the SS-Totenkopfverbände (Death’s Head Units) and of the German concentration camps. On 21 December 1939, the Topf & Söhne company of Erfurt, Germany, which had been approached by the SS authorities in this regard, submitted a cost estimate for “1 Topf incineration furnace, oil- or coke-fired, with double muffle and compressed air unit, as well as a draft enhancing unit” (*“1 öl- oder koks-beheizter Topf-Einäscherungs-Ofen mit Doppelmuffel und Druckluft-Anlage, sowie Zugverstärkungs-Anlage”*), drawing D 56570 “double-muffle cremation furnace with oil-firing” (*Doppelmuffel-Einäscherungssofen mit Ölfuerung*) and an undated drawing with the headline “Crematorium of the Bu. CC” (*“Krematorium des K.L. Bu.”*) featuring the blueprint of that crematorium.¹⁵

The comment of the authors is clearly specious, because during the period when the crematorium was requested, the *Buchenwald* camp had merely 7,958 detainees (7 August 1938; *Kommunistische...*, p. 30).

The “Description of the structure of the new emergency crematorium building in the camp for detainees of *Buchenwald* concentration camp,” written on 10 January 1940 by the New Construction Office at *Buchenwald*, states in this respect (NO-4401; cf. Mattogno/Deana, p. 208):

“On account of the high mortality at the Buchenwald concentration camp, the need has arisen for the construction of an emergency crematorium with a furnace (double-muffle furnace) heated by oil.”

If the SS provided a crematorium for a concentration camp containing less than 8,000 detainees, how can we be surprised that they had contemplated one for a camp designed for 30,000 inmates? The authors’ reference to “a high future death rate” at *Auschwitz* is thus at least malicious. It is obvious that the

¹⁵ Cf. Mattogno/Deana, vol. I, pp. 208-212, vol. II, Documents 171-174, pp. 275-284.

SS's decision to build a crematorium at Auschwitz was based on their own experience at the Buchenwald camp.

This document therefore does not represent anything new. As for me, I mentioned this in my study of the Auschwitz cremation furnaces as follows:¹⁶

"Instead of erecting a new building, however, the equipment was eventually installed in a bunker of the former Polish artillery barracks which constituted the nucleus of the new concentration camp. The plans for the crematorium were drawn up in the week of 14 to 20 June [1940]."

[3] Document 3 (pp. 47f.)

This is another Activity Report, dated 19 July 1941 for the period of 14-19 July, as the headline of this document states on its first page, which the authors omitted ("*Tätigkeitsbericht vom 14. bis 19.7.1941*").¹⁷ Paragraph IV on page III, headlined "Planning" ("*Planung*"), states:

"SS-O[ber]scha[rführer]. Maier of Office II Berlin delivers preliminary drafts for the headquarters building. Revising of the draft for a delousing facility with hydrogen cyanide system. Discussion with Camp Commander, Head of Administration, First Leader of Protective Custody Camp and Head of the Pol[iti]cal Dept. concerning space requirement of the project."

This absolutely innocuous document is interpreted by the authors as follows:

"The point 'IV – Planning' notes a visit by SS-Oberscharführer Maier, a representative of Department II of the SS-WVHA. He took part in a meeting during which plans for a disinfection installation using Zyklon B (Blausäure – System) were discussed. The highly unusual presence of the head of the Politische Abteilung, Maksymilian [recte: Maximilian] Grabner, at a meeting on construction work is noteworthy. Two months later, Lagerführer Karl Fritzsche—present at the July meeting—made the decision to use Zyklon B to murder several hundred Soviet POWs and sick prisoners in the cellars of block 11. It seems certain [przyjąć zapewne należy = must certainly assume] that he did so after conferring with Grabner, at a time when commandant Höss was absent.

The use of Zyklon B in Auschwitz for sanitary purposes made it possible to train a group of SS disinfectors who, having acquired this experience, could next be assigned to operate the gas chambers." (p. 46)

This comment is a masterpiece of disinformation and hypocrisy; it aims in a childish manner at creating a predicate offense in order to somehow substantiate the mythical "first gassing" in the basement of Block 11 at the Auschwitz

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 212, with the archival reference to the activity report (*Tätigkeitsbericht*) dated 20 June 1940, for the period of 14-20 June. RGVA, 502-1-214, p. 102.

¹⁷ RGVA, 502-1-214, p. 22.

Main Camp. The attempt, however, is rather clumsy: first the authors arbitrarily assign an exceptional character to Grabner's presence at a meeting which he was fully entitled to attend as set out in the document itself; then they presuppose the historical reality of the "first gassing," in support of which they do not, of course, submit any "new document"; finally, they establish a fictitious connection between these two assumed events, insinuating that Fritzsche had consulted with Grabner prior to this "gassing." The comment implies that Grabner insinuated himself into a matter which was none of his business – a disinfection facility using hydrogen cyanide – allegedly due to malicious homicidal intentions; next Grabner is said to have suggested to Fritzsche to use hydrogen cyanide in order to kill Soviet prisoners of war and detainees, an advice which Fritzsche allegedly implemented. This way they invent a "documentary confirmation" of the "first gassing," the one being as inconsistent as the other!

The specious character of the documentary reference cited by the authors is even more evident when considering that, in the same series of reports, the disinfection of buildings is mentioned twice prior to 19 July 1941, once even in the report of 12 July 1941, which immediately predates the one discussed above:

*"Building No. 54 meant to accommodate the guard detail was gassed against vermin and diseases."*¹⁸

*"Completion of mounting sinks and toilets in Block 14; further work was impossible, as [the building was] completely occupied due to gassing of Block 16."*¹⁹

That the SS disinfectors, who had attended special training course on the use of Zyklon B, were later deployed to carry out the alleged homicidal gasings, is yet another fable invented by the authors.

[4] Document 4 (p. 51).

This is a list dated 1 December 1941 bearing the title "Consumables. Deliveries during November 1941. – from 1 Nov. to 30 Nov." (*"Verbrauchsmittel. Eingang im Monat November 1941. - vom 1.11.-30.11."*). Among others, it also contains the following entry: "3000 (kg) of Zyklon (hydrogen cyanide) railroad car Munich 19931 – Dessau" (*"3000 (kg) Zyklon (Blausäure) Wagg. Münch. 19931 - Dessau"*; p. 51). This is the authors' explanation:

"The document notes the delivery to the camp of three tons of Zyklon B from Dessau. Lists of this kind for 1941 are only partially extant; this document is the first one recording the delivery of Zyklon B to the camp. It is

¹⁸ *Tätigkeitsbericht* of 12 July 1940. RGVA, 502-1-214, p. 97.

¹⁹ *Tätigkeitsbericht* of 12 July 1941. RGVA, 502-1-214, p. 25.

evident that, because Zyklon B was used in September of that year to murder Soviet POWs, there must also have been earlier deliveries.” (p. 50)

It is a complete mystery what relationship this document has with the crematorium and the alleged “gas chamber” of the Auschwitz Main Camp. Instead, the authors’ malicious intent is blatantly clear: they try to consolidate a purely imaginary event by conflating it with a real but chronologically unrelated fact. Their convoluted reasoning is that, since 3,000 kg of Zyklon B were supplied on 1 December 1941, there must also have been earlier deliveries, because Zyklon B was used in September 1941 for the “first gassing,” hence this document “confirms” that imaginary event! This is a puerile sophism. What can be said – even though it is tautological but at least serious – is that there must have been earlier supplies of Zyklon B, because at least the two above-mentioned documented disinfestation gassings were carried out in that camp prior to December 1941.

[5] Document 5 (p. 53)

This is a work report (*Arbeitskarte*) of the inmate locksmith shop (*Häftlings-Schlosserei*) for the crematorium at Auschwitz dated 25 September 1941 with the subject of manufacturing four airtight flaps (*Luftdichte-Klappen*). The authors comment on this document as follows:

“In the autumn of 1941, the camp authorities began killing prisoners with Zyklon B gas. After the murder of a group of Soviet POWs and sick prisoners in the basement of block 11 in early September 1941, the room in the crematorium I building that had previously served as a morgue was designated as a gas chamber. In order to seal the space to the extent required, airtight doors were installed and openings were made in the ceiling for the introduction (pouring in) of Zyklon B; these openings were sealed off by the flaps mentioned in the document.” (p. 52)

Here they completely change the meaning of the document. For starters, the adjective “*luftdicht*,” meaning “airtight” and properly translated as such in the English text, was changed to “*hermetyczny*” (hermetical) in the Polish text, which is a generic term which can apply both to a possible “gas chamber” and to a ventilation system, while the proper term for a gas chamber (or gas shelter, for that matter) would be “*gasdicht*” (gas-tight).

The historical and documentary context of this document points to a ventilation system for the crematorium’s morgue. The document in question is neither new nor unpublished, because I reproduced it in 2005 along with its reverse side, which the authors’ did not reproduce (Mattogno 2005a, pp. 120f.), and I thoroughly discussed its meaning and context (*ibid.*, pp. 19-21), which I will reiterate here.

On June 7, 1941, SS-Untersturmführer Maximilian Grabner, head of the Auschwitz Political Department, wrote the following letter to the SS-Neubau-leitung:²⁰

“It is absolutely necessary to install a separate ventilation in the morgue of the crematorium. The existing ventilation has been rendered useless by the installation of the second furnace. When the second furnace is in use – and that is now the case almost daily – the ventilation flap to the morgue has to be closed because warm air otherwise enters the morgue, causing the exact opposite of a ventilation.

The deficiencies of the ventilation and of the fresh air feed are particularly noticeable under the prevailing conditions of warm weather. It is hardly possible to spend any time in the morgue, even if such instances are generally of short duration.

A proper ventilation will surely lead to an improvement in the quality of the air and to a reduction of the humidity of the room. It would also do away with the presence of flies in the morgue or at least reduce this nuisance to a minimum. The elimination of such deficiencies is in the general interest, not least because it would put a stop to the spread of disease by the flies.

It is therefore requested that two ventilators be installed in the morgue, one for intake and one for exhaust. A separate duct leading to the chimney must be provided for the exhaust. It is requested that the work be started as soon as possible.”

Between the end of September and the middle of October 1941, ventilation work, which certainly stemmed from Grabner’s complaints, was carried out in the crematorium. A “work report” of the inmate locksmith shop dated September 25, 1941, mentions the following order: “Make 4 air-tight flaps.” The work was done the same day by the detainees Zalewski (8363), Morgiel (7686), and Dudziński (16197), blacksmiths, and Bialas (1461), welder, in a total of 11 man-hours. As is noted on the back of the sheet, the 4 flaps were done in black plate (*Schwarzblech*).²¹

Another work report of the inmate locksmith shop for the crematorium, dated 7 October 1941,²² refers to “fabrication of 2 ventilation caps in steel plate with an internal space of 27×27 cm, otherwise according to instructions.” The work was done by the detainee welder Bialas and the detainee plumbers Maliszewski (9612) and Dyntar (1409) in a total of 50 man-hours between 7

²⁰ RGVA, 502-1-312, p. 111.

²¹ “4 St. Luftdichte-Klappen anfertigen,” RGVA, 502-2-1, pp. 74-74a.

²² The date refers to the receipt of the order.

and 13 October 1941. For the fabrication of these devices, 4 square meters of black plate were used.²³

The “airtight flaps” were the air-tight closures which served to block off the ducts of a room from the system of ventilation. The “ventilation caps” were probably vertical tubes with caps to block off (or keep rain out of) vent stacks such as those (in brickwork) which were erected on the roof of the crematorium above the two furnaces for the ventilation of the furnace room.

The “Inventory map of building No. 47a, BW²⁴ 11. Crematorium,” drawn on 10 April 1942 by detainee 20033 (the Polish engineer Stefan Swiszcowski), shows in its view of the chimney on the flat roof, to the left, a fat angled tube, which probably housed an intake fan (*Belüftung*).²⁵ It could not have been an exhaust fan (*Entlüftung*), or a duct for exhaust air for two reasons: first of all, for the evacuation of the waste air from the morgue Topf had proposed a chimney 10 meters high, whereas the SS-*Neubauleitung*, for reasons of economy, had opted for the use of the existing chimney. Both Topf and SS-*Neubauleitung* were in agreement that the air removed from an ordinary morgue would have to be discharged at least 10 meters above ground. In that case, how could SS-*Neubauleitung* have decided to discharge not only the waste air from the morgue but even the lethal exhaust from the alleged homicidal gas chamber through a duct no more than 5 feet high?²⁶

Secondly, blowing out the waste air through the duct in question would have necessitated opening one or both doors of the morgue – not a good solution hygienically for an ordinary morgue, and highly hazardous for a homicidal gas chamber.

Hence, if an intake fan had been housed in that duct, the ventilation of the morgue could only have been of the type requested by Grabner. The ventilation system of the morgue was connected, through a metal duct, to the air conduit that passed under the floor of the furnace room and went to the chimney. Upstream of the juncture with the chimney there was an exhaust fan.

Such an arrangement, however, could only have functioned up to the beginning of July 1942, when the old chimney of the crematorium was demolished. No air conduit was, in fact, attached to the new chimney, as is evident from the corresponding design drawing done by the Köhler company on 11 August 1942 regarding a “Smoke flue for the Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz, O.S.”²⁷

²³ “Anfertigen von 2 Stück Entlüftungshütten aus Eisenblech 27/27 cm i. L. sonst nach Angabe,” RGVA, 502-2-1, pp. 75-75a.

²⁴ *Bauwerk* – building or construction site with multiple buildings of the same type; the term designated also administrative acts.

²⁵ “Bestandsplan des Gebäudes Nr. 47a. B.W. 11. Krematorium,” RGVA, 502-2-146, p. 21.

²⁶ This was Jean-Claude Pressac’s hypothesis.

²⁷ “Rauchkanal für die Zentralbauleitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz O.S.,” RGVA, 502-2-23, p. 18.

The authors avoid any reference to the work report of 7 October 1941, apparently because it refers very explicitly to a ventilation system, which would have compromised their bogus interpretation of the work report of 25 September in terms of those flaps being destined to equip a homicidal gas chamber.

[6] Document 6 (pp. 55f.)

This is an “Activity Report for the month of May 1942” (*“Tätigkeitsbericht für den Monat Mai 1942”*) written by *Sturmmann* Heinz Lubitz on 30 May 1942, which I mentioned in my study of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office (1998, p. 40; 2005d, p. 34) and in more detail in my study of the Auschwitz cremation furnaces. Paragraph 13 on page 2 says:

“Crematorium. Removal of the old cobbled pavement. Erecting a concrete fence in front of the entrance with 2 entry gates. Redoing the new driveway with cobblestones. Transport of material. Removal of soil.” (p. 56)

The authors’ comment reveals an extremely far-fetched logic:

“Deportees undressed in the yard thus formed before entering the gas chamber.” (p. 54)

There exists quite obviously not the slightest documentary connection between these activities and the alleged “gas chamber” of Crematorium I. This is therefore a crude attempt to indirectly substantiate this “gas chamber” with a document which is absolutely meaningless in the context of the orthodox Holocaust narrative.

As I mentioned above, the document in question does not represent anything new. In 2012 I summed up this document as follows (2012, Vol. I, p. 265; Mattogno/Deana 2015, Vol. 1, p. 221):

“During the latter half of May, work on the exterior was carried out: the yard in front of the crematorium was fenced in and provided with two wooden gates, the old pavement was replaced.”

In Footnote 173 (208 of the English edition) I gave as sources:

“Zentralbauleitung, Auftrag Nr. 436, Arbeitskarte Nr. 20 for Tischlerei dated 13 May 1942: manufacture of two entrance gates (Einfahrtstoren) 4 × 3.20 m, work done between 21 and 25 May. RGVA, 502-2-1, p. 24. Description of the job: Tätigkeitsbericht für den Monat Mai 1942, RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 299, and Baubericht für Monat Mai 1942, RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 261.”

The authors do not mention the other two documents adduced by me.

[7] Document 7 (pp. 59-61)

This is a “List of structures under construction with extent of completion.” On p. 3 under no. 28, we find the following text: “Construction of a gas-tight treatment room in the former crema. for the garrison physician.”

The authors explain that this refers to the “conversion²⁸ of an existing gas-tight room in the former crematorium I [*eines gasdichten Behandlungsraumes im früheren Krema*] for use by the garrison physician.” They then add that the “furnaces in the crematorium were dismantled in 1944; the room used as a gas chamber was to be adapted as an air-raid shelter for the nearby SS hospital.” (p. 58).

This interpretation completely distorts the significance of this document, which has been known for many years and which I already mentioned in my 2005 study on the “gas chamber” in Crematorium I. Since this book appeared in both English and German, I reiterate the text of Chapter II.2. headed “The Transformation of Crematorium I into an Air-Raid Shelter” (2005a, pp. 22-24).

On 16 November 1943, the commander of the Auschwitz Camp, SS-*Obersturmbannführer* Liebehenschel, issued the following order regarding “Air-raid measures at Garrison Auschwitz”:²⁹

“Upon advice of the competent superior authorities, the necessary air-raid protection measures will now also be undertaken in the Auschwitz garrison area with immediate effect. In my capacity as local air-raid-protection officer I have appointed SS-Untersturmführer Josten to be my permanent representative. I request all services to support SS-Untersturmführer Josten in every possible way.”

The order became effective as of 1 January 1944.³⁰ According to the usual practice, a construction site was defined for this purpose: *BW* 98, “air-raid shelter trench,” into which all such shelters planned or eventually built at Auschwitz were integrated. They became sections of *BW* 98 and carried the same designation, with an added letter. For example, the air-raid shelter of the camp commander’s residence became *BW* 98J. The old crematorium at Auschwitz also became part of this system of air-raid-protection measures.

On 16 July 1944, during his visit to Auschwitz, SS-*Obergruppenführer* Pohl approved the “Installation of a gas-proof operating room and shrapnel-proof shelter in the former crematorium for the garrison surgeon,” which became *BW* 98M.³¹

On 26 August 1944, Josten, who had meanwhile been promoted to SS-*Obersturmführer* and appointed “head of air-raid protection” (*Luftschutzlei-*

²⁸ The Polish text has here “*przebudowie*”, restructuring.

²⁹ *Standortbefehl* [garrison order] no. 51/43 of 16 November 1943. GARF, 7021-108-32, p. 73.

³⁰ Letter of the camp commander SS-*Obersturmbannführer* Liebehenschel in his function of “*Der SS-Standortälteste als örtlicher Luftschutzleiter*” (senior garrison officer as local air-raid protection chief) to Zentralbauleitung of February 17, 1944. RGVA, 502-1-401, p. 100.

³¹ Letter from SS-*Sturmbannführer* Bischoff, Leiter der Bauinspektion der Waffen-SS und Polizei “Schlesien,” to Zentralbauleitung of October 17, 1944. RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 124.

ter”) wrote a letter to the camp commander on “conversion of the old crematorium for air-raid-protection purposes,” which reads as follows:³²

“In the attachment I submit a project for the conversion of the old crematorium for air-raid protection purposes with the request for approval of this transformation.

1. Work scheduled:

Dismantling of the old muffle furnaces, including recovery and cleaning of the corresponding bricks.

Filling in of heating shafts and conduits with the rubble and waste resulting from the dismantling of the muffle furnaces.

Installation of gas protection doors, window shutters, and windows, creation of wall openings and ducts needed for heating furnaces, aeration and ventilation,

plumbing and drainage work,

re-arrangement of existing electrical wiring in accordance with floor plan,

improvement of floors and partial installation of wooden floor,

improvement of roof and coating of same with bitumen.

2. Materials needed:

500 kg of cement

400 kg of bricks

20 kg of steel rods

50 m of railway rails

24 pcs. timber, 4.80 m long, 10/15 cm

10 pcs. timber, 3.90 m long, 10/15 cm

102 sqm boards, 25 mm

13 pcs. windows, one-sided, 60 x 80 cm

2 pcs. doors, one-sided, 70 x 200 cm

16 pcs. window shutters, gas-tight and shrapnel-proof

7 pcs. doors, gas-tight and shrapnel-proof”

On 17 October SS-*Sturmbannführer* Bischoff³³ wrote a letter to the Central Construction Office regarding the start of work, which “due to urgency,” could begin immediately without the usual bureaucratic formalities.³¹ The work had, however, already started. A document dated 4 September mentions

³² RGVA, 502-1-401, p. 34.

³³ On 1 October 1941 Bischoff, at that time SS-*Hauptsturmführer*, replaced SS-*Oberscharführer* August Schlachter as head of the Auschwitz *Bauleitung*, whose name was changed to *Zentralbauleitung* on 4 November 1941. On 1 October 1943 Bischoff, who was replaced by SS-*Obersturmführer* Werner Jothann, became head of the Construction Inspectorate of the Waffen-SS and Police “Silesia” (*Leiter Bauinspektion der Waffen-SS und Polizei “Schlesien”*).

“Construction of a gas-tight treatment room in the former crema. for the garrison physician,” 5 percent of which had been completed.³⁴

On November 2, 1944, Jothann drew up an “explanatory report for conversion of the old crematorium into an air-raid shelter for the SS sickbay with an operating room in Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S. BW 98M,” in which he described the work to be done:³⁵

“Conversion of the existing and available rooms of the old crematorium into an air-raid shelter for the SS sickbay with an operating room. The existing central walls and some partitions will be reinforced to 38 cm. Any other necessary partitions will be built. An emergency operating room, two gas-locks, two flushing toilets^[36] and a water faucet in the operating room are to be installed because a water supply line is available and the sewage line can be extended. Heating will be by furnaces.”

Regarding the time schedule, Jothann adds:

“On account of its urgency, work has already started and will be completed within three weeks.”

On the same day, Jothann also drew up a cost estimate³⁷ for a total amount of 4,300 RM, and a location sketch for the air-raid shelter project.³⁸ The work was completed in the second half of November.

This, my account of 2005, shows that the authors’ statement about the “conversion of an existing gas-tight room in the former crematorium I” is unfounded. In fact, it is openly contradicted by Josten’s letter of 26 August 1944, which, among the work to be performed, explicitly mentions “Installation of gas-protection doors,” which therefore had not existed before in what the authors claim to have been a “gas chamber.” In addition, it was also necessary to create “wall openings” not just for the pipes of the heating stoves, but also for “aeration and ventilation.” From this it can be deduced that the four phantom openings in the room’s ceiling said to have been utilized for pouring in Zyklon B did not exist back then either, because had they existed, they would have been used for this purpose, and new holes would have been unnecessary.

The authors’ fallacious interpretation is therefore just another foolish attempt to corroborate with a real document a fictional story.

³⁴ “Aufstellung der im Bau befindlichen Bauwerke mit Fertigstellungsgrad” (register of building works under construction with extent of completion), drawn up by SS-Obersturmführer Jothann on September 4, 1944. RGVA, 502-1-85, p. 2.

³⁵ RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 125.

³⁶ These toilets were initially planned as “Trockenklosett” (chemical toilets). The drain pipes of these toilets can still be seen in the morgue today.

³⁷ “Kostenüberschlag zum Ausbau des alten Krematoriums als Luftschutzbunker für SS-Revier mit einem Operationsraum im K.L. Auschwitz O/S. BW 98M,” RGVA, 502-2-147, pp. 126-126a.

³⁸ “Lageskizze für den Ausbau eines Luftschutzbunkers für SS Revier,” RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 122.

II. Section “Provisional Gas Chamber Bunkers I and II in Birkenau”

[8] Document 8 (p. 65)

This is a report on work carried out at the PoW camp (*K.G.L.*), that is, Birkenau,³⁹ by the company Schlesische Industriebau Lenz & Co. Aktiengesellschaft, dated from 8 July 1942, which exists in two versions: a printed form filled in by hand, and a completely handwritten sheet. The authors observe in this regard:

“Among the items listed in the document is an entry about ‘the installation of doors at the second gas chamber’ (Türen in 2 Gaskammer).

The work involved the adaptation as a gas chamber of one of the houses remaining from the former village of Brzezinka (the so-called bunker II ‘The Little White House’). ” (p. 64)

Here they commit a major blunder, provided it isn’t a devious sleight of hand. The proper transcript of the text reads in fact:

“1 Pg + 2 M[aurer] Einmauern der Tür in d.[er] Gaskammer”

“1 Pg^[40] + 2 M[asons] blocking in of the door in the gas chamber.”

The authors therefore turned the expression “in the” into “in 2”, and then they turned the number into the ordinal “second” (Polish *drugiej*, which can be abbreviated as “d.”). They inferred from this that the work was done in the “second” bunker, or “Bunker II”!

The fact that the word “*Tür*” is singular deals a serious blow to the authors’ fatuous interpretation. In a 1994 paper Franciszek Piper presented a plan of “*Bunker 2*”:⁴¹ a house measuring 8.34 m × 17.07 m containing four “gas chambers” sporting a total of four entry doors and the same number of exit doors, so that eight gas-tight doors would have been needed. But this document speaks only of one door to the gas chamber. How can this be reconciled with the alleged “Bunker 2”?

³⁹ *Kriegsgefangenenlager*, the official term for the Birkenau camp. The most commonly used abbreviation was KGL. The Auschwitz Main Camp was called *Konzentrationslager* (KL; concentration camp).

⁴⁰ The printed form lists ten types of workers, including mason (*Maurer*) mentioned in the passage under discussion; among the other nine, the only one starting with the letter “P” is “Polier” (construction foreman); “Pg” could mean “Poliergeselle” (*Geselle* = skilled craftsman without formal foreman degree = *Meistertitel*); this is by analogy with the names of “*Maurergesellen*” and “*Zimmergesellen*” (masons and carpenters) appearing on a *Tagelohnzettel* (day-wage sheet) of Josef Kluge related to construction contracts in Crematorium IV in February 1943. RGVA, 502-2-54, p. 71ff.

⁴¹ Piper 1994, p. 162. In Polish literature, beginning with D. Czech’s *Auschwitz Chronicle*, and specifically in the study by F. Piper just cited, the two “bunkers” are always numbered with the Arabic numerals 1 and 2. In the book under review, however, they are numbered using the Roman numerals I and II. I explain the reason for this in my comment on Document 20.

This document mentions a “gas chamber” in the “prisoner-of-war camp” at Birkenau, indeed, but it is also true that the only documented “gas chamber” in this camp at that time appears only as part of a project for a delousing facility (*Entlasungsanlage*), first drawn on Map No. 801 of 8 November 1941 (Pressac 1989, p. 55), but also on successive maps (*ibid.*, pp. 56f.). It is well known that in 1942 two mirror-symmetrical disinfestation facilities were being constructed at Birkenau. They bore the identifiers BW 5a and 5b (BW = *Bauwerk* = structure) and were called “delousing barracks” 1 and 2 in the documents (“*Entlausungsbaracke*”). The disinfestation facility BW 5b was completed on 15 July 1942.⁴² On June 9 the Central Construction Office commissioned the inmate joinery (*Tischlerei*) to manufacture, among other things, “4 gas-tight double doors 1.60 x 2.00” (4 *Gasdichte Doppeltüren 1,60/2,00*) which were indubitably meant to be used for the delousing gas chamber (*Gas-kammer*, two doors) and for the adjoining airlock (*Schleuse*, two doors). Work for that project started on 11 June and was finished on 28 June.⁴³ For this reason, the installation of one of the two doors in the gas chamber on 8 July is fully compatible with these documents.

The only problem is that the document in question mentions the installation of just one of the two doors. It is, however, far more likely that it refers to BW 5a than to the mysterious “Bunker 2,” whose existence is not supported by any document. Not to mention that the date of the document contrasts sharply with the date at which “Bunker 2” is said to have been put into operation: 30 June 1942 according to Danuta Czech in her *Auschwitz Chronicle* (Czech 1990, p. 189). The authors are therefore forced to move this date to a time after 8 July.

In another study, Setkiewicz has adduced a documentary “proof” which he was careful not to repeat here. I will give the reason for this shortly. Setkiewicz wrote (2011a, p. 14):

“The several documents attesting to the existence in Birkenau of not one but two ‘gassing rooms’ (‘Vergasungsräumen des K.G.L.’ in orders from August 6, 1942) date from not earlier than August and September 1942.”

He does not provide any reference, evidently in order to make it difficult to verify the source. This is actually another fatuous trick. It is in fact known that the “Explanatory Report on the preliminary draft for the new construction of the prisoners-of-war camp of the *Waffen-SS*, Auschwitz, Upper Silesia” of 30 October 1941 uses the term “gassing room” (“*Vergasungsraum*”) for the delousing chamber of the “delousing barrack”⁴⁴ – in the singular, although two such buildings were provided for the PoW camp, referred to as “BW 5a de-

⁴² *Baufristenplan* of July 1942 for the PoW camp. RGVA, 502-1-22, p. 31.

⁴³ *Arbeitskarte. Auftrag Nr. 1577* of 9 June 1942. RGVA, 502-1-328, p. 173.

⁴⁴ *Erläuterungsbericht zum Vorentwurf für den Neubau des Kriegsgefangenenlagers der Waffen-SS, Auschwitz O/S*. RGVA, 502-1-233, p. 16 (p. 4 of the report).

lousing barrack 1” and “BW 5b delousing barrack 2.”⁴⁵ It is therefore indeed obvious that two “gassing rooms” existed in the PoW camp. Since the document mentioned by Setkiewicz undoubtedly refers to these facilities, reproducing it in the book reviewed here would have undermined the authors’ agenda, hence he forsook this (pseudo) evidentiary pearl.

[9] Document 9 (p. 69)

This is a list of inmates assigned to construction work at the Birkenau Camp on 17 August 1942. Among the various entries is also this one: “Assigned from the camp – on 7:30 hrs. for special unit 475 inmates, 25 foremen.” The authors comment on this as follows (p. 68):

“Assigning such a large number of prisoners to work for the Sonderkommando was connected with the preparation of new burning pits in proximity to the extermination sites, mainly bunker I. At the same time, the exhumation of bodies from the mass graves and attempts to burn them on pyres were underway. This fact finds confirmation in accounts by the prisoners Arnost Rosin and Andre Balbin, who were employed at this task.”

This interpretation is based on the pious fiction, tacitly or expressly accepted by all historians of the Auschwitz Museum, that only one single kind of “*Sonderkommando*” existed at Auschwitz, that is, the one working at the crematoria and the “Bunkers.” I summarize here what I explained about this in another study (2001, pp. 138-141; 2004b, pp. 101-103), with the necessary additions and corrections.

Danuta Czech explains the origin and meaning of the term “*Sonderkommando*” (special unit) as follows (Czech 1994, p. 371):

“The extermination camp created also one other group of people, those who were forced to work in the crematoria and gas chambers – the unfortunate people were assigned to the work of the special unit. The SS used code words if they spoke about the mass extermination of those ‘unworthy of life.’ It called the mass extermination as well as the transports leading to selection ‘special treatment’ (often abbreviated as SB). Thus, also, the expression ‘special unit.’”

In other words, since criminal activity described by the code word “special treatment” was allegedly being conducted in the crematoria, the staff employed there had of necessity to be a “special unit.” Naturally it was the only work unit at Auschwitz that merited the prefix “special” – otherwise the word would have lost the criminal significance that it possessed according to orthodox Holocaust historiography.

Based on the documents, the reality is entirely different.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 14 (p. 2 of the report).

First of all, in relation to the crematoria, the term “*Sonderkommando*” appears in merely one single document (see my comments on Document 31). In the 5-volume work on the general history of the Auschwitz Camp written by the Museum’s historians, Franciszek Piper claims to demonstrate on the basis of two documents that the term in question was referring to the crematoria personnel (Piper 1999, note 360, p. 213). These documents are not mentioned in the book under review: the “Duty roster for Tuesday, 18 July 1944” (dated 17 July),⁴⁶ and Headquarters Order No. 8/43 of 20 April 1943.⁴⁷ The first of these two documents in fact refers to four names listed on the right: “Buch, Kelm, Schultz, Bickel.”⁴⁸ Based on the document in question, Piper considers them all “SS members directly employed at the gas chambers and crematoria” (Piper 1999, p. 261). He furthermore states that Buch, Kelm and Schulz are also mentioned as SS supervisors of the crematoria *Sonderkommando* by the witnesses Alter Feinsilber (alias Stanisław Jankowski) and Henryk Tauber (*ibid.*, pp. 261-263), although the first merely speaks of a “*Scharführer* Buch” and a certain “Kell” (Bezwińska *et al.* 1996, p. 45), while the other mentions a certain “Schultz” and “Köln.”⁴⁹

A *Scharführer* Buch, an *Unterscharführer* Kelm and an *Unterscharführer* Schultz appear without first names on an undated list containing a column of signatures acknowledging “receipt,” so this is probably a payroll list. The list does not give any indication what these individuals were paid for, *i.e.*, what their range of duty was.⁵⁰ Heinz Schulz, who according to Piper (whose source spells it “Schultz”) was *Kommandoführer* (detail leader) of the crematoria personnel, was identified during the Frankfurt Auschwitz trial as a certain Heinz Arthur Schulz, *Unterscharführer*, who was “leader of the labor detail for dismantlement works” (Fritz Bauer Institut *et al.* 2005, pp. 33519, 46036, 46043). Hermann Buch, who Piper claims to have been a *Kommandoführer* at the crematoria as well, was something entirely different according to the same work in which Piper makes that claim: Buch was actually “head of camp section BIIe,” the so-called “family camp for gypsies,” from its inception until April 1944. In the biographical note about him comprising eight lines, there is not a hint of his ever having occupied the position of a *Kommandoführer* at the crematoria, which is so important to orthodox historiography (Lasik 1999, p. 239).

⁴⁶ “Dienstplan für Dienstag, den 18.7.1944.” APMO, D-AuII-3/4. See DOCUMENT 1 in the Appendix.

⁴⁷ “Kommandanturbefehl Nr. 8/43” of 20 April 1943. APMO, D-AuI-4/20. Transcript of this document: Frei *et al.* 2000, pp. 249-254; the term is on p. 251.

⁴⁸ In the first edition of my study on *Special Treatment in Auschwitz I* had erroneously linked the term *Sonderkommando* to “Torkontrolle” (2004b, p. 101).

⁴⁹ Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 142.

⁵⁰ GARF, 7021-108-54, pp. 97f.

Another similar document exists, the “Duty roster for Thursday, 5 October 1944” from 4 October.⁵¹ The term “*Sonderkommando*” appears on it as well, but only with one name: “Buch.” In the second column of that same line we find the words “[river] Sola, Hütte” and next “Kelm.”⁵²

Since the personnel for the crematoria at that time was divided into eight *Kommandos*, 2 for each crematorium (one day and one night shift),⁵³ this required 8 *Kommandoführer* for every day. But the first document mentions only four SS noncoms, while the second has only one, so that the “*Sonderkommando*” which that person had to supervise cannot have had anything to do with the crematoria personnel.

In addition, Piper’s second document, the Headquarters Order of 20 April 1943, speaks simply of the “pursuit of two Jews who were on the run from the special unit.” Therefore, starting from the assumption that only *one single* “special unit” existed at Auschwitz consisting of the crematoria staff, the fact that this term appears in these two documents is said to prove that the crematoria personnel was called “special unit”! A classic example of circular reasoning!

However, in documents explicitly mentioning the crematorium staff, its designation is simply “staff of crematorium,”⁵⁴ or it is identified by number – “206-B boiler, Crematorium I and II, 207-B boiler, Crematorium II and IV.”⁵⁵

There existed moreover numerous other “special units” at Auschwitz, not a single one of which had anything whatsoever to do with the crematoria. For instance (see Mattogno 2004b, pp. 102f.):

- *Sonderkommando Schädlingbekämpfung*: pest control unit made up of women.
- *Sonderkommando Reinhardt*: women’s unit assigned to the sorting of clothing.
- *Sonderkommando Zeppelin*: external unit based in Breslau.
- *Bauhof-Sonderkommando (S.K.)*: unit working at the storage facility for construction materials.⁵⁶
- *Dwory-Sonderkommando (S.K.)*: unit working in Dwory – a village about 10 km east of the town of Auschwitz.
- *Buna-Sonderkommando (S.K.)*: unit working in Monowitz.
- *Bekleidungs-Werkstätte-Sonderkommando (Bekl.Werkst.S.K.)*: unit in the clothing workshops producing clothing.
- *Sonderkommando Sola-Hütte*.

⁵¹ “Konz.-Lager Auschwitz II. Birkenau, den 4. Oktober 1944. Dienstplan für Donnerstag, den 5.10.1944,” GARF, 7021-108-59, p. 3. See DOCUMENT 2.

⁵² GARF, 7021-108-59, p. 3. The German term *Hütte* is frequently used for enterprises in the steel and coal industries.

⁵³ GARF, 7021-108-20. Cf my study 2005c, p. 89.

⁵⁴ “*Krematoriumspersonal*”; “Übersicht über Anzahl und Einsatz der Häftlinge des Konzentrationslagers”, January 31, 1944, APMO, D-f/402, n.inv. 167217, p. 34.

⁵⁵ For example, in the report “*Arbeitseinsatz für den 15. Mai 1943*”, APMO, D-AuII-3a/1a, p. 333a.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

Other *Sonderkommandos* appearing in documents adduced by the authors will be dealt with further below.

Turning back to Document 9, it is a simply an utterly unfounded conjecture that the “*Sonderkommando*” mentioned in the list of 17 August 1942 had anything to do with any personnel working at the phantasmagorical “bunker.” The orthodox “information” about that alleged “*Sonderkommando*” stems exclusively from testimonies which are very contradictory to boot. Eric Friedler *et al.* (2005, p. 77) wrote in this regard:

“The labor detail consisting of up to 50 inmates per bunker which was deployed directly at the gas chambers was called Sonderkommando right from the start. There existed another detail with Jewish workers between May and September, however, which was deployed by the SS for the removal of traces of the mass murder. The task of this ‘burial detail’ was to excavate the deep pits in which the corpses of the gassed victims from Bunkers 1 and 2 had been buried. Finally, in September 1942 the burial detail and the Sonderkommando were merged by the SS, and from then on it was called merely Sonderkommando.”

If viewed that way, the term used in the list of 17 August does not refer to a burial unit, as the authors affirm (which at that time, if we follow Friedler *et al.*, wasn’t called “*Sonderkommando*” but “*Begrabungskommando*”), but would have been a “gassing unit.”

In her entry for 4 July 1942, Czech writes in her *Auschwitz Chronicle* about the origins of the “*Sonderkommando*” (1990, p. 192):

“The so-called Sonderkommando (Special Squad) is formed, consisting of several dozen Jewish prisoners. They must dig pits near the bunker and bury those who are killed in the gas chambers. The squad is housed in the barracks in the men’s camp in Birkenau. It is completely isolated from the other prisoners.”

The source is a report of the Polish resistance. The date, however, is Czech’s invention. In fact, the “Memorandum on the State of the Nation for the Period 16 July to 25 August 1942” conveyed the following (Marczewska/Ważniewski 1968, p. 37):

“A few dozen, physically very strong detainees are selected from each group of new arrivals. This is the special company [kompania specjalna] which at night digs graves and buries the slain. This company – strictly isolated – was later exterminated in the gas chamber; a new one replaced it.”

The Polish underground periodical *Informacja Bieżąca* (Current Information) published in its no. 31 of 26 September 1942 a “Report from Auschwitz” which contains the same claims with slight variations (*ibid.*, p. 39):

“100 physically very strong people are selected from the group of new arrivals. This is the special company [kompania specjalna] which at night digs graves and buries the slain. A short while later, this strictly isolated company was exterminated in the gas chamber; a new one replaced it.”

Arnošt Rosin, whom the authors call as their witness, stated that two weeks after his arrival at Auschwitz – which occurred on 17 April 1942, hence in late April/early May – 200 detainees of his transport were selected and isolated in a hut. The next day 50 detainees were taken away. They were all assigned to the *Sonderkommando*. The group of 150 inmates to which Rosin belonged was led into the birch wood near Birkenau. They had to excavate mass graves near the “white farmhouse,” i.e. “Bunker 2” – although according to the orthodox version of events, this structure did not yet exist at that time. The other 50 detainees were allegedly involved in the gassing of the victims and the removal of their corpses (Friedler *et al.* 2005, pp. 78f.).

It is unclear how these claims can be reconciled: were there a few dozen, 100 or 200 prisoners in the *Sonderkommando*? Czech writes even that 300 prisoners of the *Sonderkommando* who had been employed in the exhumation and cremation of 107,000 corpses were killed in the “gas chamber” of Crematorium I at Auschwitz on 3 December 1942 (1990, pp. 277f.). This number is taken from a deposition Arnošt Rosin made during the 16th session of the trial of the Auschwitz camp garrison. The witness stated:⁵⁷

“On 3 December 1942, the Sonderkommando, numbering 300 people, was gassed at Auschwitz during the preparation of an escape. The rest of the Sonderkommando, numbering 10-12 people, remained in the block and were subsequently led into the so-called ‘death chamber’ – this was the place for the corpses – and the defendant Plagge himself shot them.”

To top it off, the witness Stanisław Jankowski, also adduced by Czech, asserted instead that the *Sonderkommando* had 390 inmates and was “gassed” in November or December 1942 (Bezwińska *et al.* 1996, p. 48). So how many? A few dozen? 100? 200? 300? 390? No, the authors of the reviewed book say: 500!

Leaving aside these numerical contradictions and those relating to the extermination of the *Sonderkommando*, which according to the Polish resistance’s Memorandum must have occurred already before 25 August 1942 (if at all) but which is completely ignored by Czech, the authors should address how the numerical data quoted here can be reconciled with the document under discussion. If the maximum number of prisoners in the *Sonderkommando* was 390, how do they explain the assignment to it of 500 inmates on 17 August 1942?

⁵⁷ Trial of the Auschwitz camp garrison, vol. VII, p. 7.

The authors also misinterpret the meaning of the document: “Assigned from the camp – on 7:30 hrs. for special unit 475 inmates, 25 foremen” does not mean that the *Sonderkommando* had been permanently increased to 475 inmates and 25 foremen, but that these detainees had been made available only for that particular day at 7:30 hrs. The comparison between the two pages of the document shows that the total number of prisoners employed remained unchanged (3,000) and that the 475 inmates transferred to the *Sonderkommando* consisted mainly of “*Planierungsarbeiter*” (workers engaged in leveling the ground), whose tally went down from 2,145 on August 16 to 1,710 on August 17. Some inmate workers also came from the pool originally assigned to leveling the ground for the future SS lodgings (“*Pl. Unterkunft-SS*”), which decreased from 195 to 95. It is important to point out here that the 3,000 workers in question were chosen based on their profession, as is reflected in a parallel document with the headline “Inmate deployment of 27 February 1942.”⁵⁸ The two documents published by the authors were part of a handwritten list which was certainly meant for internal use only, while the one I mentioned was a typewritten official document which reported the pertinent data in more detail.

As mentioned above, the alleged first *Sonderkommando* was formed toward late April/early May 1942 according to Rosin, or on 4 July if we follow Czech. Leaving aside this chronological contradiction, both declare that its inmates were Jews taken directly from a transport, without first passing through the official labor deployment procedure. But the 475 inmates and 25 foremen in question were rather precisely part of this official labor pool, and they remained part of it even after their temporary assignment to the *Sonderkommando*, not to mention that there is no evidence that they were Jews.

In addition, it is unknown which *Sonderkommando* the document in question relates to, and nothing in it indicates that it was involved in the excavation of mass graves or that it had any relationship to the elusive “bunkers.”

The authors’ interpretation is moreover in striking contrast to one of the cornerstones of their version of the origin of outdoor cremations. In her *Auschwitz Chronicle* under the date of 16 September 1942, Czech (1990, p. 238f.) mentions the fact that Camp Commander Rudolf Höss, accompanied by SS-*Untersturmführer* Franz Hössler and SS-*Untersturmführer* Walter Dejaco, visit SS-*Standartenführer* Paul Blobel on that date, supposedly in Chelmno, to learn about, and adopt for Auschwitz, the procedures and cremation devices employed in that camp (see Mattogno 2008). This means that prior to that date Höss would have been ignorant as to how to cremate corpses buried at Auschwitz (otherwise he wouldn’t have turned to Blobel to find out about it), so he could not possibly have ordered the preparation of “new burning pits” on August 17.

⁵⁸ RGVA, 502-1-67, pp. 94f. See DOCUMENT 3.

Here is another problem. Historians at the Auschwitz Museum claim that the corpses of the victims of the “bunkers” of Birkenau were not burned in cremation pits before Heinrich Himmler’s visit to Auschwitz on 17 and 18 July 1942. In this regard Czech explicitly states (1990, p. 199):

“At this time, the corpses [of Bunker 2] are not yet being burned but are piled up in pits and buried.”

Himmler allegedly decided to have the bodies cremated rather than buried, and “shortly after Himmler’s visit” Blobel is said to have showed up at Auschwitz “with orders to exhume all buried bodies, burn them, and to scatter the ashes to prevent the possible reconstruction of the number of victims” (Piper 1994, p. 163), although no paper trail exists of Blobel’s alleged visit to Auschwitz, and it is not even mentioned in Czech’s *Auschwitz Chronicle*.

Hence, if we follow the orthodox Holocaust logic, then the order to exhume and cremate the buried victims is said to have arrive at Auschwitz already in July 1942 (“shortly after” Himmler’s visit), but, inexplicably, Höss went to see Blobel for advice on cremating exhumed corpses only almost two months later! Meanwhile, according to the authors, he would have ordered the excavation of “new burning pits,” which indicates that, in their opinion, at that time there were already “old” cremation pits, *i.e.* that outdoor cremations were already happening.

When open-air mass cremations began on 21 September after Höss’s return to Auschwitz, the procedures adopted are said to have been rather primitive; after attempts were allegedly made to cremate the corpses on pyres, they were eventually simply burned directly in the pits (*ibid.*, pp. 305f.). Since Höss’s travel permit concerned the visit to an “experimental station for field furnaces Operation Reinhard,”⁵⁹ which were masonry furnaces requiring “building materials,”⁶⁰ it is unclear why Höss would instead apply the crude methods of pyres and burning pits at Auschwitz.

In my comments on Document 13 I will examine Setkiewicz’s pathetic attempt to unravel somewhat this web of contradictions.

In conclusion, it is unknown to which *Sonderkommando* the document in question refers, and nothing indicates that it was involved in the excavation of mass graves or had any relationship with the elusive “bunkers.” Hence Document 9 basically does not prove anything. Just like all the other documents they mentioned later on, it is of value to the authors only due to the myth of the *Sonderkommando*, the sterile vicious circle which assumes apodictically that merely one *Sonderkommando* existed at Auschwitz, and that it was of necessity devoted to cremation and gassings. Then these scholars triumphantly brandish documents that mention the term in question (and others with the

⁵⁹ *Fahrgenehmigung* of 15 September 1942. AGK, NTN, 94, p. 170. Reproduced in Mattogno 2008, p. 85.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 84, *Reisebericht über die Dienstfahrt nach Litzmannstadt*. RGVA, 502-1-336, p. 69.

“Sonder-” prefix) as “proof” of the claimed reality of the alleged homicidal gassings.

[10] Document 10 (pp. 71f.)

This is the well-known “Aktenvermerk” (file memo) by SS-Untersturmführer Fritz Ertl of 21 August 1942⁶¹ mentioning “bathing facilities for special operations,” which the authors, following the common practice of the Holocaust orthodoxy, claim to be the elusive “bunkers”:

“Protocol of a discussion that took place at KL Auschwitz on August 19, 1942. Representatives of the camp and the Zentralbauleitung negotiated with the engineer Kurt Prüfer, a specialist from the Topf und Söhne company from Erfurt, whose products included furnaces for cremating corpses. This conference was probably an outcome of Himmler’s July 1942 orders calling for an expansion of the capacity for exterminating Jews at KL Auschwitz. Instead of being buried in mass graves, the bodies of the people murdered in the gas chambers were henceforth to be burned. During the discussion it was decided to build a second crematorium based on the system of five three-retort furnaces (the future crematorium III) and the installing of crematorium furnaces next to bunkers I and II. They are defined in this document as ‘bathhouses for special operations’ (Badeanstalten für Sonderaktionen). The decision to build new furnaces adjacent to the bunkers was revised several weeks later, and it was determined that the equipment for burning corpses would be placed in newly designed facilities (later crematoria IV and V).” (p. 70)

This absolutely untenable claim has already been abundantly refuted by me in two other studies (2004b, pp. 66-71; 2019, pp. 186-190). Here I will merely summarize the three key points of my arguments. First I quote the crucial passage of this document:⁶²

“Regarding the installation of 2 three-muffle furnaces each at the ‘bathing facilities for special operations’ it was proposed by engineer Prüfer that the furnaces be diverted from an already completed shipment to Mogilev [in White Russia], and the administrative director, who was at the SS Main Office of Economic Administration in Berlin, was immediately informed of this by telephone and asked to make further arrangements.”

First of all, the text does not explicitly state that there were two such bathing facilities. If it was planned to install two furnaces at each of these “bathing facilities,” the two three-muffle furnaces originally ordered for the PoW camp would have sufficed for only one “bathing facility,” but no document mentions a further order for three-muffle furnaces .

⁶¹ RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 159.

⁶² RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 159; see Mattogno/Deana 2015, vol. 1, p. 233, for the full text and context.

Next, in August 1942 no structure existed bearing the name “bathing facilities for special operations” or any similar term. None of the buildings already erected or under construction had anything whatsoever to do with “bathing facilities.” And this, even though for this month we know exactly all the structures that existed at Birkenau; we know when they were ordered, when their construction began, what their number and their name was, what their extent of completion was, and where they were located. This information is contained in the “Construction schedule 1942. Month reported: August”⁶³ and the plan of Birkenau dated 15 August 1942 (Pressac 1989, p. 209). These documents obviously do not mention the phantasmagorical “bunkers” of Birkenau either.

These “bathing facilities” don’t show up in any project of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp, in any construction report, in any plan or map, which demonstrates that these facilities were only in a planning stage at best. This is additional proof that they could have had nothing to do with “Bunkers” 1 and 2, which were supposedly already in operation in August of 1942.

My third point is that no document shows that the “special operations” were homicidal gassing events. As I have shown in my specific study, these operations referred to the treatment of Jewish transports in general (*Sondertransporte* = special transports) with all related operations, like registration, disinfection and admission of deportees (2004b, pp. 60-87).

Finally, while there are “concordant” documents mentioning “bathing facilities” and crematoria in the context of sanitation and health care (2019, pp. 136-140), there is not a single document mentioning them in a criminal context. I will elaborate on the actual objects which these “bathing facilities” most likely refer to when commenting on the authors’ “Introduction.”

[11] Document 11 (p. 75)

The authors present it as follows:

“Work card for the electricians’ Kommando from August 22, 1942, concerning the installation for the Sonderkommando of an aboveground power line 200 m in length and a power wire 600 m in length to 19 burning sites (19 Brennstellen). The document refers to the beginning of the burning of corpses retrieved from the mass graves. The power line was associated with the necessity of illuminating the area where the burning of corpses went on all day, and also at night.” (p. 74)

The English text translates the German term “*Brennstellen*” as “burning sites”, while the Polish text uses the words “*miejsc spalenskowych*”, which is cremation sites (since “*spalenie*” means cremation when dealing with corpses).

⁶³ RGVA, 502-1-22, pp. 40f.

Here the authors commit a major translation blunder. “*Brennstelle*” is in fact a German technical term referring in general to a point for connecting lighting fixtures or other electrical loads (electrical outlet).

This document is so “new” that I mentioned it already in 2001 (p. 140; Engl.: 2004b, p. 102, fn. 358). The archival reference is RGVA, 502-1-316, p. 34. This is a work report (*Arbeitskarte*) of the inmate electrician detail (*Elektriker-Kommando*) for Order No. 1888 of 22 August 1942 regarding the construction site of structure no. 20 at Birkenau. The text states:

“For installing of the special unit Birkenau BW 20 PoW camp, the following work is to be carried out: installation and supply line for the special unit consisting of: 19 lighting outlets, 1 supply line 200 m overhead line and 600 m wire 4 x 10.”

The work started on 20 August and was done on the 22nd, requiring 60 specialist man-hours and 60 unskilled man-hours.

The authors do not show the reverse of the document, which states: “The material was obtained directly from the construction office” followed by the number of inmate labor hours used and the total costs of 6 RM.⁶⁴ An assignment sheet no. 1888 also exists from the same date and addressed to the “inmate electricians.” It contains the same text as the work report.⁶⁵

It is unclear which *Sonderkommando* the two documents refer to, and the way they are phrased does not help to elucidate it either: it speaks of installation “of the” and “for the” *Sonderkommando*.

Fact is that the document refers to BW 20 of the PoW Camp, which was the *Kraftstromanlage*, the high-voltage power system, hence the *Sonderkommando* mentioned in the document was not linked to the legendary “bunkers.”

The authors’ interpretation is intentionally misleading, because the document clearly says that “19 lighting outlets” were part of the work the electricians had to carry out, not the places where they had to work, so here the authors are committing an unambiguous fraud.

One last observation. The authors state that the “power line was associated with the necessity of illuminating the area where the burning of corpses went on all day, and also at night.” Such a conclusion is unfounded, because the document does not mention at all any floodlights necessary for illumination. If and when such an illumination was requested, the respective “work report” stated this clearly, as for example in the case of Crematorium II. On 20 November 1942, the Central Construction Office drafted a “work report” for Order No. 98/291 which stated:⁶⁶

⁶⁴ RGVA, 502-1-316, p. 34a.

⁶⁵ RGVA, 502-1-316, p. 33. See DOCUMENT 4.

⁶⁶ RGVA, 502-2-8, pp. 1-1a. See DOCUMENT 5.

“Concerning: Crematorium II – BW No. 30 in PoW camp the following work has to be carried out: construction illumination in Crematorium II, as well as adjusting the floodlights for night shift // guard detail.”

The document’s reverse lists the required material, including electric wire (*Leitung*), floodlights (*Scheinwerfer*) and incandescent bulbs (*Glühlampe*).

[12] Document 12 (p. 77)

This is page 113 of an inmate-labor-deployment register. The authors declare:

“Entry no. 1131 of August 22, 1942 mentions the receipt of a request to assign 50 additional prisoners to the Sonderkommando (Verstärkung des Sonderkdo. um 50 Häftlingen [sic]). This is further confirmation of the expansion of the tasks envisioned for this labor detail in the third week of August 1942, when the recovery of bodies from the mass graves and the burning on pyres began.” (p. 76)

This interpretation is also utterly unfounded. The document is subdivided into eight columns, only seven of which are filled in:

- 1) “*Lfd. Nr.*,” serial number: 1131
- 2) “*Eingangs-Datum*,” date of receipt: 20 August 1942
- 3) “*Aktenzeichen*,” file reference (*ohne*)
- 4) “*von wem*,” from whom: administration of inmate property (*Gefangenen-Eigentumsverwaltung*)
- 5) “*Inhalt*,” contents: “reinforcement of special unit by 50 inmates” (*Verstärkung des Sonderkommandos um 50 Häftlinge*)
- 6) “*Sachbearbeiter*,” responsible clerk: Klapper
- 7) “*Weitergeleitet an*,” forwarded to: “labor service” (*Arbeitsdienst*).

Clearly, then, on 20 August 1942 the administration of inmate property requested the augmentation of its special unit by 50 inmates, all this in keeping with the normal practice of the camp’s labor service. That is, these 50 inmates were part of the camp’s normal labor pool, so that the same considerations apply here as I have explained in relation to Document 9. The inmates’ property, which had been seized by the camp administration on the inmates’ arrival, were called “*Effekten*” (personal effects). Their sorting and cleaning, as I will show with my comments to Document 31, was carried out by a dedicated *Sonderkommando*, which in fact consisted of 50 detainees. It has nothing to do with any sinister activities.

[13] Document 13 (p. 79)

This is travel order (*Fahrbefehl*) no. 7 of 7 September 1942 for a five-ton truck. The authors stated about it:

“The purpose of the trip is listed as the delivery of wood from Radostowice. In that locality, as well as in Międzyrzecze (Messersitz), Stara Wieś

(Altdorf), and Kobiór (Kobier) on the grounds of the Pszczyna forestry office (Oberforstamt Pless), there were prisoner Kommandos (small sub-camps would later be established there) tasked with gathering branches and scrap wood used for burning corpses in Birkenau.” (p. 78)

The only information which the Auschwitz Museum has on Radostowice (in German Radostowitz) originates from statements of a former detainee who worked there between late 1941 and January-February 1943. Piotr Setkiewicz reported the essentials. According to this, the detainees in that labor detail were of all nationalities, but mostly Jews. They worked from 7 am to 5 pm. The work consisting of clearing out young deciduous trees was carried out along four lines of woodland, each 750 meters long, called G, H, J and K. They cut down especially deciduous trees, like oaks and birches, because these allegedly burned better when green. At the end of the work day, trucks came in the evening which loaded up the freshly cut wood and brought it to Birkenau (Setkiewicz 2010, pp. 147f.).

At the beginning of his article, Setkiewicz tries to put the document in question in the historical context of the alleged origins of open-air cremations at Auschwitz. After referring to the cremation order allegedly issued by Himmler during his visit to Auschwitz on 17 and 18 July 1942, he writes (*ibid.*, pp. 140f.):

“News of the intention to cremate corpses from mass graves in Birkenau reached Kurt Prüfer early, the engineer of Topf & Söhne company, because on 21 August 1942 he proposed to use for this purpose two field cremation furnaces. His proposal was rejected very quickly by the SS, however, who opted instead for the cheaper and safer solution as used at the extermination camp at Chelmo upon Ner – the cremation of corpses on pyres. Höss put the Rapportführer of the Auschwitz camp, SS-Untersturmführer Franz Hössler, in charge of carrying out that task.

The cremation of corpses in pits or on pyres began at Birkenau probably around the turn of August to September, initially using firewood stock (wood waste), but later, around 7-8 September, also systematically by beginning to bring in wood from outside. This results from the analysis of data on truck departures sent from the camp to places that are located within the large forest areas in Tychy, Żory and Pszczyna.

Trucks with 5 tons of payload headed to Radostowice at Pszczyna on 7, 8 and 9 September. The purpose given for the trip was: ‘Abholung von Holz, Holztransport’ (pick up wood, transport of wood).

We need to understand that at that time no one at the SS camp garrison initially had any experience in the construction of cremation pyres, and not even written instructions existed about it. For this reason, problems arose regarding the cremation of corpses during the initial period of open-air cremations in Birkenau: either the cremations lasted too long, or the con-

sumption of wood was too high. Höss therefore had to recognize that the difficulties were so serious that in mid-September he decided to stop the operation and to make a trip to the extermination center at Chelmino upon Ner in order to inquire about the corpse cremation methods used there."

This is an entirely fictitious historical reconstruction, invented in order to try to iron out the insuperable timing disparities arising from the previous orthodox version of the genesis of open-air cremations at Auschwitz.

Setkiewicz infers the start date of these cremations from a "letter from the Auschwitz Camp" dated 29 August 1942, which relates this fanciful story (Marczewska/Ważniewski 1968, p. 43):

"Most terrible are the mass executions in gas chambers especially designed for this purpose. There are two of them, and they can hold 1,200 people. In them, bathrooms with showers are installed, from which, alas, gas flows instead of water. In this way especially entire transports of people are killed who are left clueless. They are told that they will take a bath, they are even given towels – already 300,000 people have perished this way. Once they were buried in mass graves; now they [the bodies] are burned outdoors in specially dug pits [Kiedyś zakopywano w rowach, dziś palą na wolnym powietrzu, w rowach specjalnie wykopanych]. Death occurs by suffocation, because blood streamed from nose and mouth."

Hence, if the first documented transport of firewood from outside the camp arrived at Auschwitz on September 7 – ponders Setkiewicz – then wood stored inside the camp must have been used prior to that. This is merely a conjecture, because nothing in the above-quoted letter confirms the accuracy of this allegation.

The alleged difficulties encountered during the initial stage of outdoor cremation are only a puerile trick, devoid even of anecdotal support, in order to account for Höss's visit to the field furnaces (*Feldöfen*) of Operation Reinhardt on 16 September 1942. But here the contradiction persists, because Setkiewicz does not explain why the commandant of Auschwitz, after inspecting these field furnaces, returned to Auschwitz yet kept the cremation system in place (on the surface or in pits) which, according to the Polish historian, had presented such difficulties that they induced Höss to inspect these furnaces in the first place. As I mentioned above, the travel permission of 15 September 1942 authorizing Höss's trip explicitly states:⁶⁷

"Travel permit for passenger car from Au. to Litzmannstadt [Łódź] and back for inspecting the experimental station for field furnaces Operation Reinhard is granted herewith for 16 Sept. [19]42."

If we consider the reference in SS-Untersturmführer Ertl's file memo of 21 August 1942 to Prüfer's presence at Auschwitz on 19 and 20 August and to

⁶⁷ AGK, NTN, 94, p. 170. Reproduced in Mattogno 2008, p. 85.

his proposal for the crematoria, Setkiewicz's reconstruction appears grotesque: Despite having at his disposal one of the best German cremation specialists – *i.e.* Prüfer – Höss is said to have struggled to find merely crude and improvised solutions. Then he allegedly sought advice from Blobel, who, when it comes to outdoor cremations, knew just as much about it as Höss.

For the three travel orders mentioned by Setkiewicz, dated 7, 8 and 9 September 1942, he gives as reference “APMA-B. D-AUI-4 / 29-31, *Fahrbefehl* Volume 1 pp. 671-673” (Setkiewicz 2010, note 5, p. 140). This suggests that the Auschwitz Museum is in possession of at least two volumes of these documents, and that the first one has at least 673 pages. This Polish historian nevertheless mentions only the three above-mentioned documents, which therefore must be the only ones known within the collection of documents for 1942. Since Document 13 speaks of a five-ton truck with trailer (*mit Anhänger*), even if we assume three loads of 10 tons each, the total amount of wood brought to the camp (the document does not specify that the destination was Birkenau) would be 30 tons, enough for the cremation of merely some 100 corpses.⁶⁸ Following Höss's statement, Czech states that as of 3 December 1942 107,000 corpses had been cremated outdoors (Czech 1990, p. 277). In this case, (107,000 corpses × 320 kg/corpse =) 34,240 tons of fresh wood would have been required for their cremation, which is the equivalent of 3,424 trips of one five-ton truck with a trailer. This means that the collection of travel orders should contain at least hundreds of travel orders for hauling wood, not just three! I will return to that issue in Chapter 12 of Part Two.

The premise of the authors' (and Setkiewicz's) interpretation of Document 13 is that transporting firewood to Auschwitz served exclusively the cremation of corpses, but this is a naïve and unfounded assumption. We know that the SS men who lived with their families near the camp routinely received supplies of firewood. For example, Garrison Order no. 55/43 of 15 December 1943 mandates the following (Frei *et al.* 2000, p. 381):

“Considering the extraordinary difficulties in supplying firewood, it is ordered hereby that the households of SS members get only two loads of wood delivered during the calendar year 1 Jan. 1944 – 31 Dec. 1944. For the month of December there will be no more supplies. Since firewood is allowed to be used only for firing up, and in the Reich 10 families receive 1 cubic meter [of wood], one absolutely has to make do with the allocated quantity, which is very generous anyway.”

⁶⁸ Since these are said to have been fresh corpses, I assume a consumption of 2.82 kg dry wood per 1 kg of organic matter, equivalent to 5.36 kg of green wood, and with Robert Jan van Pelt an average weight of the bodies of 60 kg. (See Mattogno/Kues/Graf 2015, vol. II, pp. 1111, 1286f.). This results in a consumption of about 320 kg of fresh wood per corpse, so the 30 tons of green wood would be enough for the cremation of less than 100 corpses.

Nothing, therefore, rules out that the three wood transports mentioned above served for heating family homes.

[14] Document 14 (p. 81)

This is the well-known report “Visit of SS-Obergruppenführer Pohl on 23 Sept. 1942” written by the head of the Central Construction Office Bischoff.⁶⁹

Among the various sites visited by Pohl (head of the SS-WVHA), there is this: “Station 2 of Aktion Reinhard.” In their comments, the authors simply highlight this entry without any explanation. In their Introduction, however, they argue that this “Station 2 of Aktion Reinhard” refers to “Bunker 2,” a conjecture already proposed by Bertrand Perz and Thomas Sandkühler. I have already refuted this imaginative interpretation in another study, where I discussed the document in question (2008, pp. 16-21). This document contains another important reference to the “Aktion Reinhard”: “disinfestation and storage of personal belongings/Aktion Reinhard.” I therefore concluded that this term referred to the so-called “Kanada I,” that is structure BW 28, which was called “barracks for delousing and personal effects” (*“Entlausungs- und Effektenbaracken”*). This is confirmed by the report on Pohl’s visit (see Document 27), which identifies the “disinfestation and storage of personal belongings/Aktion Reinhard” with “delousing chamber and personal effects warehouses (resettlement of Jews),” as I will explain in my comments on Document 27.

The “Station 2 of Aktion Reinhard” was a huge storage facility for inmate belongings. It was called “Station 2” because “Station 1,” the main warehouse, was precisely the above-mentioned BW 28. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that even in May-June 1944 in Birkenau there was a “Sonderkommando Reinhardt” in which 2,505 inmates worked on 19 June.⁷⁰

[15] Document 15 (p. 83)

This is a “Detail of a March 1943 map showing the expansion of the Birkenau Camp.” The authors elaborate:

“Bunker II, together with three adjacent wooden barracks, is visible. One of them is crossed out, probably as a result of the updating of the map in 1944, when two barracks used for undressing by the Jews doomed to death in the gas chamber were erected at the same place where three barracks, subsequently dismantled, had stood in 1942.” (p. 82)

The document in question is the “Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215,” dated March

⁶⁹ RGVA, 502-1-19, p. 86.

⁷⁰ “Übersicht über Anzahl und Einsatz der weiblichen Häftlinge des Konzentrationslagers Auschwitz O/S. 19. Juni 1943.” GARF, 7021-108-33, p. 153.

1943,⁷¹ a section enlargement of which I published in my study on the “bunkers” of Birkenau (2004a, Doc. 8, p. 205), along with other similar maps which the authors ignore. I reiterate and expand the respective discussion of this issue as laid out in my study (*ibid.*, p. 40).

This master plan shows the complete map of the Birkenau Camp. To the north of Construction Section (*BA=Bauabschnitt*) III, just outside the camp enclosure, the houses 586, 587 and 588 are visible, together with other houses further north (*H.* 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 589, 590) as well as the group of houses from the former village of Birkenau to the east of *BA* III (DOCUMENT 6). The house that orthodox historiography today calls “Bunker 1” (the one closest to the camp, located further down in DOCUMENT 10 in the Appendix) and the other five houses to the west of it (two of which were located next to the road bifurcation further west), all without ID number, because they had been demolished. The septic tank (*Erdklärbecken*), as is apparent from a comparison of my DOCUMENTS 10 and 16a, was to be built to the south (left) of the vertical road visible in DOCUMENT 10 and barely visible in DOCUMENT 16a, while the group of four buildings (including the alleged “Bunker 1”) was north of it (right), so that there was no overlap between the septic tank and the alleged “Bunker 1.” Therefore, if the above four buildings do not appear in Plan 2215 of March 1943, then this is precisely because they had been demolished.

To the west of the *Zentralsauna*, however, the house still appears which today is known as “Bunker 2” by orthodox historiography, as well as another house predating the camp in front of it (to which I will return later), both without identification numbers, which had not yet been demolished. Near them on the map, the Soviets have crudely sketched in three rectangles supposed to represent the alleged undressing barracks of “Bunker 2,” which, however, should have been only two in number, not three.⁷² Realizing their mistake, the Soviets struck out the third barrack with three strokes of the pen! (See DOCUMENT 7.)

That those “barracks” are indeed the work of the Soviets can be seen above all from their drafting technique. In the drawings of barracks done by the Central Construction Office⁷³ the lines forming the outer edges intersect crosswise at each corner, while those drawn by the Soviets form a closed angle and show, moreover, a thicker pen stroke. Furthermore, there is another version of this drawing, identical except for the fact that the “septic tank” was changed into a “sewage plant” (*Kläranlage*). On this map, the two houses mentioned

⁷¹ RGVA, 502-2-93, p. 1.

⁷² This applies to the first claimed operational phase of “Bunker 2”; in mid-May 1944, when it is said to have resumed activity, three barracks were installed there according to F. Müller (1979, pp. 211f.).

⁷³ The map was drawn by detainee no. 471, the Polish draftsman Alfred Brzybylski.

above appear to the west of the central sauna, – again without an identification number – but there is no trace of any barracks.⁷⁴

It is true that the Central Construction Office drew its maps in several copies, which were then used for the necessary updates. The upgraded map became in turn an official document, sanctioned by its registration in the issuance ledger, which was confirmed by the stamp “Entered in map issuance ledger.” Both maps in question bear this stamp; the one on which the Soviets drew the barracks has the stamp “Entered in map issuance ledger under no. 3373 / 10 Sep 43”; the other has the stamp “Entered in map issuance ledger under no. 9288 / 13 Feb 44” (see DOCUMENTS 7a & 8a). Once recorded in the issuance ledger, changes to the two maps in question, like all the others, were no longer permitted. But since the barracks of the elusive “Bunker 2” were allegedly erected in May 1944, it is clear that, for chronological reasons, neither of these plans could have been updated to show the claimed barracks, so that the authors’ explanation is totally inconsistent with the facts.

In this context they committed a serious omission. In the area of “Bunker 2,” both maps show *two* pre-existing houses, of which the top one (west) is said to have been “Bunker 2,” but for none of the witnesses the second house existed at all. This is also true for all the descriptions of “Bunker 2” given by the key witness Szlama Dragon:⁷⁵

“We were led into a forest where there was a brick cottage with a straw-thatched roof. The windows were walled up. The door leading into the house had a metal plate with the inscription ‘Hochspannung – Lebensgefahr’ [high-voltage – danger to life]. At about 30 to 40 meters from this cottage stood two wooden barracks. On the other side of the house there were four trenches, 30 m long, 7 m wide, and 3 m deep.”

There is no reference to a second building. The authors of course know better than to even address the fact that a second building is shown on both maps. Another key element also appears on these two maps which the authors don’t address at all. I proffer the necessary explanations which I have given in my study on the “bunkers” of Birkenau.

From 31 March 1942 forward, each site of the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz was assigned an identification number preceded by the letters *BW*. All administrative acts related to a *Bauwerk* had to be marked with the reference “*BW 21/7b (Bau) 13*,” in which 21/7b identified the

⁷⁴ “*Bebauungsplan für den Auf- u. Ausbau des Konzentrationslagers u. Kriegsgefangenenlagers, Plan Nr. 2215*” dated March 1943. RGVA, 502-1-94, p. 2; section enlargement in Mattogno 2004a, p. 205, Document 9. See DOCUMENT 8 in the Appendix.

⁷⁵ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by investigating Judge Jan Sehn on 10 & 11 May 1945. Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 103.

account, “(Bau) 13” the title.⁷⁶ For the prisoner-of-war camp (the Birkenau Camp), such dispositions had already come into force in February 1942.⁷⁷

During the course of the construction of the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp, the local population was evacuated;⁷⁸ many houses that stood in the way of the plans of the SS were demolished, but countless others located within the “area of interest” of the camp remained intact and were incorporated into the administration of the camp and entrusted to the SS New Construction Office (later to become SS Construction Office and finally SS Central Construction Office). Some, though very few, houses were neither demolished nor incorporated into the camp administration.

The SS New Construction Office carried out a census of the incorporated houses and gave a serial number to each one. Numbering proceeded by zones, and one of the last zones was that of the Auschwitz railroad station. The February 1942 report of the surveying section at SS New Construction Office mentions the following activity:⁷⁹

“Numbering of the houses between Alter and Neuer Bahnhofstrasse.”

For example, in the former village of Brzezinka (Birkenau), the SS New Construction Office incorporated some forty houses, to which it assigned the numbers from 600 to 640 (see DOCUMENT 6).

On September 10, 1944, the Central Construction Office renumbered the houses to reflect a renaming of the streets.⁸⁰

All work on the houses was planned and carried out by the above office, which retained responsibility for maintaining them even after the work had been completed and the building had been handed over to the camp administration. For example, in October 1944 the Central Construction Office took on the inspection and repair of the damage caused by the U.S. aerial bombardment of September 13, 1944, creating for this purpose a special *Bauwerk* no. 167.⁸¹ Among the structures destroyed or damaged were 18 buildings⁸²

⁷⁶ “Aufteilung der Bauwerke (BW) für die Bauten, Aussen- und Nebenanlagen des Bauvorhabens Konzentrationslager Auschwitz O/S,” March 31, 1942. RGVA, 502-1-267, p. 3.

⁷⁷ “Baufristenplan für Bauvorhaben: Kriegsgefangenenlager der Waffen SS Auschwitz” of March 9, 1942, for the month of February; RGVA, 502-1-22, p. 9. “Aufteilung der Bauwerke (BW) für die Bauten, Aussen- und Nebenanlagen des Bauvorhabens ‘Lager II’ Auschwitz,” copy written by Poles without indication of date; AGK, NTN-94, p. 154.

⁷⁸ As early as March 1941, 1,600 Poles and 500 Jews had been evacuated from the Auschwitz “area of interest” and moved to the Government General; GARF, 7021-108-32, p. 30.

⁷⁹ “Tätigkeitsbericht der Tiefbau- und Vermessungsabteilung. Februar 1942,” March 2, 1942; RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 416.

⁸⁰ “Aufstellung. Umnummerierung von Hausnummern auf dem westlichen Sola-Ufer (Planungsgelände für Neustadt-West),” RGVA, 502-2-95, pp. 22-25. (Mattogno 2004a, Document 3, p. 197).

⁸¹ “Bauantrag für die Instandsetzungsarbeiten an den durch Bomben beschädigten Gebäuden und Aussenanlagen im Interessengebiet des Konzentrationslagers Auschwitz. BW. 167;” the document contains an explanatory report (*Erläuterungsbericht*) and a cost estimate (*Kostenvoranschlag*). RGVA, 502-1-159, pp. 80-90.

⁸² Buildings no. 134, 135, 136, 138, 128, 129, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 157A, 157B, 157C, 157E, 157D, 125.

and 63 houses.⁸³ For each house and each building the Central Construction Office made a damage assessment and a cost estimate for repairs.⁸⁴ In the village of Broschkowitz some thirty houses were set aside for those who had been displaced.⁸⁵

Some existing Polish houses were incorporated into the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz and were given the number of the corresponding *Bauwerk*. For example, Houses 130, 132, 150, 151, 152 and 171 became part of BW 36B (housing for officers and NCOs).⁸⁶

From the administrative point of view, the creation of a *Bauwerk* enabled the accomplishment of a complex series of bureaucratic steps, embodied in the drafting of a number of documents: besides the sketch of the location, the construction specification, and the cost estimate already mentioned, they included a drawing, an explanatory report, a transfer to the camp administration, and a notice of completion. For each *Bauwerk*, it was moreover necessary to keep a cash ledger in which all work done on the *Bauwerk* and the accompanying payments were recorded, and which reflected, so to speak, the administrative life of a *Bauwerk* (see Mattogno 2015, pp. 38 and 45). The construction or the modification was carried out by the Central Construction Office, using either its own detainees or civilian companies called in from the outside. Ordinary jobs were done by the workshops of the Central Construction Office, which had at its disposal a number of *Kommandos* of skilled workmen (blacksmiths, painters, carpenters, bricklayers, plumbers, etc.).

Turning back to the two maps no. 2215 of March 1943, they show north and east of BA III fifty houses, each of which is marked with a number preceded by the letter “H” (= *Haus*, house). It is precisely these pre-existing houses which had been taken over by the Central Construction Office and which were to be used for a specific purpose (mostly housing for families of married SS officers and NCOs, but House no. 642 was used as a school). The two houses west of the *Zentralsauna*, one of which is said to have been “Bunker 2” (right next to the three Soviet-added barracks), don’t have any numbers. This means they were neither demolished nor taken over by the Central Construction Office, so administratively they did not exist and could not be used for anything.

⁸³ Houses no. 35, 210, 36, 207, 891, 103, 115, 105, 56, 53, 52, 50, 49, 47, 44, 41, 43, 40, 27, 28, 33, 34, 16, 875, 6, 7, 8, 142, 131, 132, 133, 203, 105, 118, 118a, 149, 156, 126, 45, 25, 54, 139, 142, 46, 78, 1, 5, 9, 121, 21, 116, 117, 120, 122, 123, 125, 129, 130, 150, 152, 163, 170, 208.

⁸⁴ “*Kostenvoranschlag für die Instandsetzungsarbeiten an den durch Bomben beschädigten Gebäuden und Aussenanlagen im Interessengebiet des Konzentrationslagers Auschwitz. BW 167.*” RGVA, 502-1-159, pp. 82-90.

⁸⁵ “*Lageplan über die ausgebauten Wohnhäuser für Bombenbeschädigte BW. 166. (Eingetragen im Planausgabebuch unter Nr. 18125/29.7.44).*” RGVA, 502-2-50, p. 83.

⁸⁶ “*Baubericht für den Monat März 1942.*” RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 385; “*Tätigkeits- bzw. Baubericht für den Monat März 1942*” by SS Schütze Jothann (*Abteilung Hochbau*). RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 398.

There is another important document which also shows that the house labelled by orthodox Holocaust historians as “Bunker 1” wasn’t taken over by the Central Construction Office. This is the “Situation map of the area of interest Auschwitz Concentration Camp No. 1733” of 5 October 1942. Four buildings are shown on this map east of Construction Sector III of Birkenau, which were the homes of Józefa Wisińska, her uncle Józef Harmata, and two barns.⁸⁷ The first from the bottom (east) is said to have been transformed into “Bunker 1.” Again, it has no identification number, so at that time (October 1942) houses and barns existed (like the two buildings to the west of them, next to the road fork), but they had not been taken over by the Central Construction Office, so they, too, were non-existent, administratively speaking. Hence, without identification number and *Bauwerk* number, an existing house could not be remodeled for anything, because it did not exist neither for planning nor for accounting purposes. The house relabeled to “Bunker 1” thus required these essential bureaucratic acts, such as in the case of *Bauwerk* 83, which was House no. 184 used for sanitary purposes for the troops.

In my study of the “bunkers” in Birkenau, I presented an even more germane example: a comparison with another pre-existing home which was taken over and remodeled by the then SS New Construction Office Auschwitz: No. 44, an “existing building shell,” which was rebuilt as *BW* 36C and assigned as living quarters to *SS-Sturmbannführer* Cäsar, head of agricultural units. Although I have not investigated this *Bauwerk* in detail, it appears in 23 documents in my possession, invariably with its *Bauwerk* number.⁸⁸

The “Explanatory report on the temp[orary] expansion of Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S,” written by Bischoff on 15 July 1942, explicitly mentions *BW* 35 as a “temporary school with kindergarten” which was obtained from the “remodeling of an existing residential house.” This report describes the work done and costs incurred in detail.⁸⁹

[16] Document 16 (p. 85)

This is a work report (*Arbeitskarte*) of the inmate electrician detail regarding Order No. 636 of 9 July 1943. The authors maintain that it contains

“an order to reroute the electrical wire at bunker II (Sonderkommando) in connection with the expansion of sewage treatment facilities on the grounds of construction segment II.” (p. 84)

This is the document’s text:⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Mattogno 2004a, pp. 165f. See DOCUMENTS 9 & 10.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-39.

⁸⁹ RGVA, 502-1-223, pp. 7, 17.

⁹⁰ RGVA, 502-1-316, p. 68.

“Für Installation Sonderkommando-Birkenau ist folgende Arbeit auszuführen: Zuleitungskabel zum Sonderkommando verlegen/ wegen Einbau prov. Erdklärbecken im B.A.II.”

“For installation special unit Birkenau the following work is to be carried out: install supply wire to special unit/due to construction [of] temp.[orary] septic tank in Construction Sector II.”

Here, the authors mistranslate the German verb *verlegen*. It can have a number of distinctly different meanings, depending on the context. If people or organizations are concerned (patients, prisoners, army units, or companies, institutions etc.), *verlegen* means to move, transfer, relocate, redeploy, even to evacuate; however, if items are concerned, this verb simply means to fit, lay down (grass turfs, carpets and rugs) or to mount, to install (cables, wires, pipes, tubes, ducts).⁹¹ If you want to make clear that an already installed wire is to be rerouted, as the authors suggest, that would be *umverlegen* or *neu verlegen* in German. In other words: the document’s text does *not* suggest that an already existing wire was to be moved.

Next, the *back* of the document, unmentioned by the authors, states that no material was used (*kein Material*) and that it took 50 specialist inmate man-hours (*Häftlingsfacharbeiterstunden*) at 0.40 RM per hour as well as 120 unskilled inmate man-hours (*Häftlingshilfsarbeiterstunden*), for a total of 56 RM,⁹² with the beginning and end of the work also recorded at the end of the work report (2 to 4 August 1943). In addition, this work report refers to the structure BW 20 of the PoW camp (Birkenau). Jean-Claude Pressac has published two blueprints of a “temporary septic tank,” the first of which is dated 15 June 1943, but it refers to the “sewage-treatment plant PoW Camp, Construction Sector III, BW 18” (1989, pp. 169f.), which was located north of Crematorium V. In Birkenau such a sewage-treatment plant also existed in Construction Sector II (between Crematorium III and the *Zentralsauna*), as shown for example on Map No. 1991 of the Birkenau Camp dated 17 February 1943 (*ibid.*, p. 220). In August 1943 construction work was certainly carried out on this treatment plant, because the “Report on the progress of work for special measures in the PoW camp and in the Main Camp,” drawn up by Bischoff on 13 July 1943, states the following:⁹³

“Temporary septic tanks for Construction Sector II. 2 pieces completely excavated, 2 more pieces 2/3 excavated. Continued brickwork for operating footbridge and for feeder channel.”

The “Activity report of the Construction Office of the concentration camp and agriculture” by SS-Untersturmführer Hans Kirschnek for the period from 1

⁹¹ Other meanings are: to misplace/mislay an item; to reschedule/postpone/adjourn an event; to publish a book, none of which is an option here.

⁹² RGVA, 502-1-316, p. 68a.

⁹³ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 118.

July to 30 September 1943, which is predated 14 September 1943, does not mention the sewage-treatment plant of *BA II* in the section dedicated to the jobs carried out at the PoW camp Birkenau headlined “Special construction measures.” This means that the jobs were completed by 14 September. It does contain a reference to the treatment plant in Construction Sector *BA III*, though. The plant (*BW 18*) consisted of four basins named E, F, H and I, which were all marked as completed. F was finished on 11 August, and I on 23 August.⁹⁴ The work report of 9 July 1943 thus refers to the treatment plant in Sector II. It is true that this plant was only a few hundred meters away from the site of the alleged “Bunker 2,” but that does not make the authors’ interpretation any less unfounded.

First, since they claim that a power wire leading to “Bunker 2” had to be moved due to the new treatment plant (the document in question doesn’t even hint at this), they should show whence the wire in question came, and assuming that it was an overhead wire going in a straight line to the elusive “Bunker 2,” that it crossed the area of the treatment plant.

Second, the same historians at the Auschwitz Museum claim that at the time – in July 1943 – “Bunker 2” had been decommissioned several months ago, and that no special unit was working there at that time. For example, in the voluminous general history on the Auschwitz Camp published by the Museum, Franciszek Piper writes (Piper 1999, p. 169):

“In the spring of 1943, gassings ceased in the two bunkers after the new gas chambers and crematoria had been completed and were being used. Bunker 1 and the barracks erected next to it were demolished or disassembled, the local burning pits were filled in and leveled. The burning pits near Bunker 2 were also leveled, and the barracks standing there were dismantled, but Bunker 2 itself was left standing. In May 1944 Bunker 2 was put back into operation and used for the extermination operation of the Hungarian Jews.”

In other words, the alleged gassings at the “bunkers” ended when the first two crematoria of Birkenau went into operation, which was on 14 March (the claimed “first gassing” in Crematorium II) and 22 March (when the camp administration took over Crematorium IV). Szlama Dragon, one of the most important “eyewitnesses,” stated the following in this regard:⁹⁵

“Bunker no. 1 was dismantled completely as early as 1943. After the construction of crematorium no. 2 at Brzezinka, the barracks near Bunker no. 2 were dismantled as well and the trenches filled in.”

Dragon thus confirms that the alleged homicidal activity of “Bunker 2” ceased in March-April of 1943. It is therefore absurd to claim that a link exists be-

⁹⁴ RGVA, 502-1-27, pp. 7f.

⁹⁵ Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 106.

tween this alleged “bunker” and its purported *Sonderkommando* on the one hand and this document of 9 July 1943 on the other. I will comment more on the authors’ contradictory, no-less-than-underhanded interpretations of other documents regarding the termination of activities at the “bunkers”, the dismantling of the alleged undressing barracks, and the presence of the *Sonderkommando*, starting with their Document 34.

If the special unit in question was assigned to “Bunker 2”, which at that time was no longer in use, it is incomprehensible why the power wire was only rerouted but not removed and recovered. This is all the more incomprehensible because previously, on 17 April 1943, Bischoff had requested that the barracks installed at “*Sonderkommando II*” be moved, a term which the authors of course interpret as “Bunker 2” (see my comments on Document 32).

Finally it should be noted that this work report refers explicitly to “BW 20 KGL,” the high-voltage power system.

[17] Document 17 (pp. 87-90)

This is a report on the enlargement of the Birkenau Camp from 30 September 1943. The authors point out:

“Among the projects mentioned on the list, there is information about the remodeling of existing residential dwellings for the purpose of carrying out special operations there (twice: Ausbau eines vorhandenen Hauses für Sondermassnahmen) and the erection at each of them of three wooden barracks used as undressing rooms. The projects were registered in the documents under the numbers BW33 for construction segment II (bunker II) and BW33a for construction segment III (bunker I).” (p. 86)

If this interpretation was not deliberately done in bad faith, then it reveals an astonishing ignorance of the pertinent historical documents.

The document does not constitute anything new nor is it unique. I repeat here my analysis of the question which I published in my study on the “bunkers” of Birkenau (2004a, Paragraph 3.5.2.).

“House for Special Measures”

This designation appears in two documents, rather late in the chronology of the “bunkers”: the “Explanatory report on the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S” of 30 September 1943, which mentions “modification of an existing house for special measures” for BA II and one for BA III at Birkenau, and the “Cost estimate for extension of POW camp of the *Waffen-SS* in Auschwitz” of 1 October 1943. Both documents also mention “3 barracks for special measures” for each house. According to Fritjof Meyer, the designation “house for special measures” is the encrypted designation of the “bunkers.”⁹⁶ As I have shown elsewhere (2004b, pp. 60f.), this alleged encryp-

⁹⁶ Meyer 2002, p. 632, note 7. This reveals that not even the authors’ interpretation is new.

tion actually refers to the program for the improvement of the hygienic installations of the Birkenau Camp, appropriately called “special measures for the improvement of the hygienic installations,” which was ordered by SS-*Brigadeführer* Kammler in May of 1943. More specifically, the barracks “for special measures” bore the label BW 33a.

In fact, BW 33a was part of the inmate hospital projected for Construction Sector III of Birkenau Camp, which confirms that it had nothing to do with the alleged “bunkers.” In 1942, the relevant years for the claimed first operation period of the “bunkers,” no structure had the name “House for Special Measures,” and this is further confirmation of the fact that the two houses did not refer at all to the alleged “bunkers.”

This is fully confirmed by the context of the document. Construction Sector III of the camp is in fact described there as follows:

“Construction Sector III:

- BW 3e 114 inmate barracks Type 501/34*
- BW 4c 5 household barracks*
- BW 4e 2 household barracks Type 260/9*
- BW 4f 13 storage and laundry barracks Type 260/9*
- BW 4f 4 storage and laundry barracks Type 501/34*
- BW 6c 4 disinfestation barracks Type VII/5*
- BW 7c 11 nurse barracks (Swiss bar.)*
- BW 12b 12 barracks f. the seriously ill 501/34*
- BW 12d 2 block leader barracks Type IV/3*
- modification of an existing house for special measures*
- BW 33a 3 barracks f. special measures Type 260/9.”*

The authors carefully avoid drawing attention to this context, which by itself demolishes their senseless interpretation. For a discussion of this issue (the design and construction of the inmate hospital in Construction Sector III of Birkenau) I refer the reader to my dedicated study on this topic.⁹⁷

As regards Construction Sector II, in the Explanatory Report of 30 September 1943, the existing house and the three barracks for special measures are part of BW 33, which comprised:

- 25 barracks for inmate property (*Effektenbaracken*) Type 260/9
- 5 barracks for inmate property Type 501/34
- modification of an existing house for special measures
- three barracks for special measures Type 260/9.⁹⁸

Since the *Effektenlager* referred to the storage warehouses at Birkenau where the property seized from the detainees were stored, it is evident that these “special measures” were part of this area.

⁹⁷ Mattogno 2016c, pp. 60-72; this particular document is discussed on pp. 73f.

⁹⁸ “Erläuterungsbericht zum Ausbau des Kriegsgefangenenlagern der Waffen-SS in Auschwitz O/S.” RGVA, 502-2-60, p. 81. See DOCUMENT 11.

As stated above, this raises another problem which the authors ignore completely. If, as they claim, “Bunker 2” was *BW* 33 and “Bunker 1” *BW* 33a,⁹⁹ these references should already occur in 1942 in the copious documentation on the Birkenau Camp’s construction. Yet *BW* 33a appears for the first time in the explanatory report of 30 September 1943 mentioned above; *BW* 33, consisting merely of “30 barracks for inmate property”, appears for the first time in a “List of structures, for buildings, exterior and auxiliary facilities for the construction project of a prisoners-of-war camp Auschwitz, Upper Silesia,” dated 9 April 1943.¹⁰⁰

It should also be kept in mind that the term “special measures” did not have the sinister meaning which orthodox Holocaust historiography wants to attribute to it. It referred to simple construction measures, in particular to those of hygienic-sanitary character. Following SS-*Brigadeführer* Kammler’s visit to Auschwitz on 7 May 1943, a comprehensive program for the improvement of the camp’s hygienic and sanitary installations was launched. In the documents this program is called either “special measures” (*Sondermassnahme*), “instant programm” (*Sofortprogramm*), “special construction measures” (*Sonderbaumaussnahmen*) or even “special operation” (*Sonderaktion*). On 16 May 1943, Bischoff sent a letter to Kammler with the subject “Special measure for the improvement of sanitation facilities in the Auschwitz PoW camp.”¹⁰¹

At least since 30 May 1943, Bischoff regularly sent reports to Kammler with the subject “Construction report on the special measures in the PoW camp.”¹⁰² These reports are known at least until 23 November 1943.¹⁰³ Starting with 13 July 1943, the headline changed to “Report on the progress of work on the special measures in the PoW camp and the Main Camp.”¹⁰⁴ Among the projects described stand out those related to “disinfestation facility” and the “inmate hospital” in Birkenau’s Construction Sector II and the “inmate hospital” in Construction Sector III.

In this historical and documentary context, the authors’ interpretation is puerile, disconnected and specious, but it is also at odds with the dogmas of orthodox historiography.

As I pointed out earlier, by 30 September 1943 “Bunker 1” is said to have been demolished for several months and did no longer exist. How could it therefore be “remodeled”? And what’s the point of remodeling it anyhow, if

⁹⁹ Note that this is already in itself illogical, because in that case “Bunker 2” would chronologically and administratively precede “Bunker 1,” since the letter “a” affixed to the number of a structure would indicate a sub-structure. For example, the crematorium in the Main Camp was labeled *BW* 11, while *BW* 11a referred to the crematorium’s new chimney.

¹⁰⁰ RGVA, 502-1-267, p. 17.

¹⁰¹ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 309.

¹⁰² RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 283.

¹⁰³ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 189.

¹⁰⁴ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 118.

the same historians of the Auschwitz Museum declare that it was no longer used? As results from the Map No. 2503 of the inmate hospital dated 18 June 1943,¹⁰⁵ the building claimed to have been “Bunker 1” had been demolished, and in its location now existed the sewage-treatment plant “Temp. septic tank BW 18.”¹⁰⁶ It follows that the “existing home” in Construction Sector III could only have been one of the three homes (numbered 586, 587 and 588) which appear on Map No. 2215 of March 1943 at the northern edge of the camp.¹⁰⁷

As mentioned above, the “Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215” of March 1942 not only does *not* confirm the existence of “Bunker 2” at Birkenau, it actually proves that neither “Bunker 1” nor “Bunker 2” ever existed as such at all, that is, as existing houses taken over by the Central Construction Office and remodeled to serve as homicidal “gas chambers.” Plus there is no paper trail at all for any of the work that would have been required (water supply, sewerage, construction of fences and guard towers, installation of a power line, erection of undressing barracks, transportation of materials, installation of a field railroad, road works, and all the work in a more narrow sense for creating homicidal gas chambers; see Mattogno 2004a, pp. 40-43).

[18] Document 18 (pp. 93-96)

This is the “Cost estimate for extension of POW camp of the *Waffen-SS* in Auschwitz” of 1 October 1943 which I already mentioned in my discussion of Document 17. The content is identical. In the section about Construction Sector II, the following text is written beneath BW 33:¹⁰⁸

“Remodeling of an existing house for special measures: (blueprint not available)

3 pcs. barracks for special measures (Type 260/9) (drawing no. 5)”

In the section about Construction Sector III, in this document labeled “inmate hospital,” we find almost the identical text:¹⁰⁹

“Remodeling of an existing house for special measures: (blueprint not available)

3 ps. barracks for special measures (Type 260/9) (drawing no. 5)”

The authors dwell on the statement “blueprint not available” and claim:

“In both cases it was indicated (in what was an exception to the usual practice) that no plans had been drawn up for the buildings (Zeichnung

¹⁰⁵ RGVA, 502-2-93, p. 2.

¹⁰⁶ “K.L. Auschwitz – Bauabschnitt III Häftlingslazarett u. Quarantäne-Abt.” RGVA, 502-2-110, p. 36. See DOCUMENT 12.

¹⁰⁷ “Bebauungsplan für den Auf- u. Ausbau des Konzentrationslagers u. Kriegsgefangenenlagers, Plan Nr. 2215” of March 1943. RGVA, 502-1-94, p. 2. See DOCUMENT 13.

¹⁰⁸ RGVA, 502-2-60, p. 86.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

nicht vorhanden). *This was surely in order to reduce to a minimum the number of people who knew the true purpose of the investment.*” (p. 92)

This explanation is unfounded and illogical. The most sensible thing that can be inferred from this document is that the Central Construction Office had not yet ordered the staff of the surveying department to draft blueprints for the two houses. For this reason the cost estimate is only approximate for both houses: “z.b.N. RM 14242” (z.b.N. = *zur besten Näherung* – best approximation).

As I explained earlier, according to the historians at the Auschwitz Museum, “Bunker 1” had been demolished at the end of March 1943, hence it did not exist anymore in September 1943. BW 33a, which is the structure referred to with the entry “remodeling of an existing house,” could therefore not have been “Bunker 1.”

The blueprint for the house merely served to estimate the cost of the work. In the cost estimate in question, this calculation is based on three elements: the surface, height and cost per cubic meter. How could a blueprint like for example the one of House No. 647 in Budy (Mattogno 2004a, Document 5, p. 199), with the partition wall and the ceiling height indicated, reveal “the true purpose of the investment”? Here the authors merely suggest between the lines what they are thinking, thus inviting misunderstandings: Are they suggesting that the two houses in question were already “Bunkers” 1 and 2 at the time when this document was created (Sept./Oct. 1943)? The question should be rhetorical in nature, but the answer is not obvious at all. In fact, if the answer is yes – as it should be according to the orthodox narrative – then what were the two houses to be remodeled into? If “special measures” was a “code word” for homicidal gassings, the authors’ interpretation would be senseless, because then two already existing gassing facilities would be converted into ... gassing facilities! Conversely, if in September 1943 it was planned to convert two existing houses into gassing facilities, they could have had no relationship whatsoever to the elusive “bunkers,” because the Auschwitz Museum has never claimed that, in addition to the two legendary “bunkers,” there existed two other gassing facilities. Hence, the inevitable consequence is that the criminal interpretation of these two documents (17 and 18) is documentarily and historically untenable. Also because, as we shall see below (comments on Document 36), the authors overlook a key element in the correct interpretation of the document.

[19] Document 19 (p. 99)

This is part of a topographical map of 28 October 1943 titled “Topographical survey to the west of Construction Sector II.” The authors claim that this map shows

“the no longer existing forest road (Waldweg) running from the western edge of construction segment II to bunker II. Victims doomed to die in the gas chamber were led along this road. In aerial reconnaissance photographs from 1944, the road is visible and ends between the barracks used as undressing rooms.” (p. 98)

This argument is utter nonsense. Since the elusive “Bunker 2” used to be a residential house, it is all too obvious that it was connected by a road leading to the village of Brzezinka (Birkenau). Indeed, there were several roads. From a 1941 map it can be gleaned that three roads radiated out from the two houses located in the area of the alleged “Bunker 2.” One of them was the so-called “forest road.”¹¹⁰ This road also appears on Map No. 2215 of March 1943 (DOCUMENT 8), where, just beyond the camp fence, the four decantation basins of the sewage-treatment plant jut out from the road.

Only the authors know what the presence of this road could possibly prove. Is the mere claim that it may have led to an alleged gassing facility supposed to be proof for the facility’s existence? If that were so, then any Birkenau map showing the *Hauptstrasse* (Main Street) of the Birkenau Camp leading to Crematoria II and III, and the *B Strasse* (B Street) leading to Crematoria IV and V,¹¹¹ would prove the existence of gassing facilities. That claim is absurd.

[20] Document 20 (p. 101)

These are actually two documents. The first, a letter from the SS Garrison Administration to the Auschwitz Central Construction Office of 18 March 1944, is about the installation of an alarm siren:

“For this purpose, we ask therefore to make available to the Camp Headquarters the wire – 4 x 6 m[m]² 1 KV – leading to Bunker I., Birkenau, which is no longer needed.”

This is followed by the Central Construction Office’s reply of 24 March 1944:

“The Central Construction Office is willing to make available to the camp headquarters, for the sirens’ control line and on a loan basis, the wire 4 x 6 mm² which extends from the provisional supply line to Bunker I, Birkenau.”

The authors claim:

“This correspondence is evidence of the fact that the area where bunker I was located was not a part of ongoing extermination operations at the time, and the installations there were in the process of being dismantled and put to other uses.” (p. 100)

¹¹⁰ RGVA 502-2-93, p. 15a. See DOCUMENT 14.

¹¹¹ Especially the Central Construction Office’s Map No. 3512 of 7 February 1944, “*Absteckungsskizze der Wachtürme um das K.G.L.*” RGVA, 502-2-95, p. 19.

This conjecture contradicts the orthodox version of history as defended by the Auschwitz Museum, which is based on testimonies, according to which “Bunker 1 and the barracks erected next to it were demolished or disassembled, the local burning pits were filled in and leveled,” as I have explained when discussing Document 16. If “Bunker 1” was not demolished in 1943, then the statement by witness Szlama Dragon that it had been must be declared false.

The fact is, however, that, although the alleged “Bunker 2” appears together with another building next to it on the two maps “Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215” of March 1943, there is no trace of the four buildings in the area around the alleged location of “Bunker 1” (DOCUMENTS 6 & 8). The latter is also not included on Map No. 2503 of the inmate hospital in BA III of 18 June 1943 (DOCUMENT 12). Under these circumstances, there is no doubt that in March 1944 the house called “Bunker 1” had not existed anymore for more than a year.

Regarding the fundamental “Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215” another childish trick of the authors should be noted, who cut off the right margin (= north) of the map so as to exclude the area of “Bunker 1” (DOCUMENT 15), just so that the reader does not notice that the same map which, according to the authors, proves the existence of “Bunker 2” with its alleged undressing barracks actually demonstrates the *non-existence* of “Bunker 1” (DOCUMENT 16).

As to the electricians detail working on Order No. 1888 of 22 August 1942 (see the discussion of Document 11), setting aside the ridiculous mistranslation of the term “lighting outlets” (*Brennstellen*) as “burning sites,” orthodox historians should actually claim that this was the electric wire installed for “Bunker 1,” although it would have been rather late, since this alleged gassing facility is said to have started operations almost two months earlier. It should be noted, however, that the wire in question had a cross section of $4 \times 10 \text{ mm}^2$, while the one mentioned in the letter of 18 March 1944 was $4 \times 6 \text{ mm}^2$, so it wasn’t the same wire. The authors’ interpretation of these three documents is therefore contradictory and moreover unfounded.

Document 20 shows, however, that in March 1944 there existed a “Bunker I” in Birkenau: what was it? Was this the alleged gassing facility?

This can be ruled out for various reasons.

First of all, as I stated above, the structure called “Bunker 1” by orthodox historians was demolished and no longer existed after March-April 1943, so in March 1944 the garrison administration could not refer to it as an existing structure. But since this structure existed, it could not be the legendary “Bunker 1.” Given the scarcity of construction materials at Auschwitz, it is unlikely that a precious electric wire, after the structure had been demolition, was left in place and abandoned for a year rather than being immediately recovered and stored.

Second, the Auschwitz Museum has in its possession some 130,000 pages of documents created during the war by the Central Construction Office of Auschwitz. As the authors tell us in their introduction (p. 24), the museum historians have at last studied these documents carefully, and they concluded that this is the only reference to a “Bunker I” (and that there is no reference at all to a “Bunker II”).

Third, in relation to alleged gassing installations, the term “bunker” was never in use among the witnesses before the end of World War II. I reiterate here what I have found on the subject in my specific study (2004a, pp. 75f.).

At the time of his Soviet deposition, Szlama Dragon, the most important witness, did not yet know the terms “Bunker 1” and “Bunker 2,” allegedly used even by the SS. In this deposition he speaks always of “gazokamera” (газокамера) Nos. 1 and 2 and states explicitly that this was the official designation:

“I was taken to the gas chamber called gas chamber no. 2.”

In the later Polish deposition, the term for these alleged extermination installations becomes “bunker”:

“This chamber was designated Bunker no. 2. In addition to it, at a distance of about 500 meters, there was another chamber, indicated as Bunker no. 1.”

The term occurs here with the same frequency as the term “gazokamera” in the preceding deposition. However, in this deposition Dragon is still unaware of the other two designations, “*czerwony domek*” (little red house) for “Bunker 1” and “*biały domek*” (little white house) for “Bunker 2,” which were invented a few years later during the Höss trial.

The fact that in February-March 1945 the above-mentioned orthodox terminology was still unknown is also clear from the deposition of Henryk Tauber, dated 27 and 28 February 1945, in which he refers to the “bunkers” merely as “gas chambers” (газовые камеры). The same is true for the Polish-Soviet investigators who, in their report prepared between 14 February and 18 March 1945, never use the term “bunker” but speak only of “gas chambers” (газовые камеры) nos. 1 and 2.

The term “bunker” appears for the first time in the 16 April 1945 deposition of Stanisław Jankowski, which was concocted between 9 March and 16 April 1945. The necessity for a proper term for these two claimed killing facilities was obvious: in a legal procedure it was unacceptable that two buildings of the Auschwitz Camp, in which, as was alleged, hundreds of thousands of Jews had been murdered, did not even have an official name! Hence the alleged “official” designations of “Bunker 1” and “Bunker 2,” where the term “bunker” was simply taken from the term sometimes used for the building of

the old crematorium of the Main Camp, which before World War II had been at times an ammunition bunker or a food-storage facility.¹¹²

This also explains the wide range of meanings the term had for the “eye-witnesses.” For example, Henryk Mandelbaum, deported to Auschwitz on 23 April 1944, and assigned to the so-called “special unit” in early June, the term “bunker” designated, in fact, only the alleged semi-underground gas chambers of Crematoria II and III. At the trial of the Auschwitz camp garrison he declared:¹¹³

“In Crematoria III and IV [= IV and V in today’s numbering], the gas chambers were smaller than those of Crematoria I and II [= II and III in today’s numbering]. These crematoria were of a new kind: they could accommodate a transport of 3,000 persons. This bunker was some 50 m long and divided into two parts. In this bunker, there was a bath with showers and faucets, and a normal person entering it could believe that it was, indeed, a bath, [...]”

Four self-proclaimed members of the 1944 *Sonderkommando* of “Bunker 2” were interviewed by Gideon Greif in the late 1980s/early 1990s. They declared unanimously that the “bunker” was not a gassing facility but rather a cremation pit:

– Josef Sackar: When asked “Can you describe the ‘bunker’?” the witness answered (Greif 1995, p. 10):

“Yes, it was a large pit, to which the corpses were brought and then dumped in.”

– Jaacov Gabai: (*ibid.*, p. 132)

“Pits were arranged there to burn the corpses that the Crematorium itself could not handle. Those pits were called ‘bunker.’ I worked there for three days. From the gas chamber, one brought the corpses to the bunker and burned them.”

– Eliezer Eisenschmidt: (*ibid.*, p. 178)

“They themselves then threw the corpses into the pits. The pits, or ‘bunkers’ as we called them, were large and deep.”

– Shaul Chasan: (*ibid.*, p. 228)

“There was, in the area, a basin, a deep pit, which was called ‘bunker’.”

It should be noted here that the German term “bunker,” according to Germany’s definitive dictionary, the *Duden*, has as its primary meaning a “large container for storing bulk material (e.g. coal, ore, grain).”¹¹⁴ As a secondary

¹¹² Pressac 1989, p. 129; for example in “*Baubericht über den Stand der Bauarbeiten für das Bauvorhaben Konzentrationslager Auschwitz*” of April 15, 1942, one can read: “*Krematorium: Im vorhandenen Bunker eingebaut...*” (RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 320).

¹¹³ AGK, NTN, 162, p. 165.

¹¹⁴ www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/Bunker

meaning it refers to a “military shelter facility,” frequently to a “shelter for the civilian population during war; air-raid shelter.” As a third meaning this term refers to a prison in the vernacular.¹¹⁵ It never refers to an execution facility, though.

At the end of the day, we don’t know what this “Bunker I” mentioned in the discussed documents actually was. But if considering the official use of this term at Auschwitz:

- it was used for instance for Crematorium I, a former munitions and food storage building (“bunker” Meaning No. 1) later remodeled to serve as an air-raid shelter (“bunker” Meaning No. 2);
- it was used for many air-raid shelters throughout the camp (Meaning No. 2; see the discussion of Document 35 starting on p. 113 of the present study; and Document 39, starting on p. 122);
- it was used in the term “*Kartoffelbunker*” for a potato storage area (again Meaning no. 1; see my comments on Document 44 starting on p. 126);

then it is difficult to believe that it could be attributed to a normal house not used to store bulk items or as a reinforced air-raid-protection facility.

As mentioned earlier, based solely on these two documents, the authors have changed the hitherto unchallenged Arab numbers of the alleged “bunkers” to Roman numbers.

In conclusion, the presence of the term “Bunker I” in a document in no way proves that there was a “Bunker 1” at Birkenau in terms of a homicidal gassing facility, such as the presence of the term “*Gaskammer*” (gas chamber) in other documents (such as the blueprints of the disinfestation facilities *BW* 5a and 5b) does not demonstrate that homicidal gas chambers existed at Birkenau.

As is all too obvious, everything depends on the context in which these terms are found, but in the case of this “Bunker I” there is no context, because these documents only contain the term without any further explanation. It is therefore foolish to consider Document 20 a proof for the existence of the legendary “Bunker 1.”

III. Section “The Barracks for Undressing at Bunkers I and II”

[21] Document 21 (pp. 105-107)

This is the well-known “Construction Report for the Month of May 1942,” in which the following remark can be found among the description of work done in the PoW camp:¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ For instance, the basement jail in Block 11 at the Auschwitz Main Camp was generally referred to as the “bunker”; Mattogno 2005b, *passim*; see also p. 101 of this study.

¹¹⁶ RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 263.

“In addition, 2 barracks (horse-stable barracks) were erected outside the PoW camp.”

The authors comment:

“Apart from the yard of bunker I, there was no other place outside the camp fence at Birkenau where barracks of any kind were erected at this time.” (p. 104)

This is clearly a forced conclusion of convenience but, as we shall see, it is in contrast to the Auschwitz Museum’s orthodox version of “Bunker 1.”

The two barracks in question are not mentioned in any other document, and they do not appear in any map of this period, so it is impossible to say with certainty where they were erected. But “outside the camp fence” did not limit the possibilities to the north-west (the direction of the alleged “Bunker 1”). In particular, the north and east sides were surrounded by buildings taken over by the Central Construction Office. About thirty houses were located near the northeast corner of the camp. They made up what was left of the village of Brzezinka, and some of them were already being remodeled in April, not to mention their “exterior” (*Aussenanlagen*), which are listed in the “Explanatory report on the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S,” written by Bischoff on 15 July 1942, which includes, among other things, two residential and work barracks (*BW 55*), and three housing barracks for labor details (*BW 56*).¹¹⁷

The two barracks in question, therefore, are not inextricably linked to “Bunker 1,” as the authors claim. On the contrary. Piper says that “Bunker 1,” as indicated by Czech, went into operation “already in March 1942,” and he adds (referring to six testimonies) that “next to the house stood a barn and two sheds already installed during the remodeling works” (Piper 1999, p. 159). If that is so, then it follows that the two barracks were built as early as March 1942. How, then, can the authors point to “Bunker 1” as the location where the two barracks were erected outside the Birkenau Camp in the month of *May* – although they do not know where they were actually set up?

But there is another far more important issue. The authors claim that the construction report of May 1942 mentions the two alleged barracks of “Bunker 1”; if that is so, how come this document does not contain any reference to the “remodeling” of this “bunker”? This also applies to the construction report of March¹¹⁸ and June,¹¹⁹ the respective months when “Bunker 1” and “Bunker 2” are said to have been set up, if we follow the orthodox narrative. And why does the construction report of June contain no reference either to the three barracks allegedly installed in the course of that month as “undressing huts” near “Bunker 2”?

¹¹⁷ RGVA, 502-1-220, p. 5.

¹¹⁸ RGVA, 502-1-24, pp. 380-386.

¹¹⁹ RGVA, 502-1-24, pp. 219-225.

Yet exactly for this time period the remodeling of existing structures is richly documented. The “Activity and construction report for the month of March 1942,” drawn up on 1 April 1942 by SS-*Schütze* Werner Jothann, lists work done in houses no. 130, 132, 150, 152, 151 and 171, which were part of the “officers and NCOs accommodations.”¹²⁰ The report headlined “Work done in the period 26 March to 25 April 1942” of the inmate painter detail describes the work carried out in House Nos. 151, 136, 1, 25, 130 and 132.¹²¹

From the authors’ perspective, the alleged gassing facilities had very precise official names: The “bunkers” and “houses for special measures.” If that was so, these structures should appear as such in the documents pertaining to the camp’s construction, but they do not.

In this context, therefore, we should not be surprised by the presence of two barracks of unknown purpose somewhere outside the camp, but by the total absence of any sign about the restructuring of the alleged “bunkers.”

[22] Document 22 (pp. 109), 23 (p. 111) and 24 (pp. 113-115)

These documents must be considered together, because they deal with the same matter, which I treat chronologically (see Mattogno 2004b, pp. 43-47).

On 31 March 1942, Bischoff prepared a list of structures planned as well as already constructed at Auschwitz, which the authors don’t mention. *BW* 58 is described as follows:¹²²

“5 horse-stable barracks (special treatment) 4 in Birkenau 1 in Budy.”

In the first version of this document – it bears the same date – the existence of the *BW* is announced in the following handwritten memo:¹²³

*“5 horse-stable barracks/special treatment 4 in Birkenau 1 in Bor-Budy.”*¹²⁴

A letter by Bischoff to Office C/V of the SS-WVHA dated 9 June 1942 (Document 22) states:¹²⁵

“For the special treatment of the Jews, the camp commandant of the concentration camp, SS Stubaf. Höss, has applied orally for the erection of 4 horse-stable barracks for the accommodation of personal effects. It is

¹²⁰ RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 398.

¹²¹ RGVA, 502-1-24, pp. 370f. See DOCUMENTS 17, 17a.

¹²² “Aufteilung der Bauwerke (BW) für die Bauten, Aussen- und Nebenanlagen des Bauvorhabens Konzentrationslager Auschwitz O/S” of 31 March 1942. RGVA, 502-1-267, pp. 3-13, here p. 8; reproduced in Mattogno 2004b, Document 5, pp. 114f.

¹²³ “Aufteilung der Bauwerke (BW) für die Bauten, Aussen- und Nebenanlagen des Bauvorhabens Konzentrationslager Auschwitz O/S” of 31 March 1942. RGVA, 502-1-210, pp. 20-29, here p. 25; reproduced in Mattogno 2004b, Document 6, pp. 116f.

¹²⁴ The Bor-Budy area – two villages about 4 km south of Birkenau – was the location of the so-called “*Wirtschaftshof Budy*”, a secondary camp, in which chiefly agricultural tasks were performed. The actual camp (men and women’s secondary camp) was located in Bor.

¹²⁵ RGVA, 502-1-275, p. 56; reproduced in 2004b, Document 7, p. 118.

asked that the application be approved, since the matter is extremely urgent and the effects must absolutely be brought under shelter."

On 16 June Bischoff reported to the SS-WVHA (Document 23):

"Following an oral application of camp commander SS-Stubaf. Höss, one horse-stable barrack was erected in Bor for the accommodation of female inmates."

The "Explanatory Report on the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S", written by Bischoff on 15 July 1942, mentions as BW 58 "5 barracks for special treatment of inmates."¹²⁶ The attached "Cost estimate for the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz, Upper Silesia" specifies, at a total cost of 75,000 RM¹²⁷ (Document 24):

*"BW 58 5 Barracks for special treatment and lodging of prisoners, horse-stable barracks Type 260/9 (O.K.H.)
4 barracks for special treatment of prisoners in Birkenau
1 barrack for the lodging of prisoners in Bor"*

The authors explain that the barrack of Document 23 was intended for the "external Kommando" at Budy-Bór (p. 110), and then they insist that of the five barracks mentioned in Document 24:

"four are designated for use in the 'special treatment of prisoners in Birkenau' (Sonderbehandlung der Häftlinge in Birkenau), that is, for the storage of property plundered from the victims of extermination ('Kanada I'), while one is to be used in the Auschwitz sub-camp in Budy-Bór as housing for women prisoners." (p. 112)

In their comments, the authors neither say openly that the four barracks belonged to the "bunkers" (although the documents in question appear in the section "The Barracks for Undressing at Bunkers I and II"), nor that "special treatment" was a "code word" meaning the gassing of Jews in the "bunker," so what exactly are they trying to prove by citing these documents? This only becomes clear in their comments on Document 25.

[23] Document 25 (p. 117)

This is a list titled "Distribution of Barracks" written by Bischoff on 30 June 1942 which lists all barracks planned for the construction project Auschwitz-Birkenau.

The authors assert that the document mentions

"three undressing barracks situated at bunker I, defined as storage barracks within the framework of the 'special treatment' operation then underway (Effektenbaracken für Sonderbehandlung). The list indicates that

¹²⁶ RGVA, 502-1-220, p. 5.

¹²⁷ RGVA, 502-1-22, p. 36; reproduced in 2004b, Document 4, p. 113.

the functioning of not two (see document 21) but three barracks for undressing at bunker I can be dated from this moment.” (p. 116)

This comment is an intentional deception. The document lists all the barracks, sorted by type, which belonged to all sectors of the construction project Auschwitz, which in the end is summarized as follows:¹²⁸

<i>I.) Prisoner-of-War Camp Auschwitz</i>	<i>516 pieces</i>
<i>II.) Agriculture Auschwitz</i>	<i>55 pieces</i>
<i>III.) SS accommodations C.C. Auschwitz</i>	<i>54 pieces</i>
<i>IV.) Construction depot</i>	<i>24 pieces</i>
<i>V.) Main camp for housekeeping Auschwitz</i>	<i>2 pieces. ”</i>

The barracks for “special treatment,” however, were not part of the Birkenau Camp, but of the Auschwitz Main Camp, so they could not have any relationship with the “bunkers” at Birkenau. In fact, in the section “SS accommodations and C.C. Auschwitz” the document lists the following types of 260/9 barracks:

<i>1.) Barracks for personal effects erected near temp. delousing in C.C.</i>	<i>4 pieces</i>
<i>2.) Barracks for personal effects for special treatment</i>	<i>3 pieces</i>
<i>3.) Barracks for personal effects in women’s C.C.</i>	<i>1 piece</i>
<i>4.) Accommodation barracks Bor</i>	<i>1 piece”</i>

Therefore, of the five barracks in question, only three were specifically intended for “special treatment,” although merely for storing personal belongings of inmates in the Main Camp.

The authors’ implied reasoning is as follows: The four barracks mentioned in Documents 22 and 24 were erected at “Kanada I,” which was structure *BW* 28, the “barracks for delousing and personal effects.” The “Distribution of Barracks” mentions four barracks at this structure (called “temporary delousing”). So the authors reason that three “barracks for personal effects for special treatment” must have been something else than the above “4 barracks for special treatment of prisoners in Birkenau.” For the authors, it follows that they must have belonged to “Bunker 1,” which therefore had not two undressing barracks, as Document 21 seems to suggest, but three.

This reasoning is unfounded, as is its conclusion.

First of all, as is already clear from the list of Auschwitz structures of 31 March 1942 mentioned above, the structure “Kanada I,” which was *BW* 28, was indeed called “reception barrack with delousing,” while the five barracks for special treatment formed *BW* 58, so they had no relationship with *BW* 28. The four barracks that belonged to it were erected in June 1942, as is clear from the construction report of that month:¹²⁹

¹²⁸ RGVA, 502-1-275, pp. 270-273.

¹²⁹ “Baubericht für Monat Juni 1942.” RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 221.

*“B.W. 28 temp. reception barrack with delousing
Construction work has been finished. In addition, 4 prefabricated barracks
(horse-stable barracks) were erected thereat.”*

Next, as stated above, the distribution of barracks in question explicitly states that the three “barracks for personal effects for special treatment” were part of the construction project “SS accommodations and C.C. Auschwitz,” not of the “prisoner-of-war camp” (first section of the document), so they could not belong to the elusive “Bunker I” of Birkenau.

Finally, as noted casually by the authors, their interpretation of this document contradicts their interpretation of Document 21. The latter mentions the erection of two horse-stable barracks outside the PoW camp in May, which they associate with “Bunker I.” However, Bischoff’s letter of 9 June 1942 (Document 22) says that on that date, “for the special treatment of the Jews, camp commandant of the concentration camp, SS-*Stubaf.* Höss, has applied orally for the erection of 4 horse-stable barracks for the accommodation of personal effects.” That means these four barracks did not yet exist on 9 June, while the two barracks outside the camp existed already during the previous month. If we apply the authors’ logic, this would mean that after June 1942 “Bunker I” wouldn’t have two or three, but rather six barracks!

In reality there is no doubt that the three “Barracks for personal effects for special treatment” of the “Distribution the barracks” list in question were part of the five barracks of BW 58, as is clear from the reference to “Accommodation barracks Bor.”

[24] Document 26 (p. 121)

This is another, well-known list of barracks titled “Auschwitz Concentration Camp. Distribution of barracks” from 17 July 1942, which I published elsewhere (2004b, p. 120).

This is the authors’ comment:

“On page 2 it is noted that a total of five type 260/9 barracks are required for carrying out the ‘special treatment’ operation (Verwendungszweck-Sonderbehandlung). Three of them had been installed as of this date, with the other two waiting to be installed.

These were the barracks used for undressing at bunkers I and II. According to earlier documents, three barracks of this type were in place at bunker I at this point, and therefore the other two were to be erected next to bunker II.” (p. 120)

This reasoning is fallacious and inconsistent. The document under discussion has seven columns with the following headings: “purpose of use,” “type [of barracks],” “needed,” “erected,” “to be erected,” “stored.” “pending.” This is the line that interests us:

<i>purpose of use</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>needed</i>	<i>erected</i>	<i>to be erected</i>	<i>stored</i>	<i>pending</i>
<i>special treatment</i>	260/9	5	3	2	/	2

These are clearly the five barracks mentioned in Bischoff's explanatory report of 15 July 1942. In the original list they are referred to as "5 barracks for special treatment of inmates" which in turn, as we have seen, correspond to the five barracks for "special treatment" in the list of 31 March 1942. None of them, as I have demonstrated above, had any relationship with the elusive "bunkers" of Birkenau.

[25] Document 27 (pp. 123f.)

This is the "Report about the inspection of the Auschwitz Concentration Camp by SS-Obergruppenführer Pohl on 23 September 1942," which describes the course of the inspection: protective custody camp (=Auschwitz), construction depot, DAW (Deutsche Ausrüstungswerke workshops), delousing chamber and storage of personal effects (resettlement of Jews), new horse stable farm, Birkenau Camp.

A comparison with the detailed description of Pohl's inspection, after his visit to the DAW workshops, shows that the delousing chamber and storage of personal effects (resettlement of Jews) was identical with the "delousing chamber and storage of personal effects/Aktion Reinhard,"¹³⁰ that is, "Kanada I" (see comments on Document 14).

This resettlement of Jews corresponded to the "migration to the East" mentioned in Pohl's report to Himmler of 16 September 1942: Minister Speer needed 50,000 able-bodied workers who were to be selected at Auschwitz from the migration to the East. The document says explicitly:¹³¹

"The able-bodied Jews intended for the migration to the east will therefore have to interrupt their journey and perform armament work."

Resettlement of Jews and migration to the east were synonyms referring to the Jewish deportation to the East via Auschwitz. According to this document, the Jews fit for labor were kept at Auschwitz, who therefore interrupted their journey, while those unable to work continued their journey to the East. This operation of keeping able-bodied Jews at Auschwitz was called "special treatment of the Jews." This "special treatment" had therefore nothing to do with mythical homicidal gassings.

[26] Document 28 (p. 127)

This is a list of structures titled "Structures of the Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz in the 3rd budget year of war." The page in question concerns the "structures which were added to the priority list

¹³⁰ RGVA, 502-1-19, p. 86.

¹³¹ BAK, NS 19/14, p. 132; see Mattogno 2004b, pp. 53, 82; Mattogno/Kues/Graf 2015, pp. 521-524.

of the defense district” (*Bauten, welche die in Wehrkreisrangfolgeliste aufgenommen wurden*) for the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz. The first five columns refer to “serial no.,” “construction project,” “GBBau Nr.” (a project’s ID number on the lists of the Speer ministry’s construction sector), “percent complete,” “total costs.”

Items 20 and 21 contain the following entries:

“20Delousing bar. a. 4 inmate property bar. VIII Za1 (1) 100% 80,000.--
21Special tr. 5 barracks as before 100% 90,000.--”

The authors claim the five barracks for “special treatment,” had been assigned as follows:

“three undressing barracks at bunker I and two at bunker II” (p. 126)

As I have shown above, such a claim is completely unfounded. The authors, among other things, forget to explain why the five barracks, if they were located at Birkenau, were part of construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz rather than construction project PoW camp.

The “Plan of the prisoner-of-war camp of Auschwitz Upper Silesia” of 28 October 1942 shows two barracks for “inmate belongings,” both at the western border of the camp, one in BA II, close to the southeast angle of the *Effektenlager*, the other in BA III, close to the first of the two morgues (*Leichenhallen*).¹³²

[27] Document 29 (pp. 129-131)

This is another distribution list of barracks, dated 8 December 1942, which is a well-known document published by me (2004b, p. 121.).

On p. 3, under the heading “PoW camp,” appears an entry relating to “special treatment (old),” according to which five barracks Type 260/9 were needed, five had already been erected, and none were pending. Here is the translated text of this entry:

<i>purpose of use</i>	<i>type</i>	<i>needed</i>	<i>already erected</i>	<i>pending</i>
<i>special treatment (old)</i>	260/9	5	5	/

This entry is listed under Construction Sector I, which further detracts from the authors’ claim that they had been installed near the elusive “Bunkers” 1 and 2, which, administratively speaking, would have belonged to the area of Sectors II and III, respectively. These all in all (5+5=) ten barracks were most likely “Station 2 of Aktion Reinhard.”

The authors’ comment on this is bizarre and senseless:

“The use in this list of the term ‘old special treatment site’ (*Sonderbehandlung alt*) must certainly have resulted from the fact that, as of December

¹³² “Lageplan des Kriegsgefangenenlagers Auschwitz O/S. Plan Nr. 1782” of 28 October 1942. VHA, Fond OT 31(2)/8.

1942, the construction of the ‘new’ crematoria and gas chambers was already quite advanced.” (p. 128)

The translation is misleading, because special treatment was not implemented on a “site” (in Polish: *miejsce*), but was rather a general operation. The “old” special treatment referred undoubtedly to the old special treatment procedure, which was replaced in October 1942 by the new procedure, by virtue of which the entire construction project “PoW camp Auschwitz” received the official title “implementation of special treatment” (see Mattogno 2004b, pp. 38f., 72-75). I will return to this fundamental issue when discussing Document 64.

[28] Document 30 (p. 133)

This is another list of barracks headlined “As of 7 Feb. 1943 the barracks listed below have been installed.” Among other entries, it lists five horse-stable barracks for a “special unit.” The authors argue that these barracks are “associated with bunkers I and II” because they “appear under the rubric ‘Sonderkommando’ (*Sonder Kdo.*)” (p. 132).

Here the authors commit the same inane circular reasoning that I mentioned earlier: they assume *a priori* that the *Sonderkommando* was inextricably linked to the legendary “bunkers” without supporting this with even the vaguest documentary hint. Then they deduce from the presence of the term *Sonderkommando* the existence of the “bunkers.” Their explanation is also illogical because in the document in question the term *Sonderkommando* indicates the barracks’ purpose of use, as results from other entries in it, beginning with the preceding one (*Entwesung*, disinfestation). At the alleged “bunkers,” however, the claimed undressing barracks were not to be used by the members of the *Sonderkommando*, if we follow the orthodox narrative, but rather as undressing huts by the inmate victims who were to be gassed.

According to the authors’ logical fallacy, the purpose of use should have been “special treatment of the Jews,” *i.e.*, alleged homicidal gassing, or the “old” special treatment as it appears in the list of 8 December 1942. From this list we learn that a disinfestation facility existed as part of the construction project concentration camp (Auschwitz), for which they planned five barracks Type 260/9, another one in construction project construction depot (*Bauhof*, Kanada I), which involved seven barracks of the same type, two of which were already erected and five more were to be erected. In the list of 7 February 1943 under discussion, a first disinfestation facility with five barracks is listed, a second with two, followed immediately by the “special unit” with five barracks. In this list the “special treatment (old)” of Sector BI is no longer mentioned, but not even a reference to the five still missing barracks for the disinfestation facility appears here. This indicates that the five barracks for “special unit” of this document are precisely the five barracks of the disinfestation facility that were still missing two months earlier, and that the special

unit in question was a disinfection detail, the “special unit pest control” or “*Sonderkommando Reinhardt*” whose members worked at the “Station 2 of Action Reinhardt.” Their intended use was the storage of personal belongings of Jews subject to the migration to the East, as is confirmed by the next document.

[29] Document 31 (pp. 135f.)

This is a “file memorandum regarding the barracks and permanent buildings presently used for the storage of personal effects,” written by Bischoff on 10 February 1943.¹³³

The authors assert:

“At the head of the list are facilities referred to as ‘Sonderkommando I’ and ‘Sonderkommando II,’ each of which has three adjacent stable-type barracks (now there are six of them, which means that the third barracks at bunker II had been erected over the previous few days—see document 30) used for undressing.” (p. 134)

Here they completely distort the real meaning of this document, which I outlined in another study (2004b, pp. 73f). I will reiterate and expand my elaboration here.

The quantity of personal belongings taken from the – for the most part Jewish – prisoners was huge and consequently required much space. According to a “file memorandum regarding the barracks and permanent buildings presently used for the storage of personal effects” written by Bischoff on February 10, 1943, 31 “horse-stable barracks” with a total surface area of 12,090 m² as well as four walled structures serving as storehouses with a total area of 4,306 m², thus 16,396 m² altogether, were employed for this purpose. In addition there were the 30 barracks of the so-called personal-effects storage, of which 25 had already been built, and the rest were supposed to be finished within fourteen days.

The personal-effects storage was identical with BW 33. It consisted of 25 “personal-property barracks Type 260/9” with dimensions 9.56 m × 40.76 m and five “personal-property barracks Type 501/34 Z.8,” also called “air-force barracks,” which measured 12.64 m × 41.39 m. The construction of the horse-stable barracks (Numbers 1–8 and 13–29) had begun on October 15, 1942, that of the air-force barracks (Numbers 9–12 and 30) on February 4, 1943.¹³⁴

¹³³ “Aktenvermerk über die derzeit für die Lagerung von Effekten verwendeten Baracken und Massivgebäude,” RGVA, 502-1-26, pp. 33f.

¹³⁴ – “Bauantrag zum Ausbau des Kriegsgefangenenlagers der Waffen SS in Auschwitz O/S. Errichtung von 25 Stck. Effektenbaracken. Erläuterungsbericht und Kostenvoranschlag”, March 4, 1944. RGVA, 502-1-230, pp. 95-97.

– “Bestandsplan der 25 Effektenbaracken”, October 20, 1943. RGVA, 502-1-230, p. 100.

– “Bauantrag zum Ausbau des Kriegsgefangenenlagers der Waffen SS in Auschwitz O/S. Errichtung von 25 Effektenbaracken BW 33. Erläuterungsbericht Kostenvoranschlag”, March 4,

Since the personal-effects storage was intended specifically to accommodate personal belongings of prisoners, as soon as it came into operation, the 31 horse-stable barracks initially allocated for this purpose became free for other uses. This is crucial in order to understand the true meaning of the following documents.

According to Bischoff's file memo of 10 February 1943, the following barracks were still available "for the storage of personal effects":¹³⁵

"1. At Special Unit 1, 3 horse-stable barracks

2. At Special Unit 2, 3 horse-stable barracks."

The document explicitly says that these barracks were intended to store personal belongings of prisoners, but then how can the authors seriously claim that these six barracks were used as undressing huts near the elusive "bunkers"? Here, as elsewhere, this is a matter of bad faith, as is reflected further by the fact that they are silent about other documents confirming my interpretation.

In a 1999 article, German orthodox scholars Bertrand Perz and Thomas Sandkühler drew attention to the personnel files of some SS NCOs transferred to Auschwitz in 1942 as part of Operation Reinhard (Perz/Sandkühler 1999, pp. 283-318; see Mattogno 2008, pp. 24-31), a fact confirmed by the authors' Document 61 (p. 221), which lists 12 SS men transferred from Dachau to Auschwitz "for Operation Reinhard." Perz and Sandkühler write (*ibid.*, p. 296):

"Kühnemann^[136] was deployed exclusively at the operation 'resettlement of the Jews,' where he was in charge of supervising, sorting and storing the belongings accumulating at So.[nder]K[omman]do. I and Crematorium II."

The source given by Perz and Sandkühler is a "certificate of service" (*Dienstleistungszeugnis*) of 30 March 1943 (*ibid.*, p. 314, note 110). They also inform us that SS-Hauptscharführer Georg Höcker "watched *Sonderkommandos* I and II and the delousing chambers 1 and 2" (*ibid.*, p. 314, note 113). They also quote the following note by SS-Sturmbannführer Willi Bürger, head of the camp's Section IV – Administration (*ibid.*, p. 296):

"As of 25 September 1942, SS-Hauptscharführer Höcker carries out his duty at the administration CC and SS garrison administration Auschwitz. [...] He was entrusted with supervising the *Sonderkommando* and the disinfection chamber. He was moreover employed as deputy head of the admin-

1944. RGVA, 502-1-230, pp. 103-105.

– "Bestandsplan der Effektenbaracke – Type Luftwaffe", October 22, 1943. RGVA, 502-1-230, p. 108.

¹³⁵ RGVA, 502-1-26, p. 73.

¹³⁶ SS-Unterscharführer Heinz Kühnemann was administrator of inmate belongings (*Effektenverwalter*).

istration of inmate property. From end of September until mid-November 1943 Höcker supervised Disinfestation Chamber I."

The context of the document under review is therefore unequivocally that of storage and pest control of Jewish property: the connection between *Sonderkommando* I and II on the one hand and "storage of personal effects" and "disinfestation chambers" on the other confirms that the *Sonderkommando* I and II in question had nothing to do with any alleged homicidal gas chambers, but had to do precisely with pest control.

Franciszek Piper commented as follows about this (Piper 1995, p. 181):

"Initially, until the commissioning of the 'Kanada I' warehouses, the personal belongings of gassed inmates were stored in the Deposit Warehouses at the Main Camp. These warehouses located next to the DAW workshops, including the disinfection chamber, were surrounded by a barbed-wire fence and were constantly guarded by SS guards on watchtowers. The SS man Wladimir Bilan was the first head of these warehouses, then Georg Höcker since October 1942 [...]."

As Andrzej Strzelecki confirms, this refers to "Kanada I," whose former head was Wladimir Bilan (Strzelecki 1999, p. 199). Hence Höcker was the head of this storage area precisely since October 1942.

Strzelecki also states that neither Kühnemann nor Höcker has ever been accused by witnesses of having been involved in any extermination activities (*ibid.*, p. 140). This is not quite true, though, because Höcker is mentioned as "*Hauptscharführer* and head of disinfestation I Auschwitz I"¹³⁷ as well as an alleged "murderer" in a list of former SS men from various concentration camps drawn up on 16 December 1946 by former Auschwitz inmate Adolf Rögner. Kühnemann appears there as "*Unterscharführer*, disinfestation I Auschwitz I," with his alleged "crimes" being thuggery and denouncing Jews.¹³⁸

Finally, the relationship between the belongings of prisoners and Crematorium II remains to be explained. In March 1943 the situation of storing the belongings of the deported Jews was catastrophic, as is clear from a letter by Bischoff to Kammler dated 2 March 1943 with the subject "installing disinfestation barracks," in which we read:¹³⁹

"As can be seen from the letter of the Central Construction Office to the Commandant of the CC, everything possible has been done on this side to provide accommodation for the accumulating effects. If clothing and other items accruing from the transports are stacked in the open, then this is only

¹³⁷ Which confirms that the "Entwesungs- u. Effektenkammer Aktion Reinhardt" – i.e. "Kanada I" – was identical with "Station I" of "Aktion Reinhardt."

¹³⁸ "SS-Beurteilungsliste von ehemaligen SS-Angehörigen verschiedener Konzentrationslager, Auschwitz I, II, III, Dachau, Mauthausen, Melk und Ebensee i/S." AGK, NTN, 118, p. 10, 5.

¹³⁹ RGVA, 502-1-336, p. 77.

due to their improper storage, for which the administration of the concentration camp is responsible. If a major part of the effects stored outdoors is lost due to the weather, then this office cannot be blamed for this at all."

In this situation, the most-likely scenario is that some of the personal effects had been provisionally deposited outdoors near Crematorium II, which had one of the largest open spaces of the entire camp, awaiting the pending entry into operation of the new *Effektenlager*, which was located in the same western sector of the Birkenau Camp where this crematorium was located.

Document 32, which we will discuss next, fully corroborates the interpretation set out above.

In this context, the authors overlooked an important document published several years ago by the Auschwitz Museum, which in fact mentions the term *Sonderkommando* I and II (see DOCUMENT 18). It is from the officer on duty, dated 9-10 December 1942.¹⁴⁰ Here I translate only the most important parts:

"At 12:25 it was reported that 6 inmates had fled from Sonderkommande I [sic...]. At 20:30 Harmenze [sic] called that 2 inmates were apprehended. [...] These were the two Jewish inmates N 36816 + 38313 who had fled early on 7 Dec. 42 from Sonderkom. II."

In her *Auschwitz Chronicle*, Danuta Czech summarizes the reviewed document as follows in an entry of 9 December 1942 (1990, p. 282):

"At 12:25 P.M., the Guard Commander receives the report that six prisoners have escaped from the Special Squad."

She then states that "[t]he two Jewish prisoners, Nos. 36816 and 38313," fled "from Special Squad II." For 10 December she adds (*ibid.*):

"The two Jewish prisoners, Ladislaus Knopp (No. 36816) and Samuel Cu-lea (No. 38313), who escaped from the Special Squad on December 7, are locked in the bunker of Block 11 and released from the bunker to the camp the same day.

*Two Jewish prisoners who escaped from the Special Squad the previous day are captured and sent to the bunker of Block 11. They are Bar Borenstein (No. 74858), born February 10, 1920; and Nojech Borenstein (No. 74859), born March 25, 1925, in Szreńsk. [...] The two of them are probably executed publicly on December 17 in the presence of the Special Squad to terrorize the other prisoners. **"*

In a footnote Czech explains (*ibid.*):

*"** Next to the names of the two prisoners and the entry 'released' is the letter 'Ü'."*

¹⁴⁰ The document gives as its date "9/10.42," but this cannot be the 9th of October, but must be the night from the 9th to the 10th of December (the month, missing in the date, is given in the report's text). This is the night spanning the two days when the officer in question was on duty (judging from the mentioned hours, probably from 12.00 on the 9th to 12.00 on the 10th).

It is unclear why the author of the *Auschwitz Chronicle* assumes that these two prisoners were executed, since “Ü” usually was short for “überstellt” – transferred. In fact, the numbers of these detainees are not included in the list of deceased inmates of the morgue register of Block 28 of the Main Camp – neither for 9 December 1942 nor for any of the following days.¹⁴¹

It is not even clear why the two pairs of Jewish inmates are supposed to have been treated so differently: the first pair was released back into the camp, while the second pair is assumed to have been killed. As for the first pair, the names of Ladislav Knapp [sic] and Samul Culer [sic] are listed in the fragment of the camp’s card index as copied by the former prisoner Otto Wolken. According to this, Knapp belonged to *Sonderkommando* II, while the other was employed at a *Sonderkommando*. For both, their cards show under “changes”: “15.12.42 abg. am 10.12.42 abgesetzt / Flüchtling /.”¹⁴² The term “abgesetzt” means that the two detainees’ entries had been suspended from the card index; the abbreviation “abg.” could mean “abgegeben,” handed over, *i.e.* reassigned to the inmate-labor-deployment authorities. It is certain, however, that the two detainees were not killed, because the words “verstorben” (deceased) are missing, as occurs for instance for the two prisoners preceding the entry of Knapp: the Slovak Jews Eduard Tintner, no. 36682, “died 22 June 1942” (*verstorben 22.06.42*), and Alfred Timföld, no. 36810, “died 16 June 1942” (*verstorben 16.06.42*).¹⁴³

This is confirmed by the list “Arrivals of 23 May 1942, transferred from CC Lublin,” which includes 1,000 detainees with serial number, first and last name, date and place of birth, as well as date of death. The vast majority of these prisoners died during August 1942, but Ladislav Knapp was one of the few survivors, while Alfred Timföld died on 16 June 1942.¹⁴⁴

Had Knapp, Culer and/or the Borensteins really been part of any *Sonderkommando* tied to homicidal activities at the “bunkers,” these prisoners who had dared to escape would have been killed without mercy, if the orthodox narrative were true.

The most important aspect of Wolken’s record referred to above is the fact that Czech omitted the Roman number of the *Sonderkommando* from which six detainees had fled: “I.” The reason is easily understood. In her entry for 3 December 1942 she writes (1990, pp. 277f.):

“The approximately 300 Jewish prisoners in the special squad who dig up and burn the 107,000 bodies buried in mass graves are taken from Birkenau to the main camp by the SS. There they are led to the gas chamber in

¹⁴¹ AGK, *Leichenhallenbuch*, Collection “OB,” 385, pp. 42f. and following.

¹⁴² AGK, NTN, 149, pp. 142f., serial numbers 2083 and 2092.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 142, serial numbers 2081 and 2082.

¹⁴⁴ APMO, Fot. 423, pp. 142f.

Crematorium I and killed with gas. Thus the witnesses to the corpse burning are disposed of."

For 6 December 1942 she notes (p. 280):

"A new Special Squad is formed to which several dozen Jewish prisoners, selected from Section B-Ib, are assigned. It is probably called Special Squad II; some of those assigned to it are Meilech (Milton) Buki (No. 80312) and Szlama Dragon (No. 80359) [...]. In the trial against Rudolf Höss, he [Szlama Dragon] appears as a witness and charges that the group of Jewish prisoners was sent to the Special Squad on December 9 and employed in incinerating corpses for several days thereafter. On the other hand, the camp documents indicate that the Special Squad [II] must have already been in existence when prisoners who were working in it made attempts to escape on December 7 and 9."

Her reference to "camp documents" most likely points at the above-mentioned report by the officer on duty filed on 9 December 1942.

In summary, the *Sonderkommando* allegedly exterminated on 3 December 1942 is said to have been replaced by a *Sonderkommando* II on 6 December, which means the first one was *Sonderkommando* I. Czech claims that the prisoners who escaped on 7 and 9 December all came from *Sonderkommando* II, but the report by the officer on duty explicitly says that the six detainees in question had been employed in *Sonderkommando* I. By omitting the number "I" in her entry on 9 December and by falsely asserting in her entry on 6 December that all escaped prisoners came from *Sonderkommando* II, Czech tried to conceal the fact that on 9 December 1942 both a *Sonderkommando* I and a *Sonderkommando* II existed simultaneously, which destroys her fallacious reconstruction. It is all too obvious that, if the two *Sonderkommandos* existed at the same time, the first could not have been exterminated several days earlier, and the second could not have taken its place a few days later.

Czech's deceptions aimed at giving credence to the thesis that *only one Sonderkommando* existed at Auschwitz which worked in the crematoria, and it had to be the only one, because, as I explained above, its very name pointed at its alleged duty of cooperation in the claimed *Sonderbehandlung*. It is clear that the editor of the *Auschwitz Chronicle* was forced to resort to this deception because at that time (1989/1990) no document was known which established a relationship between the *Sonderkommando* and the crematoria.

The Auschwitz Museum has since published a document on its website, which, as far as I know, is the only one unequivocally establishing this relationship: the "escape report" of 7 September 1944 (see DOCUMENT 19).

Transcript:

"a) Geheime Staatspolizei Auschwitz

b) Stadtrevier Auschwitz

Pezola, Wachtm[eister] d[er] S[chutzpolizei] d.A. [?]

c) 7.9.44. 1915 Uhr Wilczek

Fluchtmeldung.

Gegen 1400 Uhr ist heute aus dem K.L. Auschwitz II vom Sonderkommando (Krematorium) eine größere Anzahl Häftlinge ausgebrochen meist Juden. Die Flüchtigen wurden bereits zum Teil bei der sofort aufgenommenen Verfolgung erschossen. Die Suchaktion wird fortgesetzt.

Kennzeichen: geschoren, auf dem l[inken]. Unterarm eintätowierte No. Kleidung teils Civil mit roten Streifen. Weitere Fahndungsmaßnahmen u[nd]. Verständigung der untergeordneten Stellen bitte ich sofort durchzuführen.

Es sind nur noch 4 Häftlinge flüchtig.

Verstärkte Streife zum Bahnhofsgelände entsandt."

Translation:

"[Column 1]

a) Secret Police Auschwitz

b) City district Auschwitz

Pezula, Constable of the Protective Police d.A. [?]

c) 7 Sept. 44. 19:15 AM Wilczek

[Column 2]

Escape report.

Around 1400 hours today, a large number of prisoners escaped from the C.C. Auschwitz II, from the Sonderkommando (crematorium), mostly Jews. Some of the fugitives have already been shot during the instantly initiated pursuit. The search operation continues.

Features: shaved, no. tattooed on the l.[eft] forearm. Clothing: partly civilian with red stripes. I request to instantly carry out further search measures a.[nd] to inform subordinate offices.

There are only 4 inmates left on the run.

[Column 3]

Reinforced patrol sent to the railway station area."

This document tells us that there was a *Sonderkommando* even at the crematorium, but this was just one of many *Sonderkommandos* existing at Auschwitz. This is even confirmed indirectly by the document itself, because the fact that it specifies in parentheses that they had escaped from the *Sonderkommando* of the "crematorium" implies that there were also other *Sonderkommandos*. Even the fact that only "most" of the escapees from this *Sonderkommando* were Jews contradicts the orthodox Holocaust narrative, according to which basically *all* members of the *Sonderkommando* at the crematoria were Jews.

[30] Document 32 (pp. 139)

This is a letter by Bischoff to the Camp Commandant dated 17 April 1943 with the subject "Allocation of horse-stable barracks on a loan basis." There is

nothing new about this either, as I examined this document already elsewhere (2004b, pp. 73f.). It states:¹⁴⁵

“The horse-stable barracks erected at Special Unit II and at Crematorium III are urgently needed for troop accommodation in Birkenau and for the infirmary in Construction Sector II. After the operation of Special Unit II has stopped and the corresponding rooms at Crematorium III are available as well, information is requested as to when the barracks can be dismantled, so that they can be erected at the determined places as soon as possible.”

The authors claim that *Sonderkommando* II refers to the inmate detail working at “Bunker II” and that the entry relating to Crematorium III is erroneous and should be Crematorium II instead. Then they add:

“An extant map of the camp from March 20, 1943 shows the location of the barracks next to the north wall of crematorium II. It served as a provisional undressing facility before the completion of the underground rooms designated for this purpose.” (p. 138)

The first interpretation, as I noted above, is completely unfounded: *Sonderkommando* II was referring to the storage of personal effects confiscated from the deportees, and was therefore unrelated to the chimeric “Bunker II.” The activity of *Sonderkommando* II had ceased because, as explained in the file memo of 20 February 1943, the new Birkenau *Effektenlager* went into operation in late February/early March 1943.

The second interpretation is equally unfounded. It should be noted right away that the map of 20 March 1943 (reproduced by the authors on their p. 140) had already been published by Jean-Claude Pressac, as will be seen. He meant to use it in order to undergird Henryk Tauber’s declaration which attributed a murderous purpose to this shed, a claim embraced by the authors. On this issue there are again a number of other fundamental documents which the authors ignore. I reiterate here a slightly updated version of my exposé published in another study (2019, pp. 67-73).

On 21 January 1943, the SS garrison surgeon of Auschwitz, *SS-Hauptsturmführer* Eduard Wirths, wrote a letter to the camp commander:¹⁴⁶

“1. The SS garrison surgeon at Auschwitz requests to install a partition in the dissecting hall planned for the new crematorium building at Birkenau, dividing the hall into 2 rooms of equal size and to have 1 or 2 wash basins installed in the first of these rooms, because the latter will be needed as an autopsy room, whereas the 2nd room will be needed for anatomical preparations, for the preservation of files and writing materials and books, for

¹⁴⁵ “Leihweise Zurverfügungstellung von Pferdestallbaracken Typ 260/9.” RGVA, 502-1-79, p. 119.

¹⁴⁶ RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 57.

the preparation of colored tissue sections and for work with the microscope.

2. Furthermore it is requested to provide for an 'undressing room' [Auskleideraum] in the cellar rooms."

Highly important conclusions for our topic derive from this letter. Before setting them out, we must outline the implications of the alleged decision to transform *Leichenkeller* 1 of Crematoria II and III into homicidal gas chambers.

If we follow Pressac, the Central Construction Office decided in November 1942 "to equip the crematoria with homicidal gas chambers" (1993, p. 66). This decision is said to have begun to permeate the crematoria projects such as Blueprint No. 2003 of 19 December 1942. Because a ventilation with aeration and de-aeration had been planned only for *Leichenkeller* 1, it is clear that this room had to become the homicidal gas chamber. And because it was planned to implement mass exterminations, it is also clear that *Leichenkeller* 2 had to be turned into the undressing room for the future victims, in keeping with the procedure already tried out – according to Pressac – in Crematorium I. Hence, the decision to transform *Leichenkeller* 1 into a homicidal gas chamber implied the decision to transform *Leichenkeller* 2 into an undressing room, and the two decisions were taken at the same time.

This having been said, let us go back to the letter discussed above, from which we derive:

1. The decision to create an undressing room in the crematorium was taken neither by the *Kommandantur* (the camp commander, *i.e.* Höss) nor by Central Construction Office (Bischoff) but by the SS garrison surgeon.
2. The garrison surgeon did not specify anything in particular in his request, presenting it as a mere afterthought to the sanitary and hygienic requirements set out for the autopsy room.
3. In hygienic and sanitary matters, as well as in matters relating to pathology and forensic medicine, the crematorium was attached to the garrison surgeon who knew the corresponding projects very well and occasionally intervened – as in this case – with the Central Construction Office asking for modifications.
4. The letter cited demonstrates that the SS garrison surgeon was completely unaware of the alleged plan to change *Leichenkeller* 2 into an undressing room for the victims to be gassed: he requested for an undressing room to be provided, in a very general way, "in the cellar rooms" without specifically mentioning *Leichenkeller* 2 or excluding *Leichenkeller* 1 for this purpose. However, in view of his position, the SS garrison surgeon could not have been unaware of a decision, allegedly taken three months earlier, to create an undressing room in *Leichenkeller* 2, because otherwise, considering his position in the camp hierarchy, such a decision could not actually

have been arrived at. Yet as results from the above document, the idea of an undressing room was conceived by the SS garrison surgeon only in January 1943 and conveyed to the Auschwitz camp commander on January 21st.

On 15 February, Janisch replied to the SS garrison surgeon's letter by a handwritten note stating:¹⁴⁷

"item 1.) has been arranged for.

item 2.) for undressing, a horse-stable barrack has been erected in front of the cellar entrance."

Why should a crematorium have an undressing room? And why was a barrack built for such a purpose?

Pressac has noted that a horse-stable-type barrack in front of the crematorium does indeed appear on the map entitled "Situation map of the PoW Camp Auschwitz O/S" dated 20 March 1943. It is at the location mentioned by Janisch, i.e. "in front of the cellar entrance." Pressac writes (1989, p. 462):

"The drawing confirms the erection of a hut of the stable type in the north yard of Krematorium II in March 1943. We know little about this hut, except that after serving as an undressing room for the first batch of Jews to be gassed in this Krematorium, it was quickly dismantled – only a week later according to the Sonderkommando witness Henryk Tauber. The first mention of an access stairway through Leichenkeller 2 found in the PMO archives, BW 30/40, page 68e, is dated 26/2/43 (Document 7a). As soon as this entrance was operational, the undressing hut was no longer required."

Pressac treats the matter also elsewhere, but provides a different reasoning (*ibid.*, p. 227):

"On Sunday 14th March, Messing continued installing the ventilation of Leichenkeller 2, which he called 'Auskleidekeller II/Undressing Cellar II.' In the evening, about 1,500 Jews from the Cracow ghetto were the first victims to be gassed in Krematorium II. They did not undress in Leichenkeller 2, still cluttered with tools and ventilation components, but in a stable-type hut temporarily erected in the north yard of the Krematorium."

He later comes back to the first interpretation (*ibid.*, p. 492):

"This Bauleitung source confirms the erection in mid-March 1943 of a hut running south-north in the north yard of Krematorium II, which was used, according to Henryk Tauber, as an undressing room, apparently because the access to the underground undressing room (Leichenkeller 2) was not yet completed."

Pressac refers to the following statement by Henryk Tauber:¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 57a.

¹⁴⁸ Minutes of the deposition of Henryk Tauber dated 24 May 1945, before the investigating Judge Jan Sehn. Höss Trial, vol. 11, pp. 122-150, here, p. 136.

“They [the alleged victims] were pushed into a barrack which then stood perpendicular to the building of the crematorium on the side of the entrance to the yard of crematorium no. II. The people entered into this barrack through a door located near the entrance and went down [into the half-basement of the crematorium] along steps which were to the right of the Mühlverbrennung [sic] (garbage incinerator). This barrack was used at the time as an undressing place. But it was used for more or less one week and was then dismantled.”

Pressac publishes Map 2216 of 20 March 1943 in its entirety, but with illegible writing (*ibid.*, p. 226). However, he points out a detail from another version of this map (corresponding to another negative at the Auschwitz Museum) in which the entries are clearly visible (*ibid.*, p. 462). The barrack in front of the crematorium is shown as a light-colored rectangle, a symbol which corresponds neither to a finished barrack, which would have been a dark rectangle, nor to a barrack under construction, which would have had diagonal hatching, but to a planned barrack. This shows up even more clearly in another detail of this map also published by Pressac (*ibid.*, p. 256).

There is, moreover, yet another map of Birkenau, drawn up immediately prior to the one shown by Pressac, in which the barrack in question does not appear at all. It is the “Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215” dated March 1943 (see Note 71 on p. 73). As it has the number 2215, it was prepared immediately before the one numbered 2216, and therefore dates from 20 March 1943 or before.

It is not clear why this barrack appears only on Map 2216. Even though it had already been erected in front of Crematorium II on 15 February 1943, it is not indicated on map 1991 of 17 February, which otherwise shows barracks planned, under construction, and finished (Pressac 1989, p. 220). This is probably due to its being an emergency stop-gap measure. One does not know when the barrack was taken down. What is certain, however, is that the erection of this barrack had nothing to do with the alleged homicidal gassings.

Pressac’s first explanation – that the barrack was erected because access to *Leichenkeller 2* was not yet ready – does not hold much water. Speaking of Crematorium III, he affirms that work on the entrance to *Leichenkeller 2* of Crematorium III began on 10 February 1943, and that for Crematorium II the only reference to the realization of an entrance is dated 26 February, which according to Pressac would lead us into an irresolvable paradox (1989, p. 217). In fact, there is no paradox, because Pressac’s dates for Crematorium III are wrong. On 14 March 1943, the entrance was perfectly serviceable, and there would therefore have been no need for an undressing barrack.

On 20 March 1943, the day on which map 2216 was being prepared, the SS garrison surgeon at Auschwitz, in a letter to the camp commander, men-

tioned the removal of the corpses from the detainee hospital to the crematorium.¹⁴⁹ This makes the matter very clear. The SS garrison surgeon was worried about the poor sanitary and hygienic conditions in which the corpses of the detainees were kept on account of the inadequacy of the then existing morgues. These were simple wooden sheds which could not keep rats from feeding on the corpses, with the risk of an outbreak of the plague, as he writes clearly in his letter of 20 July 1943¹⁵⁰ about a situation which must already have existed in January.

The SS garrison surgeon thus intended to have the corpses taken to a safer place, from a sanitary point of view, and the best places were obviously the two morgues of Crematorium II which, at that time, was the farthest advanced. On 21 January 1943 he requested the provision of an undressing room for these corpses “in the cellar rooms” of Crematorium II. On 29 January, Bischoff replied that the corpses of the detainees could not be placed in *Leichenkeller* 2, but said that this was irrelevant because they could be placed in the *Vergasungskeller* instead.

On 15 February Janisch informed the garrison surgeon that “a horse-stable-type barrack in front of the cellar entrance” had been erected at Crematorium II as an undressing room for the corpses. This barrack was therefore built between 21 January and 15 February, and for that reason alone it could not have had a criminal purpose. This is confirmed by the fact that Crematorium II went into operation on 20 February 1943. A report by Kirschnek dated 29 March 1943, states the following about this crematorium:¹⁵¹

“Brickwork completely finished and started up on 20 February 1943.”

Thus, the crematorium went into operation even before the ventilation had been installed in *Leichenkeller* 1, which means that it received corpses even before that room could theoretically have been used as a homicidal gas chamber. But why then was an outdoor barrack needed? The answer is simple. On 11 February 1943 – four days before the date of Janisch’s reply to the SS garrison surgeon – work on the installation of the ventilation equipment in *Leichenkeller* 1 had begun,¹⁵² and therefore this room was no longer available as an undressing room. Besides, *Leichenkeller* 2 was not operational either from January 1943 onwards. In “Report no. 1” from Bischoff to Kammler dat-

¹⁴⁹ Letter from SS-Standortarzt to the Commandant of CC dated 20 March 1943, concerning “Häftlings-Krankenbau – KGL.” RGVA, 502-1-261, p. 112.

¹⁵⁰ Letter from SS-Standortarzt to Zentralbauleitung of July 20, 1943 concerning “Hygienische Sofort-Massnahmen im KL.” RGVA, 502-1-170, p. 263.

¹⁵¹ “Tätigkeitsbericht des SS-Ustuf. (F) Kirschnek, Bauleiter für das Schutzhaftlager und für landwirtschaftliche Bauvorhaben. 1. Jan. 1943 bis 31. März 1943,” of March 29, 1943. RGVA, 502-1-26, p. 59.

¹⁵² APMO, BW 30/31, p. 30.

ed 23 January on the subject “Crematoria PoW camp, state of advancement” we can read:¹⁵³

“Cellar II. Reinforced-concrete ceiling finished, removal of planking subject to weather conditions.”

In his report dated 29 January 1943, Prüfer confirmed:¹⁵⁴

“Ceiling of Leichenkeller 2 cannot yet be freed of planking because of frost.”

On the same day, Kirschnek confirms in a file memo:¹⁵⁵

“Leichenkeller 2 basically finished, except for removal of planking from ceiling, which can only be done on days without frost.”

Finally, as we have already seen, Bischoff informs Kammler in his letter of 29 January 1943:¹⁵⁶

“The Reinforced-concrete ceiling of the Leichenkeller could not yet be freed of its planking because of frost conditions.”

During the first week of February 1943, average temperatures at Krakow were below -5°C , and during the second week below 0°C (Setkiewicz 2011b, p. 59), which makes it highly likely that *Leichenkeller 2* remained non-operational for some time longer because of the impossibility to remove the form planks from the concrete.

On 8 March 1943, Messing, the technician, began to install the ventilation duct in *Leichenkeller 2*, which he regularly calls “undressing cellar” in his weekly work reports.¹⁵⁷ The work was finished on 31 March 1943 (“de-aeration system undressing cellar installed”).¹⁵⁸ Therefore, already by 8 March the Central Construction Office – acting on the request of SS garrison surgeon – had decided to create an undressing room in the half-basement of Crematorium II, more specifically in *Leichenkeller 2*. As against this, *Leichenkeller 1* became operational as of March 13 (“aeration and de-aeration systems of cellar 1 put into service”).¹⁵⁷ On 20 March, the day of the alleged gassing of 2,191 Greek Jews (Czech 1990, p. 356), the SS garrison surgeon was occupied only with the removal of the corpses of detainees from the camp hospital to Crematorium II without any reference to any alleged gassing victims.

We now have the answers to the two questions raised in the beginning:

1. The undressing room was used for the corpses of the detainees who had died in the camp. At the Belsen trial, SS-*Hauptsturmführer* Josef Kramer,

¹⁵³ RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 54.

¹⁵⁴ APMO, BW 30/40, p. 101.

¹⁵⁵ APMO, BW 30/34, p. 105.

¹⁵⁶ APMO, BW 30/34, p. 100.

¹⁵⁷ Arbeitszeit-Bescheinigung of Topf for the period of March 8-14, 1943. APMO, D-ZBau/2540, p. 26.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

commander of the Auschwitz Camp from May 8, 1944, declared in this respect (Phillips, p. 731):

“Whoever died during the day was put into a special building called the mortuary, and they were carried to the crematorium every evening by lorry. They were loaded on the lorry and off the lorry by prisoners. They were stripped by the prisoners of their clothes in the crematorium before being cremated.”

2. Initially a barrack set up in front of the crematorium was used as undressing room, because *Leichenkeller 2* was not yet operational on 21 January 1943, the day the SS garrison surgeon requested an undressing room; *Leichenkeller 1* was available from 11 February.

The existence of an undressing room in the crematorium is therefore entirely normal, as results moreover from the assignment of rooms in Crematorium I of the Main Camp: Laying-out room (*Aufbahrungsraum*), corpse washing room (*Waschraum*) and morgue (*Leichenhalle*). As the corpses were cremated without a coffin, the Laying-out room was not a “hall for the placement of the corpse on a stretcher” but a room in which the bodies were undressed before being washed in the room next door and finally placed naked in the morgue.

This exposé deals with the building appearing on Map No. 2216 of 20 March 1943, but that does not mean that Bischoff’s letter of 17 April 1943 (Document 32) refers to it, erroneously mentioning twice Crematorium III instead of Crematorium II. Because this building was dismantled after just a week, hence toward the end of March, if we follow the orthodox Holocaust authority Henryk Tauber, we have to assume that Bischoff was referring precisely to Crematorium III. Although it was in an advanced stage of construction at that time, this crematorium became operational only on 26 June 1943. This means that one or more shacks erected near it before 17 April could not have had a criminal purpose. Their purpose could simply have been for the temporary storage of crematorium or construction equipment. When “the corresponding rooms at Crematorium III” were available for their intended purpose, the barrack was dismantled (or the barracks).

[31] Document 33 (pp. 143-145)

On 7 May 1943 Kammler visited Auschwitz. At 20:15, at the *Führerheim* (of-ficers’ hall), he had a meeting with six SS officers, SS-*Obersturmbannführer* Höss, commandant of the camp, SS-*Obersturmbannführer* Möckel, head of the SS garrison administration, SS-*Sturm-bannführer* Bischoff, head of the Central Construction Office, SS-*Sturm-bannführer* Caesar [Cäsar], head of agricultural units, SS-*Hauptsturmführer* Wirths, garrison surgeon, and SS-*Untersturmführer* Kirschnek, head of the construction office C.C. Auschwitz and agriculture Auschwitz.

After that meeting, Bischoff wrote a file memo on 9 May which the authors present as their Document 33. As point i), under the heading “Agricultural Construction,” it states:¹⁵⁹

“i. Stable farm Birkenau:

Two horse-stable barracks from ‘Special Operation 1’ are erected in addition to one Swiss and one air-force barrack. While all agricultural structures are now to be finished in sequence with massive efforts, erecting these barracks is particularly urgent.”

The authors first decree that “Special Operation 1” was “Bunker I,” then explain:

“Documents 32 and 33 indicate that bunkers I and II were withdrawn from use in May 1943. In the light of the entry into operation of the new crematoria and gas chambers in the first half of 1943, there were probably plans for the dismantling of both bunkers. It seems, however, that the malfunctions of the crematoria that occurred at the turn of May/June 1943, which could potentially result in the suspension of the extermination of the Jews, led to the abandonment of these plans.” (p. 142)

From this document we can actually infer on the one hand that there was at least one “Special Operation 2,” and on the other hand that “Special Operation 1” had more than two barracks. It is therefore clear that “Special Operation 1” corresponded to the activity of *Sonderkommando 1* at the three barracks for inmate property (*Effektenbaracken*) assigned to it, and that *Sonderkommando 2* was in service at “Special Operation 2.” And if “*Sonderkommando 2*” had gone out of business on 17 April 1943, and on 9 May two of the three barracks of “Special Operation 1” could be put to another use,¹⁶⁰ this resulted obviously from the fact that the 30 barracks of the *Effektenlager* were ready for use since late February/early March 1943, as I pointed out above.

[32] Document 34 (p. 147)

This is a letter by Bischoff to the head of the SS garrison administration, SS-*Obersturmbannführer* Karl Ernst Möckel, dated 4 February 1944, stating:

“For carrying out a special measure, I once made available 3 horse-stable barracks from Construction Sector III of the PoW camp on a loan basis. After the crematoria have been completed long time ago and have been handed over to your administration, the above-mentioned barracks allocated on a loan basis are no longer needed at Sonderkommando I. The barracks were meant for a specific purpose and must be set up in the Construction Sector III of the PoW camp. [...]

¹⁵⁹ RGVA, 502-2-117, p. 6.

¹⁶⁰ Both documents speak of “horse-stable barracks,” as in the file memo of 10 February 1943 in relation to *Sonderkommando 1* and 2.

I have given orders that the barracks are to be dismantled at Sonderkommando I and are to be set up in Construction Sector III."

According to the authors,

"This passage indicates that bunker I and its three undressing barracks were still in existence in early 1944, and that their occasional use for killing Jews deported to Auschwitz as late as the second half of 1943 cannot be ruled out." (p. 146)

Here the authors are forced to overturn one of the tenets of the fantastic orthodox story of the "bunkers" at Birkenau, according to which, as I pointed out in my comments to Document 16, "Bunker 1" was demolished and the alleged undressing barracks were removed in March/April 1943. The historians at the Auschwitz Museum arrived at this tenet based on testimonies, starting with the fundamental one by Szlama Dragon. If they want to change that story line now, they will also have to admit that the testimonies upon which the old version is based are incorrect, unreliable or deceitful. But since the entire story of the "bunkers" as extermination facilities is based exclusively on testimonies, that entire story would thus become incorrect, unreliable or deceitful.

There is also another serious problem. Eyewitnesses of the "bunkers" do not refer to any activities of these alleged extermination facilities for the period from March/April 1943 through May 1944, so that the authors' random conjectures are without any anecdotal support.

The authors' interpretation is not merely unfounded, but also contradictory. In fact, they claim that the "Special Operation 1" mentioned in the file memo of 9 May 1943 (their Document 33) refers to "Bunker 1." In that case, two of the three alleged undressing barracks would have been dismantled already in May 1943 and installed at the "stable farm Birkenau." There can be little doubt about that, because Bischoff had declared that their setup was "particularly urgent," and because Kammler had ordered the transfer of 60 inmate carpenters from Weimar and Neuengamme to Auschwitz for this project.¹⁶¹ If that is so, how could there still have been three barracks near "Bunker 1" in February 1944?

I will return to this document's reference to the crematoria in Section 12 of Part Two.

[33] Document 35 (pp. 149-151)

Document 35 is a telegram by Kammler to Bischoff dated 21 May 1944 with the following text:

"For Special Operation Hungary Program 3 horse-stable barracks are to be set up immediately at the evasion bunkers."

¹⁶¹ RGVA, 502-1-233, p. 35.

The authors, who erroneously translate the German prefix *Ausweich-* as reserve, assert that this document refers to “bunker II, referred to here as a ‘reserve bunker’ (*Ausweichbunker*)” (p. 148).

For the real meaning of this document, I point the reader to what I have already laid out in a different study (2004b, pp. 96-98), and I elaborate on it further here.

On 31 May 1944 Bischoff, as head of the Construction Inspection Office of the *Waffen-SS* and Police, Silesia, sent a letter to the Central Construction Office on the subject “Construction of three horse-stable barracks for Special Operation Hungary,” in which he advised, with reference to Kammler’s telegram of 25 May, that the barracks were to be picked up from Construction Depot I (depot for storing construction material) of the Construction Inspection Office of Silesia, and he requested the immediate preparation of the necessary administrative documents for the construction.¹⁶² This is the authors’ Document 37, of which they published a transcript of the original.¹⁶³

Their interpretation is based on a misreading of the two terms *Sonderaktion* (special operation) and *Ausweichbunker* (evasion bunker). As to the first, the authors tacitly assume that it referred to the alleged gassing of Jews. In fact, as I have shown with documents in a dedicated study, the term had a wide range of meanings that not only revolved around the internment of Jewish deportation convoys and the transport and storage of their personal effects, but also referred to the construction of hygienic and sanitation facilities, and in one case even to the interrogation of civilian workers by the Political Department of the camp (2004b, pp. 60-75, 96-99).

The *Sonderaktion* was finally also connected to the collection and sorting of Jewish assets. *SS-Sturmabführer* Alfred Franke-Gricksch made an inspection visit to Poland between 4 and 16 May 1943, about which he wrote a detailed report. Among other things, he visited Auschwitz and Lublin, where he became interested in *Operation Reinhardt*. Today, only an English translation of this report is known. It uses the term “‘special enterprise’ Reinhard,”¹⁶⁴ while another translation of the document shows the original expression: “*Sonderaktion ‘Reinhard,’*” which is described as follows:¹⁶⁵

“This branch has had the task of realising all mobile Jewish property in the Gouvernement Poland.”

This explains the request dated 24 December 1943 from the head of the Central Construction Office to the SS Garrison Administration:¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² Letter by the Leiter der Bauinspektion der Waffen-SS und Polizei “Schlesien” (Bischoff) to the Central Construction Office of 31 May 1944. RGVA, 502-1-251, p. 46.

¹⁶³ RGVA, 501-2-351, p. 46.

¹⁶⁴ TNA, WO 309-374, pp. 6f.

¹⁶⁵ TNA, WO 309-2241, p. 6.

¹⁶⁶ Letter by the head of the Zentralbauleitung to the SS Standortverwaltung of 24 December 1943. RGVA, 502-1-345, p. 69. See Mattogno 2004b, Document 23, p. 136.

“For the operations of the Construction Office of the POW camp Birkenau, the following drafting instruments are most urgently required:

10 sets of drawing instruments, 10 stylographs

10 slide rules

5 calipers

It is requested that these be made available on loan to the Construction Office from the stores of the special operations.”

A message partially deciphered by the British on 18 Dec. 1942 spoke of “stocks from the Jewish resettlement” which included watches and razors, among other things.¹⁶⁷

This also explains the “special operation” mentioned in Document 33.

Next we turn to the authors’ faulty interpretation of the term *Ausweichbunker*. First, the authors’ translation for *Ausweich-* as “reserve” is flawed. The German verb *ausweichen* translates as “to get out of the way of something, to avoid, elude, evade, dodge, swerve, shirk, duck.” The term “reserve” is nowhere connected to it. It can therefore not surprise that this structure had nothing to do with the alleged “Bunker 2.” This is already clear from the fact that “Bunker 2” is said to have been the only homicidal “bunker” in operation in the summer of 1944, while the three barracks for the “Special Operation Hungary” had to be installed “at the reserve bunkers” (“*bei den Ausweichbunkern*”) in the plural.

Ausweichbunker were in fact harmless bomb shelters – built so people could “get out of the way of, avoid, elude, evade, dodge, swerve, shirk, duck” Allied bombs. Point 2 of Garrison Order No. 12/44 of 12 April 1944, titled “evasion points in case of air-raid alarm” (*Ausweichstellen bei Fliegeralarm*), provided that, in case of an air-raid attack against housing, the rank and file should seek shelter in the indicated “evasion rooms” (*Ausweichräume*) and explained:¹⁶⁸

“The evasion rooms are meant to have the purpose of protecting rank and file from bomb blasts, shrapnel, and fire”

The various types of air-raid shelters also included proper air-raid shelters (*Luftschutz-Bunker*), which were bomb-proof structures (*bombensichere Bauwerke*).¹⁶⁹ Therefore the “evasion bunkers” (*Ausweichbunker*) were air-raid bunkers probably destined for the SS troops running the camp.

Garrison Order no. 13/44 of 2 May 1944 dedicated its Point 6 to the “pollution of the line of bunkers,” complaining that:¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ TNA, HW 16/22, German Police Decodes No. 3 Traffic: 18.12.1942. ZIP/GPDD 331b/22.12.42.

¹⁶⁸ “Sonderbefehl Nr. 12/44” of 12 April 1944. AGK, NTN, 121, p. 114.

¹⁶⁹ SS-Wirtschafts-Verwaltungshauptamt. Amtsgruppe C. Amt C II - Technische Fachgebiete.

“Richtlinie Nr. 58” of 14 July 1944. RGVA, 501-1-401, page number illegible.

¹⁷⁰ Frei *et al.* 2000, p. 442.

“The prisoners use the prepared field positions and bunkers within the large sentry cordon as toilets.”

Regarding other documents, the authors write:

“Two more telegrams with similar contents were sent to Auschwitz several days later, on May 25 and 30, 1944.” (p. 148)

In reality only one document exists, the original of which, dated 25 May 1944, was published years ago by me (2004b, Document 25, p. 138).¹⁷¹ The authors reproduce it on p. 150. The transcript of this telegram reproduced on their p. 149 bears the erroneous date of 21 May;¹⁷² this document was again transcribed on 30 May (reproduced on their p. 151); yet another transcript which the authors did not publish was passed on to Jothann at the Birkenau Construction Office on that same day.¹⁷³

In conclusion, the three horse-stable barracks for the Special Operation Hungary had to be set up near air-raid shelters and had consequently no relation to the imaginary “Bunker 2.”

[34] Documents 36 (pp. 153-156), 40 (p. 167) and 42 (p. 171)

Document 36 is presented by the authors as follows:

“Request dated May 26, 1944 for the re-erection of three barracks designated for a special operation (Errichtung von 3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen). There can be no doubt that they were to be located at one of the already existing bunkers, which previously bore the number II. Page 2 of this document is a standard formula used to describe the implementation of construction projects. The rubric ‘time of construction’ (Bauzeit) often refers in such documents not to any specific step, but rather to the general time frame of the entire construction project. That is why the protocol contains the information that the work on erecting the barracks in Birkenau for special operations was begun in March 1942 (Bauzeit: mit den Arbeiten wurde im März 1942 begonnen). This is indirect evidence that bunker I dates from and began operating in March 1942.” (p. 152)

The document in question is a “construction request for the expansion of the PoW camp of the *Waffen-SS* at Auschwitz Upper Silesia. Installation of 3 barracks for special measures” prepared on 26 May 1944.¹⁷⁴ The authors’ claim that this was a re-erection is only a transparent ploy to create a fictitious connection with the alleged barracks of “Bunker 2” of the first operational phase (mid-1942 to early 1943). Their claim about the “indirect proof” of the existence of “Bunker 1” since March 1942 is absolutely inconsistent. The reference

¹⁷¹ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 22.

¹⁷² RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 21.

¹⁷³ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 21a.

¹⁷⁴ RGVA, 502-2-125, pp. 227-229. See DOCUMENT 22

to the beginning of the work in March 1942 is in fact a standard phrase taken from another application form, like the one directly thereafter: “The buildings have [been] completed and handed over for use to the SS garrison administration,” which, if it were true, would mean that Jothann filed a construction request *after* the structure had already been finished and handed over!

The authors, however, commit an even more serious error – attested to by their comment on Document 42 – attributing to the elusive “Bunker 2” both the “3 horse-stable barracks for Special Operation Hungary” and the “3 barracks for special measures,” as if they were of the same barracks. In reality, however, as is confirmed by their Document 42, these were two different structures: the “3 barracks for special measures” were part of BW 54, while the “3 horse-stable barracks for Special Operation Hungary” were part of BW 33a.

Document 42 is a “list of existing construction requests of the Central Construction Office for the construction project PoW Camp Auschwitz, Upper Silesia.” The first three columns show the serial number, the structure’s ID, and the number and date of construction order. Entries no. 49 and 50 have the following handwritten annotations:

“49. 33A 3 barracks for special measures

50. 54 3 barracks for special measures (Hungary).”

The authors comment:

“The meaning of this entry is not completely understood. It might, however, be hypothesized that two orders have been entered twice, and that the annotation (Ungarn) in point 50 actually pertains to point 49 because the designation of investment BW33A corresponds to work connected with the undressing barracks that existed at the bunkers in 1942 and 1943.” (p. 170)

It is clear that they have understood nothing of the issue at hand, particularly when considering their false interpretation of the explanatory report of 30 September 1943 (their Document 17). They interpret the document in retrospect, as if (in this case) it were referring to barracks already completed in the past. Only by doing this are they able to allocate the three barracks for special measures Type 260/9 mentioned therein for Construction Sectors II and III of Birkenau to the “bunkers,” which are said to have gone into operation in 1942.

In reality, however, this is a very simple project, as is clear from the fact that three barracks of Construction Sector III, called BW 33a, are preceded by a series of structures related to the hospital camp (BW 3a, 4c, 4e, 4f 6 c, 7 c, 12 c, 12 b), a total of 167 barracks, but on 6 October 1943, about a week after the preparation of the explanatory report mentioned above, the shells of only 47 barracks had been erected (*im Rohbau*).¹⁷⁵ As I explained above, both the

¹⁷⁵ Letter by Jothann to Kammler of 6 October 1943. RGVA, 502-1-351, p. 352.

existing houses as well as the barracks for special measures appear for the first time in this document, which means that the barracks did not exist prior to 20 September 1943.

Another essential thing which has escaped the authors' attention is the fact that the three barracks for special measures from the construction request of 26 May 1944 (Document 36) are identical to the three barracks for special measures in Construction Sector III of the explanatory report of 30 September 1943: the planned expenditure is in fact identical (RM 55,758), and Document 42 identifies these three barracks as *BW* 33A (or 33a).

This is further confirmed by a document ignored by the authors. It is the construction expense ledger (*Bauausgabebuch*) of *BW* 54, headed precisely "3 barracks for special measures."¹⁷⁶ It gives the expense chapter with "21/7 b" and the title "(*Bau*) 65". The back specifies the work carried out on 5 September 1944 by the company Lenz & Co. A.G. Kattowitz for a total amount of 681.08 RM. It can therefore be stated with certainty that the three barracks in question were erected in early September 1944.

The "Construction Order No. 61" issued by Bischoff as head of the Construction Inspectorate of the *Waffen-SS* and Police "Silesia" dated 11 July 1944 is about the "construction request for the installation of 3 barracks for special measures." The reference is to a letter from the Central Construction Office dated 19 June with registration number 51851/44/Tei/L. The total expense is calculated as 51,000 RM.¹⁷⁷ The authors' Document 40 (p. 167) allows us to correctly interpret Bischoff's order.

On 19 June 1944, Jothann sent to the Construction Inspectorate of the *Waffen-SS* and Police "Silesia" a letter with protocol number 51851/44/Tei/L. with the subject: "CC II – Structure: – Construction Request for installation of 3 barracks for special measures in CC II [Birkenau]." Attached to this letter was the construction request of 26 May 1944, which in fact bears the stamp "*Gepprüft*" (audited) of Construction Inspectorate of the *Waffen-SS* and Police "Silesia" with the date of 6 July 1944. The estimated cost was 61,000 RM, recorded in expenditure item 21/7b (*Bau*) 65, which was that of structure *BW* 54.¹⁷⁸ All these data coincide with those of Bischoff's "Construction Order No. 61," except for the expense, which was undoubtedly reduced by his office from 61,000 to 51,000 RM.

It can therefore be concluded with certainty that the "3 barracks for special measures / *BW* 54" had no relation to the legendary "Bunker 2."

The text of Document 36 published by the authors was a first version that was subsequently edited by hand (the total due for the three barracks was reduced from 55,758 to 46,467 RM). The document is partially torn at the mar-

¹⁷⁶ RGVA, 502-1-111, pp. 573-573a. See DOCUMENT 20.

¹⁷⁷ RGVA, 502-1-281, p. 54. See DOCUMENT 21.

¹⁷⁸ In the document published by the authors, the header row relating to "Subject" has a wide space between "*BW*" and "*– Bauantrag*": it is probable that the original text was "*BW: 54 – Bauantrag*."

gin. I reproduce all pages of the final, edited version in the Appendix (my DOCUMENT 22).

[35] Document 37 (p. 159)

As mentioned before when discussing Document 35, Bischoff sent a letter to the Central Construction Office on 31 May 1944 with the subject “Construction of 3 horse-stable barracks for Special Operation ‘Hungary.’” With reference to Kammler’s order of 25 May, he stated that the barracks had to be taken from *Bauhof I* (storage of construction materials) of the Construction Inspectorate “Silesia,” and demanded that the administrative steps needed for this construction be carried out instantly.¹⁶² This is the authors’ Document 37, of which they published merely a transcript of the original.¹⁷⁹ They comment as follows:

“These barracks had not yet been built, but they were at the so-called Bauhof I—the construction material depot near the Auschwitz main camp (Die Baracken sind dem Bauhof I der Bauinspektion ‘Schlesien’ zu entnehmen). In the first phase of the extermination of the Jews deported from Hungary, the persons destined to die in bunker II were made to disrobe in the open air nearby. This is confirmed by an aerial photograph of the Birkenau camp taken by an RAF aircraft on May 30, 1944, in which only the vestigial outlines of the old undressing barracks are visible.” (p. 158)

On p. 159, below this document, the authors publish a section of an air photo showing the area of the alleged “Bunker 2.” Here they commit yet another blunder, because the air photo in question was taken on 31 May 1944 by an aircraft of the U.S. Air Forces.¹⁸⁰ I have dealt in depth with this and other air photos in two of my earlier studies.¹⁸¹

The issue is much more complex than the authors would have you believe. It concerns not only three barracks, but also the activities around the alleged homicidal “Bunker 2.”

In the photo of 31 May 1944, the old “forest road,” which is discussed here in the section dealing with Document 19, is no longer well defined; the disused road seems to have been invaded by vegetation. This is in contrast to the three rectangular shapes which show newly cleared areas. It is therefore impossible that these were the footprints of the barracks that had been dismantled more than a year before.

Two barracks, erected on two of the three rectangular shapes just mentioned, appear in the vicinity of “Bunker 2” for the first time in an air photo

¹⁷⁹ RGVA, 501-1-351, p. 46.

¹⁸⁰ NA, Mission 60 PRS/462 60 SQ, Exposure 3056.

¹⁸¹ Mattogno 2004a, pp. 226f.; Mattogno 2005c, pp. 101-103 (photo of 31 May 1944 and its section enlargements).

taken on 26 June 1944,¹⁸² and more-clearly still on a photo made by the Royal Air Force on 23 August 1944.¹⁸³

On this photo, the “forest road” appears to have been restored. This road started at the camp’s western gate (near the *Effektenlager*), then passed between the two newly erected barracks, and a few meters beyond that it merged into the old road, forming the hypotenuse of a right triangle.

On 30 August 1944, two members of the camp resistance movement, “Stakło” (Stanisław Kłodziński) and an unidentified “J.,” sent the following secret message out of the camp:¹⁸⁴

“The gassing of Jews continues. Transports from Lodz, the Netherlands and Italy. The pits in which they cremated the corpses of the gassed at Birkenau when the crematoria were insufficient, are currently filled up [obecnie zasypują] to erase the traces.”

This means that the outdoor cremations of allegedly gassed corpses had ceased at that time, and consequently that the activities of “Bunker 2” had ceased as well.

However, the two barracks still appear on an air photo taken on 29 November 1944,¹⁸⁵ which also shows the building said to have been “Bunker 2.” According to normal practice prevailing in Auschwitz because of the shortage of barracks, when a barrack was no longer needed, it was dismantled and reassembled wherever needed for another purpose. But if the two barracks had been the changing rooms for the alleged victims of “Bunker 2,” why were they left in place for three months after the cessation of its activities? This is all the more inexplicable since, according to Czech, the presumed order to “end all homicidal gassings” arrived at Auschwitz on 2 November 1944 (Czech 1990, p. 743).

No known document mentions these two barracks, so it is hard to say what their purpose was. Even though they cannot be the “three horse-stable barracks for Special Operation ‘Hungary,’” since those were three barracks rather than just two, it seems certain that they have a direct relation to the deportation of the Hungarian Jews.

The Hungarian Jews were deported between mid-May and early July 1944. They brought to Birkenau enormous quantities of personal items, which were piled up in front of the barracks of the *Effektenlager*, as shown by various era photos (Freyer/Pressac, photos 121-125, pp. 150-155). It is likely that the two barracks in question, erected not far from the *Effektenlager*, were intended to accommodate these items, which had to be protected from the elements. The

¹⁸² NA, Mission: 60/PR522 60SQ. Can: C1172, Exposure 5022.

¹⁸³ Mattogno 2005c, Documents 36 & 37, pp. 117f.

¹⁸⁴ APMO, D-RO/85, vol. II, p. 126.

¹⁸⁵ NA, Record Group no. 373, Mission: 15 SG/887 5 PG. Can: D 1610. Exposure: 4058. *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations*, op. cit., Document 41 on p. 122.

expansion of the courtyard of “Bunker 2” can be explained as follows: it was used to unload the material, which was then sorted by the inmates and placed inside the two barracks.

According to “eyewitnesses,” the following numbers of cremation pits are said to have operated in the summer of 1944 in the area of “Bunker 2”:

- one according to Shaul Chasan and Shlomo Venezia;
- two according to Miklos Nyiszli and Dov Paisikovic;
- four according to Filip Müller.¹⁸⁶

According to Filip Müller, the preparations for the extermination of the Hungarian Jews in “Bunker 2” (which he called “Bunker V”) began in early May 1944. Four “cremation pits” were excavated measuring 40-50 m × 8 m × 2 m. In mid-May the first transports of Hungarian Jews arrived, who were allegedly exterminated in “Bunker V.”¹⁸⁷

Dov Paisikovic claimed to have worked at “Bunker 2” for two weeks, from 23 May to 6 June. According to him, an uninterrupted extermination activity, day and night, unfolded in that area on 31 May 1944. The two mass cremation pits claimed by him measuring 30 m × 10 m or 30 m × 6 m had to operate at full capacity. Pressac spoke of two small pits of 30 and 20 square meters.¹⁸⁸ The orthodox Holocaust writer Mark van Alstine claims to have identified on air photos three “cremation pits” with an area of about 106.8 m² each and about 320 m² in total in the area of the alleged “Bunker 2.”¹⁸⁹ Piper did not mention the number of “cremation pits” near “Bunker 2,” but claimed that their total capacity was 5,000 corpses per day.¹⁹⁰

On 31 May 1944, the area of “Bunker 2” would therefore have been an inferno of fire and smoke, but the above-mentioned air photos, including the one published by the authors, show no trace of either smoking or non-smoking pits; or of any kind of smoke; or of any activity of the 100 or 150 inmates who were allegedly employed there; or of trucks delivering fuel wood or removing ashes; or of stacks of wood piled up for the cremation of the corpses. As I mentioned above, in the air photo of 31 May 1944, the “forest road” was not even in use. The only road linking the Birkenau Camp to “Bunker 2” started from the area of the sewage-treatment plant, continued to the southwest, then bent at a 90° angle to the southeast toward the area of “Bunker 2,” but it was blocked by a thick hedge preventing access to the fenced-in yard of the building.¹⁹¹ So the claimed trucks with the victims (which are not visible on any air photo either) had to stop at the end of the road, the victims had to get off the trucks and somehow get through the hedge in order to get to the yard of the al-

¹⁸⁶ Mattogno 2005c, p. 23.

¹⁸⁷ Müller 1979, pp. 198-212.

¹⁸⁸ Pressac 1994, p. 172.

¹⁸⁹ Mattogno 2005c, p. 44.

¹⁹⁰ Piper 1994, pp. 173f.

¹⁹¹ Mattogno 2005c, Documents 20 & 22, pp. 103, 105.

leged “bunker,” with the risk of them escaping and having to be shot at, and all this in plain view of the camp. Hence the very air photo presented by the authors radically debunks all their conjectures on the gassing “bunker” and its alleged undressing barracks.

[36] Document 38 (p. 161)

This is a letter by Jothann dated 1 June 1944 with the subject “Erection of 3 horse-stable barracks – Special Operation ‘Hungary.’” The authors adduce it as such without any comment.

[37] Document 39 (p. 163-165)

This is a file memo about the Auschwitz visit by SS-*Obergruppenführer* Pohl on 16 June 1944, dated 17 June. In this regard the authors write:

“On page 2 of the protocol there is a list of intended construction projects that cannot be carried out until the appropriate proposals have been submitted. Item 10 mentions three barracks needed as urgent measures for the ‘Jewish operation’ (3 Baracken für Sofortmassnahme ‘Judenaktion’).” (p. 162)

This document¹⁹² states that Pohl had authorized the list of 29 requested construction projects, including these three barracks, after he had checked their degree of urgency. Among these construction projects were finishing a building for the Hygienic Institute (Point 2), extending and finishing House No. 7 (Point 11), an air-raid shelter (*Luftschutzbunker*) and a shrapnel-protection shelter (*Splitterschutzbunker*; Points 20, 21 and 29).

The term *Sofortmassnahme* (immediate measures) had no criminal connotation, on the contrary: it is in fact referring to sanitation. For example, on 7 June 1943 the garrison surgeon submitted a request to the Central Construction Office requesting that, “in the course of the immediate measures to improve the hygienic conditions in CC Auschwitz,” the hot-air-disinfestation chambers be modified in such a way that they no longer pose any fire hazard.¹⁹³ In another letter dated 20 July 1943 with the subject “hygienic immediate measures,” Wirths asked the Central Construction Office to install adequate morgues, because rats were feeding on the corpses in the existing wooden ones.¹⁹⁴

It is also worth mentioning that the term special measures had the same meaning. The entire Birkenau hospital sector *BA III* was a “special measure,” as the “List of barracks necessary for the implementation of the special measure in the PoW camp” of 11 June 1943 shows.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² NO-2359.

¹⁹³ RGVA, 502-1-170, p. 150.

¹⁹⁴ RGVA, 502-1-170, p. 263.

¹⁹⁵ RGVA, 502-1-79, p. 100. See Mattogno 2016c, Document 26, p. 334.

[38] Document 41 (p. 169)

This is the well-known “Construction Order No. 63,” signed by Bischoff on 20 July 1944, which refers to the “construction request for the erection of 3 barracks for special measures,” for a total amount RM 41,000.¹⁹⁶ The authors comment on this as follows:

“Under point 13 on page 2 of document 7 above, there is information that three barracks for the ‘Jewish operation’ (Judenaktion) are 90 percent completed. RAF aerial photographs from the second half of August 1944, however, show that in the end only two undressing barracks were built at bunker II.” (p. 168)

The reference to their Document 7 is to the “List of structures under construction with extent of completion” dated 4 September 1944, which in Paragraph 13 of the list b) reads: “3 barracks for immediate measures (Jewish operation).” The list also includes finishing a residential house for agriculture (List a), Item 9), finishing two residential houses for civilian employees (Item 20), temporarily finishing 60 residential houses in the relevant camp area for bombed-out SS members (Item 43), finishing a house for the Hygienic Institute (List b), Item 5), and the extension of House No. 7 (Item 14). The authors do not even ask why the documents supposedly list the erection of the undressing barracks at the elusive “bunker,” while being absolutely silent about the transformation work which would have been required to convert the two relevant existing houses into the claimed gassing facilities, although documents on similar conversion projects appear in abundance for many existing houses which the Central Construction Office had taken over and put to one use or another.

The authors’ conjecture is also senseless from a chronological point of view. Kammler’s telegram containing the order to erect three barracks for “Special Operation Hungary” dates back to 25 May 1944. The deportation of Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz began on 15 May 1944, and the first transport arrived at the camp on May 17 (Czech 1990, p. 628). By 25 May, already 138,870 Jews had been deported in 44 trains.¹⁹⁷ During these first 10 days, on average almost 13,900 Jews arrived at Birkenau every day, most of whom, according to the historians at the Auschwitz Museum, were gassed in the claimed extermination facilities at Birkenau, including “Bunker 2.” If, therefore, Kammler’s order was referring to the erection of three undressing barracks near “Bunker 2,” this was not only a little late (the deportation schedule had been discussed in Vienna on 4 and 5 May 1944,¹⁹⁸ at which point Auschwitz camp administration must have been informed about the upcoming deportations). In addition, the order was not even implemented!

¹⁹⁶ RGVA, 502-1-281, p. 57. See DOCUMENT 23

¹⁹⁷ NG-5623.

¹⁹⁸ NG-5565.

Fact is that the deportation of the Hungarian Jews ended on 8 July 1944, and the last transport arrived at Auschwitz three days later, but on 4 September the three barracks in question had still not been finalized and were not yet in operation. Even if they were for the “Special Operation ‘Hungary,’” the barracks now were meant to serve a completely different purpose. In fact, the “Hungary Program” brings to mind the “fighter-construction program,” a program for the construction of underground aircraft factories to quickly build a large fleet of small aircraft capable of defending Germany against the Allied bomber fleets. For this purpose, Hitler informed Luftwaffe Field Marshal Erhard Milch on 9 April 1944 that Himmler was in charge of gathering 100,000 Hungarian Jews for this program,¹⁹⁹ and on 9 May the Führer ordered the withdrawal from Sevastopol of 10,000 men to watch over 200,000 Jews who were about to be sent to concentration camps in order to be deployed in that program.²⁰⁰ Kammler’s stake in the “Special Operation ‘Hungary,’” program was that he was Himmler’s representative in the German government department overseeing the production of fighter aircraft; he was the “Plenipotentiary of the *Reichsführer-SS* at the Reich Ministry for Armaments and War Production, ‘Fighter Staff’” (*Bevollmächtigter des Reichsführers-SS beim Reichsministerium für Rüstung und Kriegsproduktion, ‘Jägerstab’*).²⁰¹

IV. Section “The Railroad Ramp (*Alte Judenrampe*)”

This section is the most-tenuous of the whole book, since the documents proffered have not the slightest relevance to the alleged extermination of the Jews.

[39] Document 43 (p. 175)

This is a file memo by SS-*Untersturmführer* Kirschnek dated 28 July 1943 which merely mentions the “Jews ramp” (*Judenrampe*), and this is the only reason why the authors published it, as if this fact had been unknown! They explain that on this ramp “SS men received transports of deportees and subjected them to selection from mid-1942” (p. 174). Is the presence of the railway ramp supposed to be evidence for the claim that arriving Jews were gassed later on?

[40] Document 44 (p. 175)

It is a sketch by the industrial construction company Schlesische Industriebau Lenz & Co. AG on a project called “railway construction – potato transportation to the potato bunker” – another real yet innocuous bunker! The sketch sports a label saying “external ramp – Jew track” – and that’s all!

¹⁹⁹ R-134.

²⁰⁰ NO-5689.

²⁰¹ NARA, T 175/226, 2764970.

[41] Document 45 (p. 179)

This is a letter by Bischoff to Kammler of 19 January 1943 concerning the construction of a spur from the Auschwitz railway station to the Birkenau Camp. The authors comment:

“The first of its functions mentioned here is receiving transports sent to the camp within the framework of special operations (Direkte Anfahrt der Transportzüge – Sondermassnahmen).” (p. 178)

The German phrase translates to: “Direct approach of the transport trains – special measures.” But what proves that these “special measures” were homicidal gassings? Above I have elaborated on the various meanings of the terms *Sondermassnahme* or *Sofortmassnahme*, so there is no need to probe the subject here again.

[42] Document 46 (pp. 181-183)

This is a report on a meeting of 23 March 1943 between representatives of the railway management at Oppeln (today Opole) as well as members of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office and camp headquarters. The report is dated 25 March 1943. Among the issues discussed is also that of a railway spur between the Auschwitz railway station and the Birkenau Camp. The authors point out:

“The report includes information about plans to use the freight station as the place for the ‘unloading of special transports of the office of the commandant of Auschwitz concentration camp’ as well as for the unloading of construction materials required by the Zentralbauleitung. Additionally, the document mentions the necessity of expanding the area of the freight station so that it can handle the daily arrival of 10 special transports and 40 train cars carrying construction material and supplies (Soll das Baugleis täglich neben dem Baustoffverkehr mit bis zu 10 Sondertransporten und bis zu 40 Waggons mit Baustoff, Verpflegung usw. für die Kommandantur und die Zentralbauleitung belastet werden).” (p. 180)

Apparently, the authors reproduced this document merely because it contains the term “special transports,” which for them is obviously evidence that the majority of these “special transports” were then gassed.

[43] Document 47 (pp. 185)

This is a letter by the German State Railway (*Reichsbahn*) to the Central Construction Office dated 17 March 1943. It refers to “Relocating the ramp for the camp’s special transports.” Here, too, the magical term “special transports” appears.

[44] Document 48 (pp. 187)

This is page 335 of the inmate labor-deployment register (see their Document 12) which confirms the “Relocation of the ramp for special transports,” and that is all.

Since the authors seem to be obsessed with the “relocation of the ramp for special transports,” I inform them that more documents exist in this regard, the “File memo about a conference with representatives of the *Reichsbahn* at the Central Construction Office of the *Waffen-SS* and Police Auschwitz on 9 April 1943 regarding relocating the ramp for special transports,”²⁰² and a “Report on the relocation of the ramp for special transports.”²⁰³

[45] Document 49 (pp. 189-191)

These are two documents, a letter from the *Reichsbahn* railway management Oppeln to the Central Construction Office of 20 April 1943, and a letter from the Central Construction Office to the camp commandant of 25 March 1943. In both the magical term “special transports” appears again, and that’s good enough for the authors to include it. What they imagine this proves remains a mystery.

[46] Document 50 (p. 193)

This document is about the “potato-storage warehouses.” The authors explain:

“They were built in 1943 near the unloading ramp where Jewish transports were received in the period from the spring of 1942 to May 1944 and subjected to selection. The location and dimensions of the unloading ramp are visible, as is the road running in the direction of the Birkenau camp that was defined as the ‘camp access road’ (Zufahrtstrasse zum KGL).” (p. 192)

In this document, not even the term “special transports” appears but simply the word “ramps”!

They could just as well have reproduced the map of 21 June 1944 showing the area between Sectors I and II of Birkenau which Pressac published decades ago and which even indicates the width of the two ramps: 2 and 10 meters, respectively (*“Rampe 2 m breit; Rampe 10 m breit”*; Pressac 1989, pp. 254f.).

[47] Document 51 (pp. 195f.)

This is a file memo by Bischoff of 12 July 1943 mentioning the “track for special transports” (*Gleis für Sondertransporte*). Yet another irrelevant document.

²⁰² RGVA, 502-1-186, pp. 205f.

²⁰³ RGVA, 502-1-86, pp. 160f.

V. Section “The *Sonderkommando*”

[48] Document 52 (p. 201)

This is a compilation of expenses for materials at the Birkenau Camp. On 23 April 1942 are recorded 300 kg of cement and 400 kg of bagged lime (*Sackkalk*; see my DOCUMENT 28). The authors explain that these materials had been “required by the *Sonderkommando*” and that the lime “was used as a disinfectant when burying bodies in mass graves” (p. 200).

This is a deliberate misrepresentation for two reasons. First, *Sackkalk* was a German term for powdered unslaked lime (CaO) sold in bags to the pottery and construction industry (see Lamock 1911). It was and is to this day one of the major components of mortar and plaster, together with cement, water and sand. The fact that the lime was listed together with cement should alert readers to the incontrovertible fact that here simple building materials were ordered. But the authors very prudently decided to ignore the cement so that they wouldn’t have to repeat the absurd explanation in their introduction.²⁰⁴ After all, what was the alleged *Sonderkommando* at the elusive “bunkers” supposed to have done with 300 kg of cement? Besides, had the SS ordered lime-based powder for disinfection purposes, they would have ordered chlorinated lime (*Chlorkalk*),²⁰⁵ see the next document discussed.

Next, the authors pass over a second central bit of information: the complete recipient of these supplies: “BW. 4 Sonderk. Bir.,” which means “Structure 4 of the Birkenau *Sonderkommando*.” BW 4 Birkenau referred to the construction of 14 barracks for economy (*Wirtschaftsbaracken*).²⁰⁶ The construction work of two of these barracks, labelled BW 4a, had started on 10 November 1941; one had been completed at the end of March 1942, the second was 90% finished, and its completion was scheduled for 31 May 1942.²⁰⁷ The above-mentioned construction materials were used for building these very barracks for logistical maintenance, and the “Birkenau *Sonderkommando*” was working in it.

[49] Document 53 (p. 203)

This is a request (*Anforderung*) by the “*Sonderkommando* Birkenau” from 10 February 1943 regarding “1 barrel of chlorinated lime.” The authors affirm

²⁰⁴ See my comments below on their Introduction, Part Two, Section 11. “*Sonderkommando*” and “Bunker.”

²⁰⁵ A mixture of highly corrosive calcium hypochlorite $\text{Ca}(\text{ClO})_2$, calcium chloride CaCl_2 and calcium hydroxide $\text{Ca}(\text{OH})_2$.

²⁰⁶ “BW 4 Wirtschaftsbaracken 1-14”; “Erläuterungsbericht zum Vorentwurf für den Neubau des Kriegsgefangenenlagers der Waffen-SS Auschwitz O/S,” 30 October 1941. RGVA, 502-1-233, p. 14 (p. 2 of the report). It is not entirely clear what a *Wirtschaftsbarracke* was, but it may have referred to buildings for activities of logistical maintenance/domestic economy (*Hauswirtschaftsbarracke*), like bakery, kitchen, laundry etc.

²⁰⁷ “Baufristenplan” of the “Kriegsgefangenenlager” dated 5 May 1942. RGVA, 502-1-22, p. 15.

that the *Sonderkommando* used these 200 kg of chlorinated lime “for disinfection” (p. 202), always insinuating that it was meant to be used in mass graves of gassing victims. This is, of course, purely conjectural, because no one knows to which *Sonderkommando* the document refers. But even if it were true that it was used in mass graves, that doesn’t prove that a mass murder was going on in Birkenau at that time. Since at that point in time a typhus epidemic had been raging inside the camp for seven months, claiming tens of thousands of victims without adequate cremation capacity, a huge need for chlorinated lime cannot surprise. Actually, it is a miracle that this is the only order for chlorinated lime the museum could locate. But we don’t even know whether that lime was meant to disinfect corpses, because that is not the only possible application for chlorinated lime. It is also used in garbage dumps, septic tanks, cesspits, and last but not least for cleaning toilets and other sanitary facilities.

[50] Document 54 (p. 205)

This is Receipt No. 2102 of 18 December 1942 for “*Sonderkommando Nr. 2*” concerning the delivery of 3 tons of coke. Here the authors’ incredible interpretation:

“In the winter, coke was burned in portable iron baskets to heat the gas chambers.” (p. 204)

This is a ridiculous stopgap trick designed to somehow explain the supply of coke, a hypothesis not backed up by anything, not even an anecdote. Szlama Dragon, who claims to have been assigned to the *Sonderkommando* on 10 December 1942 – eight days before the aforementioned coke delivery – described with great wealth of detail the alleged gassing procedure, but without ever mentioning portable coal baskets (so-called braziers), which in fact wouldn’t have been needed, because when the “gas chamber” was opened, it “was very warm” (*było bardzo gorąco*).²⁰⁸

Setkiewicz published another document elsewhere which is said to indicate the supply of another 3 tons of coke to this *Sonderkommando* on 26 February 1943. This is not, however, a proper document such as Document 54, but a mere sheet of paper in which the following text appears in handwriting:

“3 – –

Sondern [sic] Kommando II
26/ Februar.”

It is therefore neither specified whether it is 3 tons of coke nor that the year is 1943. Here is Setkiewicz’s incredible comment (2011a, p. 106):

²⁰⁸ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by investigating Judge Jan Sehn, 10 & 11 May 1945. Höss Trial, vol. 11, pp.103-106.

“This suggests that at the time a ‘Sonderkommando I’ had to exist; in other words, there were two Sonderkommandos assigned to the gas chambers of the ‘red house’ and the ‘white house’.”

A delirious logic, to say the least!

[51] Document 55 (p. 207)

This is a page of the inmate-labor-deployment register from which the authors drew their Documents 12 and 48 (see there). In an entry dated 19 January 1943, we read in the “contents” column:

“Request for 2 guards for Sonderkommando.”

As in the case of Document 12, the authors fail to report that in the fourth column headed “by whom,” giving the entity which filed the request, has the following text: “Administration of Inmate Property.” So this *Sonderkommando*, exactly like the one mentioned in Document 12, was sorting and disinfesting inmate belongings. The Administration of Inmate Belongings was a subsection of “Department IV – Administration” of the Auschwitz Concentration Camp.

[52] Document 56 (p. 209)

This is again taken from the just-mentioned register, page 259. On 10 February 1943 a “Request for dentists to the special operation” was filed by the “dental center.” The authors merely repeat this request without making any comment. They probably imply that any reader sufficiently imbued with orthodox propaganda assumes that the two dentists in question had the task of extracting gold teeth from the corpses of allegedly gassed victims. This presumably derives from the mere presence of the term “special operation.” But the term referred very generally to the arrival of “special transports” with all the operations resulting from it: reception, disinfestation and sorting of the deportees, as I explained earlier. These operations were also called “special measures,” as is sensationally confirmed by Document 67, to be discussed further below.

The former detainee Männe Kratz claimed during the hearing on 21 December 1964 of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial that he had been part of the dental center’s *Sonderkommando*, which he described as follows:²⁰⁹

“The ‘Sonderkommando’ of the dental station was occupied with smelting the gold teeth extracted from the dead.”

The use of the term “special operation” to describe the extraction of gold teeth from dead bodies is not attested to by any document. It is however known that, according to investigating judge Jan Sehn, during 200 days of the year

²⁰⁹ Fritz Bauer Institut *et al.* 2005, p. 27049.

1942, 16,325 gold fillings or fillings of other precious metal alloys were extracted from the teeth of 2,904 corpses.²¹⁰ For this existed special pre-printed forms which read as follows:²¹¹

*“Inmate Dental Center of CC Auschwitz. Auschwitz, the194...
To the Political Department of CC Auschwitz.
From the corpse of ... inmate no. ... the following dentures were removed:
1.) precious metal alloy R... L... 2.) Gold R ... L...
Number of links
Total number of links
The Head of the Inmate Dental Center of the CC Auschwitz
SS-Untersturmführer.”*

All this happened in broad daylight without any “code word.” Removing dentures and dental fillings from corpses prior to their cremation is not only standard practice in every crematorium of the world, but it is also necessary to prevent those metals from accumulating in the cremation device – and from polluting the environment (in case of amalgam fillings).²¹² The issue is not that fillings were extracted, but what happened with the precious ones afterwards.

On 14 January 1943 the British decoded the following message sent by the SS-Führungshauptamt to the doctor of an unspecified division:²¹³

*“To div. surgeon.
The 18 dentists and dental technicians drafted to the division for a special operation are to be put in motion immediately, together with the additionally supplied equipment, to the SS medical replacement battalion STETTIN, Kückenmühle.”*

This suggests that a “special operation” performed by dentists did not necessarily have a criminal character.

[53] Documents 57 and 58 (p. 211-213)

Document 57 is a letter by SS-Untersturmführer Josef Janisch to the camp headquarters dated 24 December 1943 with the subject “Return of field railway material made available to *Sonderkommando* I on a loan basis.” It states:²¹⁴

²¹⁰ Höss Trial, vol. 3, p. 86; note that this would amount to 5.6 gold fillings per corpse, which seems a little high.

²¹¹ J. Sehn, “Obóz koncentracyjny i zagłady Oświęcim”, in: *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Niemieckich w Polsce*, I, Poznań, 1946, photo on unnumbered page.

²¹² Amalgam is an alloy of silver and mercury. The latter, a poisonous heavy metal, melts and evaporates during cremation.

²¹³ TNA, HW 16/23, German Decodes No. 3 Traffic: 14.1.43 Addenda to I Traffic. ZIP/GPDD 358a/4.2.43.

²¹⁴ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 54.

“A while ago, the Central Construction Office made some field railway material available to Sonderkommando I, specifically tracks and wagons. This field railway material, which is currently not being used there, is urgently needed by the PoW Construction Office. It is requested to immediately hand it over to the PoW Construction Office in Birkenau.”

The authors comment on it this way:

“It can be concluded from numerous accounts by Sonderkommando prisoners such as Szlama Dragon and Eliezera Eisenschmidt that the transport of corpses from the gas chamber to the burning pits and pyres at bunkers I and II was carried out with the aid of flatcars running on the provisional rails of a field railroad.” (p. 210)

Subsequently the authors present two more documents dealing with the same issue (their Document 58) – a letter by the camp headquarters to the Central Construction Office dated 7 February 1944, and the Office’s response on 24 February²¹⁵ (p. 213). They highlight the phrase “currently not being used,” perhaps because, in their confused version of the orthodox history of the “bunkers,” they believe that “Bunker 1” had ceased operations in December 1943. Neither of these documents adds anything new to the debate.

It is true that “Bunker 2” is claimed to have had such a field railway as well. It appears clearly on the map drawn by Ing. Eugeniusz Nosal based on Dragon’s instructions (Mattogno 2004a, p. 207, Document 12). Other than that, however, nothing is known about this field railway. Not even the inmate-labor-deployment register, of which the authors publish three pages (their Documents 12, 48 and 55), contains any hint of a field railway loaned to *Sonderkommando I* (supposedly working at “Bunker 1”) or to *Sonderkommando 2* (at “Bunker 2”), because in that case it would have been invariably reported.

Apart from that, the authors’ time line of dismantling various items said to have belonged to “Bunker 1” is confused and illogical. Here are some of the things they claim:

- May 1943: request to remove two undressing barracks from “Bunker 1” (their interpretation of Document 33).
- 24 December 1943: request to remove field railway from “Bunker 1” (their interpretation of the present document).
- 4 February 1944: request to remove three undressing barracks from “Bunker 1” (although two had already been removed earlier; their interpretation of Document 34).
- 18 March 1944: request to dismantle an electric wire from “Bunker 1” (their interpretation of Document 20).

²¹⁵ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 41.

If “Bunker 1” ceased its activities in early May 1943, with a large sewage-treatment plant built on its claimed site, why was it noticed only seven months later, on Christmas Eve of 1943, that the field railway was “currently not being used”? Can anyone believe that, after the termination of the alleged activities of “Bunker 1,” the railroad would have been left abandoned for seven months, sitting in plain sight of the sewage-treatment plant rusting away?

In the absence of any specific documents, we cannot ascertain the location and purpose of this field railway.

A letter from the company Schlesische Industriebau Lenz & Co. AG to the Central Construction Office of 3 February 1944 contains an offer for a field railway track (*Feldbahngleis*) for “BW 47 – BA III,”²¹⁶ which was to be used to transport construction materials. This shows that the presence of a field railway in Auschwitz was not necessarily linked to any alleged extermination activities.

VI. Section “*Sonderaktionen*” (Special Operations)

[54] Document 59 (p. 217)

This is a letter from Bischoff to the camp Headquarters dated 18 August 1942 with the headline “immediate measure” (*Sofortmaßnahme*). This is the text:

“Due to constant labor interruption caused by the special operation, the Central Construction Office requests the allocation, with immediate effect, of one additional NCO and three guards for the labor detail PoW Camp ring trench, Construction Sector III (100 inmates, currently with four guards), so that it can be deployed for urgent excavation works at the Vistula trench with a guard [ratio] of 1:6.”

The authors claim that the prisoners of this excavation detail “at the time were used to dig drainage ditches near the bunker I” (p. 216), but they do not explain the document’s meaning in this perspective.

First, why does it mention only one “special operation” in the singular rather than “special operations” (= alleged homicidal gassings) in the plural, as would have to be expected? How and why could the “special operation” constantly interrupt this detail’s work? How could four additional guards prevent further interruptions? And apart from that, four additional guards would increase the ratio only from 1:25 to 1:12.5, not 1:6, as the document claims.

Without the aid of other documents it is very difficult to determine what the special operation in question was about, but we can assume this document was about the same inmate detail as the one mentioned in Document 66.

²¹⁶ RGVA, 502-1-346, p. 44.

[55] Document 60 (p. 219)

On 14 September 1942, SS-Obersturmbannführer Arthur Liebehenschel, head of Office D/I of the SS-WVHA (Zentralamt),²¹⁷ signed the following travel permit (*Fahrgenehmigung*):

“For the purpose of an urgent transfer of 5 trucks and an accompanying machine, a travel permit from Oranienburg to Auschwitz is herewith issued for 14 September 1942.

Reason:

*Immediate transfer of the allotted trucks to C.C. Auschwitz, since these vehicles have to be used immediately for special operations.”*²¹⁸

This is the content of Document 60, which the authors interpret as follows:

“These trucks were used to carry deported Jewish children and those who were too sick or frail to march from the ‘old ramp’ to the gas chambers. They also delivered the victims’ luggage to the ‘Kanada I’ warehouses.” (p. 218)

As I explained earlier, in September 1942 the personal belongings of the Jewish deportees were disinfected and stored as part of “Operation Reinhard,” and it is evident that those belongings were to be transported from the Auschwitz railway station to “Kanada I” and to “Station 2 of Aktion Reinhard” Birkenau, then into the various warehouses at Auschwitz and Birkenau. That is why the trucks were needed. This is further confirmed by Document 61, while the authors’ claim that the trucks served to transport kids and disabled inmates to the “gas chambers” is not in the least supported by any document.

[56] Document 61 (p. 221)

This is a transfer document from Dachau to Auschwitz “for Operation ‘Reinhard’” concerning 12 non-commissioned SS officers and soldiers, including the already-mentioned SS-Hauptscharführer Georg Höcker and SS-Unterscharführer Heinz Kühnemann. As I demonstrated in my comments on Document 31, they were employed in the disinfestation and storage of Jewish belongings. It is not clear why the authors have included this document in the section of “special operations,” since it does not contain any reference to this term.

[57] Document 62 (p. 223)

This is a note (*Vermerk*) by Bischoff dated 1 October 1942 saying:

“During the service meeting on 28 September 1942 at Camp Commandant Obersturmbannführer Höss’s, the undersigned, in his capacity as building

²¹⁷ Department 3 of the office (D/I/3) was in charge of motor vehicles (*Kraftfahrwesen*).

²¹⁸ Trial of the Auschwitz camp garrison, vol. 38, p. 113.

inspector, drew attention to the fact that no luggage and refuse from inmate belongings are to be incinerated nearby buildings, since otherwise a conflagration can break out, to which whole parts of the camp could fall victim.

As determined on Saturday, 26 September 1942, the start of a fire could be prevented at the last minute, which was caused by carelessly burning old suitcases and the like at the effect barracks south of the DAW."

The authors do not provide any explanation, except that "at the time, these items were stored on the grounds of the 'Kanada 1' storehouses located near the Auschwitz I camp." (p. 222)

As with the previous case, it is not clear what relationship this document has with "special operations" in the eyes of the authors. Instead, it illuminates the background of Höss's visit to the "experimental station for field furnaces Operation Reinhard," which had taken place only a few weeks earlier, on 16 September 1942.

In an older study, in which I treated that issue in depth, I demonstrated the utter absurdity of the interpretation proffered by orthodox Holocaust historians (that is, that Höss had gone to Chelmno to learn from Blobel a corpse cremation technique which was then also to be introduced at Auschwitz) and eventually I came to the conclusion that this trip had nothing at all to do with cremating corpses (2008, p. 56):

"Even the claim that these 'field furnaces' were intended for corpses is actually a simple hypothesis: in hindsight, in fact, there is nothing in the two documents mentioned above – Dejaco's report and the travel permit by the SS-WVHA – indicating that this was about cremating corpses. The 'field furnaces' really had nothing to do with cremation furnaces. The famous engineering manual 'Hütte' describes them as follows:

'Ceramic furnaces (brick furnaces). Combustion temperature from 800 to 1200°. One distinguishes furnaces for temporary operation and furnaces for continuous operation. The first is part of the so-called field furnace, rectangular with solid side walls and stoking channel at the bottom. The furnaces are between 4 and 9 meters wide, as long as needed, and open at the top.'

The device designed by F. Siemens was indeed specifically a 'Feldofen für Leichenverbrennung' (field furnace for cremating corpses).^[219]

However, since the 'Operation Reinhard' at Auschwitz simply meant the collection and exploitation of property stolen from the Jews, the term 'field furnaces' could refer in one way or another only to these goods."

At the time I did not want to get deeper into the matter, but Document 62 provides the missing key: in the Auschwitz Camp, combustible refuse from the

²¹⁹ I published the design of this device: Mattogno/Deana 2015, vol. II, Doc. 93, p. 130.

deportees' belongings was burned outside, and this was dangerous. Höss therefore travelled to a place near Litzmannstadt (Łódź), not to Chełmno! The authorization for this trip (*Fahrtgenehmigung*), coming directly from Glücks as head of Office Group D of the SS-WVHA, referred expressly to a trip "from Auschwitz to Litzmannstadt and back,"²²⁰ while Chełmno is located about 60 km north-west of Łódź. On the other hand, Chełmno had no relation to "Operation Reinhard" (or Reinhardt). Furthermore, no orthodox Holocaust historian has yet managed to explain why any experimental corpse cremation for the Reinhardt camps (Belzec, Sobibor, Treblinka) would have been conducted at Chełmno rather than at those camps or at Auschwitz, and why those experiments would have been entrusted to a layman like Blobel, while the engineer supervising the planning and construction of the crematoria at Auschwitz was one of the leading German specialists in that field: Engineer Kurt Prüfer.

The "Travel report service trip to Litzmannstadt," prepared on 17 September 1942 by SS-*Untersturmführer* Walter Dejaco on the trip he had made the day before together with Höss and SS-*Untersturmführer* Franz Hössler – but without Garrison Surgeon Wirths or any of his representatives, which would be strange if this had been about inspecting a cremation device – contains another important element: it was decided to hand over to the Auschwitz Camp a "ball mill for substances."²²¹ This ball mill was a spinning metal drum with metal balls inside to pulverize the materials placed in it. There is not even a trifle of support for the orthodox hypothesis that this device served to crush the cremated bones of alleged gassing victims. In the context outlined above, however, this device can be understood as the counterpart to the "field furnaces:" the mill was used to grind down the incombustible remains from incinerating the refuse from the deportee's belongings.

[58] Document 63 (p. 225)

On 13 October 1942, Bischoff sent a letter to the head of Office C/V of the SS-WVHA with the subject "Assignment of construction tasks for the new construction of the prisoner-of-war camp of the *Waffen-SS* in Auschwitz, Upper Silesia" which states, among other things:²²²

"Due to the situation created by the special operations, the construction of the crematorium had to be begun immediately just this past July. The firms of Huta, Hoch- und Tiefbau-A.G., Kattowitz, Friedrichstr. 19, and Schles. Industriebau Lenz & Co, A.G., Kattowitz, Grundmannstr. 23, which are already working in the prisoner-of-war camp, were invited to a restricted bidding.

²²⁰ AGK, NTN, 94, p. 170.

²²¹ RGVA, 502-1-336, p. 69.

²²² GARF, 7021-108-32, pp. 45-47.

According to a letter of 15 July 1942, the Schles. Industriebau Lenz & Co. made no bid due to lack of workers. For this reason, the Huta firm was commissioned immediately to begin work in accordance with its bid of 13 July 1942."

This letter, known even to Pressac, was published by the authors as their Document 63 with this following comment:

"The 'situation' that Bischoff writes about surely refers to the constantly rising number of people who were deported and killed in the gas chambers." (p. 224)

In other words, they opine that the construction of the new crematorium was commenced instantly because of the gassings in "Bunkers" 1 and 2. This interpretation is unfounded and contradictory, as I showed in an earlier dedicated study (2004b, pp. 62-66), which I will reiterate here.

The sentence "Due to the situation created by the special operations, the construction of the crematorium had to be begun immediately just this past July" means that the special operations had created an *unexpected* new situation. The limited bidding mentioned by Bischoff was thus the first consequence of these circumstances. Since it took place at the instance of the Central Construction Office on 1 July 1942,²²³ the new situation must have manifested itself in all its urgency already before this date.

On the other hand, dealing with this question was not at first a matter of urgency for the Central Construction Office. After the Lenz firm declined to submit an offer on 15 July, they waited fourteen days before concluding a contract with the Huta firm.²²⁴ In July 1942, prisoners under the authority of the Central Construction Office had "finished the excavation work at the crematorium,"²²⁵ which had already begun the previous month.²²⁶ The actual construction work began in August.²²⁷ The PoW camp's construction schedule for July gives the second of that month as the starting date of the construction of the crematorium.²²⁸

However, the "special operations," in the orthodox sense, allegedly began on 4 July, the date on which, according to Danuta Czech, the "selection" of a Jewish transport took place for the first time at Birkenau, in consequence of which those "selected" were allegedly gassed in the "bunkers" (Czech 1990, pp. 191f.). The necessity to immediately begin the construction of the crema-

²²³ APMO, D-Z/Bau-6.

²²⁴ Contract award (*Zuschlag*) by the Central Construction Office to the Huta firm on 29 July 1942. Document published by Pressac 1989, p. 200.

²²⁵ "Am Krematorium wurden die Ausschachtungsarbeiten beendet." "Baubericht für Monat Juli 1942." RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 184.

²²⁶ "Ebenso wurde mit dem Ausschachten der Baugrube für das Krematorium aufgestellt." "Baubericht für Monat Juni 1942." RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 224.

²²⁷ On 10 August, according to Pressac 1994, p. 57.

²²⁸ "Baufristenplan 1942." "Berichtsmonat Juli" for the PoW camp. RGVA, 502-1-22, p. 32.

torium can, therefore, have had nothing to do with these alleged “special operations.”

But there is a much more fundamental problem: Why would the “special operations” have made the construction of the crematorium so urgently necessary, if *no crematoria whatsoever had been planned for “Bunkers” 1 and 2?* Their alleged victims were supposedly just buried in mass graves!

It deserves emphasis that the crematorium of the PoW camp was planned for the cremation of registered prisoners who had died “naturally,” but not for criminal purposes, that is, for the cremation of murdered inmates, as Pressac demonstrated impeccably (1994, p. 64).

According to the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, the burning of those allegedly gassed in the “bunkers,” together with the dead buried in mass graves, is supposed to have begun on 21 September 1942 (Czech 1990, p. 242), allegedly resulting from an order issued by Himmler on 17 July 1942, on the occasion of his visit to Auschwitz. Franciszek Piper claims (1994, p. 163):

“During Himmler’s second inspection visit to Auschwitz on 17 July 1942, he witnessed the entire procedure of liquidation of one transport – from unloading the train cars to gassing (in bunker two) and removing the bodies. It cannot be ruled out that his observations resulted in the decision to cremate the bodies instead of burying them. In fact, shortly after Himmler’s visit, Standartenführer Paul Blobel from Eichmann’s office arrived at Auschwitz with orders to exhume all buried bodies, burn them, and scatter the ashes to prevent the possible reconstruction of the number of victims.”

Himmler’s order to burn the alleged victims of “special operations” – on pyres! – is therefore supposed to have been issued *after* the decision to immediately build the crematorium – which had been triggered by “special operations.” The conclusion is compelling that at the time when a new situation made this construction necessary, there could not yet have been any thought of burning gassed persons – in a crematorium or otherwise. Consequently, the “special operations” – if by this one means the gassing of human beings – could in no way have given the impetus for the rapid construction of the crematorium, but, possibly, only an expansion of the mass graves.

Indeed, there can be no doubt that the Bischoff letter indicates a direct connection between the new situation caused by the “special operations” and the immediate construction of the crematorium. But of what does this connection consist? In order to be able to answer this question, we must embed Bischoff’s remarks within their historical context.

On 1 March 1942, the strength of the camp population of Auschwitz was 11,132 prisoners at the morning roll call, the majority of whom were Poles.²²⁹ On 26 March the first “special trains” organized by the *RSHA* arrived. In March 2,909 Jewish deportees arrived, 7,762 in April, 1,000 in May, and

²²⁹ *Stärkebuch*, analysis by Jan Sehn. AGK, NTN, 92, p. 22.

5,096 in June, amounting to a total of 16,767, of which 10,332 were men and 6,435 women. There was a corresponding increase in prisoner mortality. In March 1942 3,038 deaths were registered in Auschwitz, 2,209 in April, and in the following months the mortality climbed at an even greater rate: 3,341 deaths in May and 3,817 in June, among them 2,289 Jews in the men's camp alone, which accounted for more than 62 percent of the deaths for that month. From June 22–30, an average of 140 prisoners died each day, the highest figure (194 deaths) occurring on June 25. From 1 to 13 July, the average daily mortality rate hovered was about 130.

This already desperate state of affairs was made worse by the murderous typhus epidemic that broke out on 1 July in the communal camp of the civilian workers deployed in Birkenau²³⁰ and very soon spread to the prisoners.²³¹ Under these circumstances, a further increase in mortality in the camp was to be expected. The situation became so drastic that on 23 July Höss had to impose a total quarantine on the camp to prevent the epidemic from spreading to the outside world.²³² In the month of July, 4,401 prisoners died, 4,124 of them in the men's camp alone; 2,903 or more than 70 percent of the victims were Jews.²³³ Nevertheless, the "special trains" continued to arrive in Auschwitz, indeed more frequently than before: In July 11,756 Jews were received into the camp population, so that typhus was able to reap an even richer harvest than before. This explains the extremely high percentage of Jews among those who died.

The hygienic situation became even more catastrophic: The crematorium at the Main Camp had not been functioning properly since the beginning of June 1942, because its chimney was damaged. The chimney had to be removed and restored, and the crematorium went out of service at the beginning of July.²³⁴ Therefore the dead had to be buried in mass graves, which of course further worsened hygienic and sanitary conditions in the camp.

Let us recapitulate. At the beginning of July the situation was as follows:

- Sanitary conditions were rapidly worsening.
- Mortality was rising.
- The Jewish transports were arriving at a faster pace.
- The crematorium in the Main Camp had stopped operations.

²³⁰ Letter of 1 July 1942 from the official commissioner to the firms of Huta and Lenz. RGVA, 502-1-332, p. 151.

²³¹ As a matter of fact, typhus was already raging in the camp prior to this, as Czech indicates with her entries for 27 March, 10 & 25 May and 17 June 1942 (1990, pp. 150, 165, 171, 182). The first typhus cases seem to have been imported into the camp by a transfer of prisoners from the Lublin prison as early as 6 April 1941, however (*ibid.*, p. 57).

²³² The measure was already in preparation on the 20th. "Hausverfügung" no. 40 of 20 July 1942. RGVA, 501-1-25, p. 61.

²³³ *Stärkebuch*, analysis by Jan Sehn. AGK, NTN, pp. 109f.

²³⁴ Letter of 6 July 1942, from Pollock. RGVA, 502-1-312, pp. 29 and 31. The crematorium was most certainly taken out of operation the following day.

The first three factors were closely connected with one another: In a tragic feedback loop, the increase in Jewish transports led to a worsening of sanitary conditions and consequently to soaring mortality.

In this context, the sentence of Bischoff that is under dispute can mean nothing other than this: In July 1942, the immediate construction of the new crematorium had become an absolute necessity as a result of the unexpected and critical deterioration of health and sanitary conditions in the camp caused by the Jewish transports as described above.

As we will see in Documents 67 and 69, “special measures” and “immediate operations,” equivalents for “special operations,” consisted precisely in the reception and accommodation of Jewish transports.

[59] Document 64 (p. 229)

This is a letter by Bischoff dated 4 November 1942 with the subject “Construction Project VIII Up a 2.” At the beginning the “Construction Project ‘PoW Camp (Implementation of Special Treatment)’” is mentioned, which had the ID number VIII Up a 2.²³⁵ The authors explain in this regard:

“The contingent documentation identification number (Kennnummer VIII Up a 2) refers, among other things, to the construction of the crematoria and installations defined as ‘for special treatment’ (für Sonderbehandlung).” (p. 228)

Here the authors’ dishonesty is outright blatant. First they reported an insignificant document instead of an essential documentation, and they moreover give information which must be utterly incomprehensible to anyone who is not a specialist in the matter: “contingent documentation identification number (Kennnummer VIII Up a 2).” Finally, as we shall see, they falsely associate the crematoria with the term “for special treatment.”

On 28 October 1942, Bischoff drafted a general construction project for the Birkenau Camp titled “Construction Project PoW Camp (Implementation of Special Treatment),” bearing the construction reference number VIII Up 2 (see DOCUMENT 24). All structures of the camp fell within the “Implementation of Special Treatment,” but contrary to the authors’ mendacity, the sole facility to which the document specifically assigns the function of “special treatment,” is not a crematorium, but a disinfestation facility, as I have stated already many years ago elsewhere (2004b, pp. 38-41):²³⁶

“16a) Delousing facility

1. for special treatment

Area: 50.00 x 20.00 =

1,000 m²

Height of building: 6.20

²³⁵ On the meaning of this reference see Mattogno 2005d, pp. 26f.

²³⁶ “Vorhaben: Kriegsgefangenenlager Auschwitz (Durchführung der Sonderbehandlung).” VHA, Fond OT 31(2)/8, p. 9. See DOCUMENTS 24a, 24b.

<i>Enclosed space:</i> $1,000.00 \times 6.20 =$	$6,200 \text{ m}^3$
<i>Cellar section:</i> $35.00 \times 20.00 \times 3.20 =$	$2,240 \text{ m}^3$
<i>total</i>	$8,400 \text{ m}^3$
<i>Cost for 1 m³ RM 28.00</i>	
$8,400.00 \times 28.00 =$	236,320.00
<i>Extra charges for heating, shower and disinfection facilities</i>	<u>RM 73,680.00</u>
	310,000.00
<i>16b) 2. For the guard troops</i>	
<i>Area:</i> $12.25 \times 12.65 + 12.40 \times 8.70 =$	262.84 m^2
<i>Height of building:</i> 2.80 m	
<i>Enclosed space:</i> $262.84 \times 2.80 = \text{approx.}$	736.00 m^3
[...]	
<i>Costs for 1 m³:</i>	RM 30.00
$736.00 \times 30.00 =$	RM 22,080
<i>Extra charges for heating, shower and disinfection facilities</i>	<u>RM 7,920</u>
	RM 30,000''

It remains to be established what the nature of this “disinfection facility for special treatment” was.

The two disinfection facilities mentioned are listed under the same numbers (16a and 16b) in another report of the Central Construction Office, dated 2 February 1943. Here, Facility 16b is designated a “delousing facility for the guard troops,” and its dimensions correspond exactly to those stated in the project – of 28 October 1942: “ $12.65 \times 12.25 + 12.40 \times 8.70 \text{ m}$ ”; Facility 16a is called a “delousing facility for prisoners” and shows dimensions different from those given in the project: $48 \text{ m} \times 12 \text{ m} + 34 \text{ m} \times 12 \text{ m}$. This reduction in volume can be explained by a shortage of building materials, for the document referring to this is, in fact, titled “Auditor’s Report on Saving Building Material.”²³⁷ The new dimensions of the installation agree perfectly with those of Drawings No. 1841 of the Central Construction Office of 24 November and No. 1846 of 25 November 1942, in which the “Disinfection and Delousing Facility in the PoW Camp” is depicted and which reflect the original project of the Birkenau *Zentralsauna* (blueprints reproduced in Pressac 1989, pp. 68f.).

The “Situation map of the prisoner-of-war camp” of 6 October 1942 confirms this situation explicitly: The rectangle representing the so-called *Zentralsauna* bears the designation “16a disinfection.”²³⁸ Thus the “disinfection facility for special treatment” of the project of 28 October 1942 was noth-

²³⁷ “Prüfungsbericht Nr. 491 über Baustoffeinsparung gemäß G.B.-Anordnung Nr. 22.” RGVA, 502-1-28, pp. 234-238. The two facilities are mentioned on p. 236.

²³⁸ VHA, Fond OT 31(2)/8.

ing other than the famous *Zentralsauna*, the most important hygienic-sanitary facility of the entire Auschwitz-Birkenau camp complex. Special treatment – *Sonderbehandlung* – consisted therefore in carrying out hygienic-sanitary measures.

The authors' dishonesty is also evident from the fact that their Document 28, "Structures of the Central Construction Office of the *Waffen-SS* and Police Auschwitz in the 3rd budget year of war," which in paragraph 21 mentions five barracks for special treatment, explicitly refers to the "disinfestation facility for special treatment" in the section for the PoW camp Birkenau. A different version of the document, dated 15 November 1942, reported under the construction reference number "GB Bau VIII Z a 1(1)," Point 21, "5 barracks for special treatment,"²³⁹ and under the construction reference number "G.B.-Bau Nr. VIII Up a 2", Point 31, "disinfestation facility a) f. special treatment b) f. the troops (sauna and disinfection)." Point 30 mentions "4 crematoria and 4 morgues,"²⁴⁰ which shows that the crematoria were not designated for "special treatment," and at the same time this exposes the authors' lie and explains the reason for their calculated omission.

[60] Documents 65 (p. 231) and 68 (p. 237)

These two documents concern the same issue, so I examine them together. The first is a "list of concrete requirements for the month of January 1943" written by Bischoff on 20 November 1942. The estimated need was 300 metric tons, 150 of them for Construction Project VIII Up a 1, and 150 for Construction Project VIII Up a 2. Point 2) clarifies:

"a) *SS accommodation and CC Auschwitz – VIII Up a 1*

b) *PoW Camp Auschwitz O/S – VIII Up a 2 (implementation of special treatment).*"

The authors limited themselves to stating that "the special treatment operation was underway on the grounds of the Birkenau camp (*Durchführung der Sonderbehandlung*)" (p. 230), but carefully avoid explaining why this "special treatment" operation required 150 tons of cement (just like the Auschwitz Main Camp, where that operation was not in progress). What is the relationship between these 150 tons of cement and the alleged gassings in the "bunkers"?

Document 68 is a letter by Bischoff of 9 January 1943 addressed to the camp commandant listing the camp's various construction offices subordinate to the Central Construction Office. Birkenau is listed there as follows:

"3. *Construction Office of the Prisoner-of-War Camp (implementation of special treatment) Auschwitz.*"

²³⁹ RGVA, 502-1-85, p. 114.

²⁴⁰ RGVA, 502-1-85, p. 119. See DOCUMENT 25.

The authors do not comment on this, but merely point to the presence of the expression “implementation of special treatment,” as if that were enough.

As indicated earlier, they have dishonestly concealed from the reader that the special treatment referred to in these documents had nothing to do with any mythical homicidal gassings, but with sanitary and hygienic measures. This fact and other documents ignored by the authors allow us to further deepen our understanding of the meaning and significance of this “special treatment.”

The organizational chart for the Central Construction Office created by Bischoff in three versions in January 1943 gives the tasks of the Birkenau Construction Office as follows:

- 1) “Construction Office of the Prisoner-of-War Camp (implementation of special treatment)”²⁴¹
- 2) “Construction Office of the Prisoner-of-War Camp (implementation of special construction measures)”²⁴²
- 3) “Construction Office of the Prisoner-of-War Camp (implementation of special operation)”²⁴³

In the latter document we also read:²⁴⁴

“At the present time, the completion of the PoW camp (special measures) is most urgent.”

These documents prove that “special treatment” (*“Sonderbehandlung”*), “special construction measure” (*“Sonderbaumassnahmen”*) and “special operation” (*“Sonderaktion”*) were one and the same thing, none of which referred to the alleged homicidal gassings.

The equivalence of these terms is further confirmed by other documents ignored by the authors:

- Bischoff’s letter to the Contingency Office of the General Plenipotentiary for Regulating the Construction Industry (Albert Speer; *Kontingentsstelle des G.B. Bau*) of 19 December 1942, in which he complains that Construction Project VIII Up a 2 (Birkenau) had received an allocation of 2,800 tons of cement for the months of November and December, but that only 1,800 had been delivered. The letter has as its subject: “PoW camp Auschwitz, special construction measures.”²⁴⁵

²⁴¹ “Geschäftsverteilungsplan der Zentralbauleitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz und der unterstellten Bauleitungen.” RGVA, 502-1-57, p. 316; reproduced in Mattogno 2004b, p. 129.

²⁴² Organization chart of the *Zentralbauleitung* on key personnel for the operations of each individual *Bauleitungen* (the first page of this document is missing). RGVA, 502-1-57, p. 310; reproduced in Mattogno 2004b, p. 130.

²⁴³ Letter by Bischoff to Kammler of 27 January 1943. RGVA, 502-1-28, p. 248; reproduced in Mattogno 2004b, p. 131.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

²⁴⁵ RGVA, 502-1-319, p. 49.

- Bischoff’s letter to Kammler of 14 May 1943 with the subject “Carrying out of the special operation – procurement of material,” regarding the consignment of various types of pipes.²⁴⁶
- SS-Untersturmführer Pollock’s request to the contingency office of the *GB Bau* from 14 March 1943 concerning “Construction project Prisoner-of-War Camp – implementation of special treatment.” It mentions an allocation of 459,111 kg of iron for the second quarter of 1943; 29,940 kg of construction iron (*Baueisen*) were destined for Crematoria II and III, 15,316 for Crematoria IV and V. The remaining quantity was for five other structures, including the sewage-treatment plant and the fresh-water supply system (*Wasserversorgung*).²⁴⁷ Which demonstrates that the crematoria did not have any special relevance in the context of special treatment, since the term referred to the entire Birkenau Camp.
- Kirschnek’s already-mentioned “Activity report of the Construction Office of the concentration camp and agriculture” for the period from 1 July to 30 September 1943 contains a section headlined “Work carried out in the PoW camp – deployment of local construction office for special construction measures”; the construction of five wash and toilet barracks is listed for Construction Sector I (*BW 6-7A*); for Construction Sector II the following items are listed: four storage barracks (*BW 14*), 12 wash barracks (*BW 6b*), 21 toilet barracks (*BW 7b*), 60 housing barracks for prisoners (*BW 3d*), the disinfestation facility (*BW 32*, the *Zentralsauna*), the delousing facility in the gypsy camp (also *BW 32*) as well as 11 infirmary barracks with annexes (*BW 12a*); for Construction Sector III the document lists only the fence (*BW 24*) and drainage ditches E, F, H, I (*BW 18*).²⁴⁸
- The “Report on requirements for thick, medium and thin sheet metal for the IV. Quarter of 1944” contains two references to Construction Project VIII b Up a 2003 “Auschwitz CC II special measures.”²⁴⁹

[61] Documents 66 (p. 233), 71 (p. 249) and 72 (p. 251)

Document 66 is a letter by Bischoff to Office C/V (Central Construction Inspectorate) of the SS-WVHA dated 29 December 1942 with the subject “Labor Deployment Auschwitz. Reimbursement of canceled labor hours due to a decreed special operation.” The text says:

“The Central Construction Office hereby reports that inmates and civilian workers employed at the individual construction sites could not be deployed during four days as a result of carrying out a special operation.

²⁴⁶ RGVA, 502-1-83, pp. 315f.; reproduced in Mattogno 2004b, pp. 133f.

²⁴⁷ RGVA, 502-1-319, p. 15.

²⁴⁸ RGVA, 502-1-27, pp. 6-8.

²⁴⁹ RGVA, 502-1-317, p. 36.

Advice is requested as to which titles and chapters these costs are to be allocated to.”

In their English caption the authors speak of “interruptions of work by prisoners and civilian workers resulting from special operations”²⁵⁰ (p. 232), evidently having in mind the “constant labor interruption” mentioned in Document 59.

In this context, they omit a well-known document from an earlier date which clarifies the entire affair. On 18 December 1942 Bischoff sent a secret telegram to Kammler on the expected completion of the crematoria in which he conveyed the following:²⁵¹

“In the month of December work had to come to a standstill for several days due to delousing and disinfestation. Likewise, a Gestapo special operation for security reasons encompassing all civilian workers has been underway since 16 December. Due to the imposition of a camp lock-down, the civilian workers have been unable to leave the camp for six months. For that reason, a grant of leave from 23 Dec. 1942 to 4 Jan. 1943 is absolutely essential.”

Pressac commented on this as follows (1994, p. 73):

“The revelation [postponement of vacations for civilian workers] embittered the civilian workers, since they had been stuck in Auschwitz for five months. It is not known exactly what happened next, but on the 17th and 18th of December none of the civilian workers showed up at the building site, and work didn’t resume until the 19th. On the 17th a spontaneous strike is supposed to have occurred, that led to the intervention of the camp Gestapo (the political department), in order to bring it under control. This intervention was designated a ‘special action for security reasons.’ (Sonderaktion aus Sicherheitsgründen). The civilian workers are supposed to have been subjected to interrogation by the political department, which wanted to learn the reason for the strike.”

Document 72 is a simple reminder letter by Bischoff from 28 January 1943, also with the subject “Labor Deployment Auschwitz. Reimbursement of canceled labor hours due to a decreed special operation,” to find out which title and chapter the costs should be allocated to that had been caused by the special operation conducted by the camp’s Political Department. The reference of the letter shows that Bischoff had already written a first reminder on 29 December 1942.

Document 71 is a letter from the company Baugeschäft Anhalt – Hoch-Tief-Eisenbetonbau of Berlin to the Central Construction Office dated 22 Jan-

²⁵⁰ In the Polish original “*przerwa*,” interruption, and “*w wyniku realizacji akcji specjalnej*,” “as a result of carrying out of a special operation.”

²⁵¹ APMO, BW 30/27, p. 17.

uary 1943. It lists the costs of the company's activities during the construction of various structures at Auschwitz, which also includes:

"Special operation, department for labor deployment, Auschwitz O/S on 11 Jan. 43 in the amount of RM 753.29 – 12 daily-wage slips."

According to the authors, this referred to "work done on January 11, 1943 at a place where a special operation (*Sonderaktion*) was underway" (p. 248).

Their concealing the telex dated 18 December 1942 happened in my opinion more likely due to deliberate dishonesty than to simple historical-documentary ignorance. In fact, Document 71 is closely linked to the special operation conducted by the Political Department of Auschwitz. That special operation was triggered by the strike of the civilian workers, which in turn caused the interruption of work for four days, resulting in financial damage to their employers. With the letter of 22 January 1943, the company Baugeschäft Anhalt therefore simply sought reimbursement of the 753.29 RM lost during the four days of forced labor standstill. The date of 11 January 1943, which is also given for two other entries on that document not mentioning any special operation, is probably that company's reference to an administrative act by the Central Construction Office, with which the employer's right to a reimbursement had been recognized. Subsequently Bischoff urged Kammler precisely because of this request (and possibly those of other companies) to inform him how he should account for – and then also pay – these expenses.

[62] Document 67 (p. 235)

This is a letter by Bischoff to the camp commandant dated 7 January 1943. The first paragraph states:

"18 guards for wagon transports to the PoW camp are urgently needed for the special measures to be carried out (accommodating the announced transports of 10 to 31 January 1943). Should the assignment of the guards not be possible, then the commandant's task cannot be carried out. The construction materials are required for setting up the stoves."

The document clearly says that the special measures consisted in *accommodating* the transports, not in *killing* them in "gas chamber." The 18 guards had to supervise the trucks used to transport construction materials for heating stoves to Birkenau, which evidently were to be installed in the barracks set up to accommodate the announced transports.

In their mendacious comments, however, the authors distort the meaning of the document, stating that the SS guards were meant to supervise "the transport of materials for the construction of objects serving special actions"! (p. 234, Polish text).

A week later, on 14 January 1943, the British intercepted the following message illuminating the letter in question:²⁵²

“From WVH[A] SS, BERLIN, to CC. AUSCHWITZ, outpost FLUSSZNIES [sic].

Re.: Stoves for barracks. Stoves are wrapped and ready for shipment at ORANIENBURG. Shipment follows by railway right after approval of waybill; pickup therefore not needed.

SS WVH[A] BERLIN, the Head of Office W I, p.p. signed SCHWARZ, SS Hauptsturmführer.”

[63] Document 69 (p. 241)

This is a telex by Bischoff to the head of Office B/V (transports) of the SS-WVHA, SS-*Sturmbannführer* Rudolf Scheide, dated 15 January 1943, which contains the following request:

“Referring on the one hand to the above-mentioned letter, and on the other hand with regard to the instant operation ordered by the Reichsführer SS – accommodation of 47,000 Jews within a very short period of time – this office once more requests the immediate assignment of 6 dump trucks in order that the construction of the respective accommodations can be finished on schedule (until 31 Jan. 43), which is technically impossible for this office with the motor pool currently available to it.”

This document fully confirms Document 67: special measures and immediate operation meant accommodating Jewish transports. We have seen above that special treatment, *inter alia*, expressly referred to the disinfection and disinfection facility called *Zentralsauna*.

The authors butcher the document’s self-evident meaning by speculating:

“This might have been connected with preparations to deport and exterminate Jews from Greece, whose concentration in the ghetto at Salonika began a month earlier. A total of 47,200 Greek Jews were deported to Auschwitz from March to June 1943.” (p. 240)

Such an explanation can only be the result of deliberate deceitfulness. Their conjecture actually doesn’t even make sense, precisely because the deportation considered by the authors took place between March and June 1943, while the document in question mentions a “very short period of time” and a deadline “until 31 Jan. 43.”

In this context another pathetic ploy of the authors should also be noted. From 20 March to 18 August 1943, 18 Jewish transports arrived at Auschwitz from Greece bringing 48,533 people into the camp. In order to make that number match the figure of 47,000 given in the telex, the authors ignore the last transport of 18 August 1943 with 1,800 people. But even then their figure

²⁵² TNA, German Police Decodes No. 3 Traffic: 14.1.43. I B Traffic. ZIP/GPDD 358b/22.1.43.

of 47,200 deportees is wrong, apparently forcibly adjusted for the same reason, because the total number of deportees from the remaining earlier transports is 46,733 (Czech 1970, Table outside of text).

It is clear that the content of the document in question refers to the telex sent on 16 December 1942 by the Gestapo Chief Heinrich Müller to Himmler, which reads:²⁵³

“In the course of the increased recruitment of manpower into the concentration camps, as ordered to occur by 30 January 1943, the following may be applied in the Jewish sector:

1. / Total amount: 45,000 Jews. –

2. / Start of transportation 11 January 1943 –

End of transportation: 31 January 1943 – (In the period from 15 Dec. 1942 to 10 Jan. 1943, the Reichsbahn is unable to provide special trains for the evacuation due to increased Wehrmacht holiday traffic.) –

3. / Breakdown: the 45,000 Jews are divided up in 30,000 Jews from the Bialystok district – 10,000 Jews from the ghetto Theresienstadt. Of them 5,000 employable Jews, who were employed so far for minor jobs in the ghetto, and 5,000 Jews, generally unable to work, even those over 60 years old, in order to reduce the camp’s overly high occupancy on this occasion in the interests of expanding the ghetto.

For this I ask to grant a special permission. As before, only those Jews would be included in the evacuation who have no special relationships and connections and who have no high decorations. – 3,000 Jews from the occupied Dutch areas. – 2,000 Jews from Berlin = 45,000. The number of 45,000 includes unemployable (underscored) relatives (elderly Jews and children). When applying conducive criteria while examining the Jews arriving at Auschwitz – at least 10,000 to 15,000 laborers (underscored) arise from this.”

Evidently, Himmler had increased the number of these deportees to 47,000. We therefore leave aside the difference of 2,000 deportees, which is irrelevant in the context of this argument. Since the above-mentioned 45,000 deported Jews could contain 30,000-35,000 unemployable individuals, the document shows that these were not slated to be gassed. Otherwise Himmler would have ordered only an “immediate operation – accommodation” for 10,000-15,000 Jews fit for labor, not for all 47,000.

According to the *Auschwitz Chronicle*, between 11 and 31 January 1943, 51,417 deportees arrived at Auschwitz, of which 43,764 were gassed and just 7,653 registered, less than 15%! This is in total contrast to Himmler’s order to accommodate 47,000 inmates at Auschwitz, and to Bischoff’s concern to prepare the necessary accommodations for *all* of them on time.

²⁵³ PS-1472. IMT, vol. XXVII, pp. 252f.

[64] Document 70 (p. 245)

This is the well-known file memo written on 22 May 1943 about a meeting with Kammler in the offices of the Central Construction Office which occurred during the previous day. The authors interpret it this way:

“On the first page, in the section presenting the founding and development of the Auschwitz camp, there is information that the operation to solve the Jewish question is currently underway there (Dazu kam in letzter Zeit die Lösung der Judenfrage).” (p. 244)

Even this comment is surprisingly insidious. I reiterate here my analysis of this document as presented in one of my earlier studies (2004b, pp. 51f., 58) and elaborate on it further.

On 22 May 1943 Höss gave a speech to the head of Office Group C of the SS-WVHA, Hans Kammler, as well as other functionaries, in which he outlined the origin and development of the institutional missions of the camp.²⁵⁴

“In the year 1940, the Auschwitz Camp came into existence in the delta estuary between the Vistula River and the Sola River after the evacuation of 7 Polish villages, through the reconstruction of an artillery-barracks site and much construction of extensions, reconstructions and new buildings, utilizing large quantities of material from buildings that had been demolished. Originally intended as a quarantine camp, this later became a Reich camp and thereby was destined for a new purpose. As the situation grew ever more critical, its position on the border of the Reich and G.G. [General Gouvernement] proved especially opportune, since the filling of the camp with workers was guaranteed. Recently and in addition to that came the solution of the Jewish question, which required creating the means to accommodate 60,000 prisoners at first, which increases^[255] to 100,000 within a short time. The inmates of the camp are predominantly intended for the industries which are locating in the vicinity. The camp contains within its sphere of interest various armament firms, for which the workers are regularly provided.” (p. 85)

The “solution of the Jewish question” thus required no extermination or crematorium facilities, but instead measures for the construction of accommodations for 100,000 prisoners: The supposed homicidal function of the camp was not only not a priority, it did not exist at all!

Throughout the document there is not the vaguest hint at deportees being killed; in fact, it insists on the improvement of the camp’s hygienic and sanitary conditions. Point 2 of the speech, headlined “Large PoW camp” (*Gross-lager K.G.L.*), reports (p. 86):

²⁵⁴ Aktenvermerk of 22 May 1943. RGVA, 502-1-26, pp. 85-87.

²⁵⁵ The past tense (“increased”), which appeared originally in the text, has been changed to present tense. In this context, this present tense has the meaning of a future tense.

“But due to various dangers of epidemic disease, it is at present essential to take immediate measures for the improvement of the existing facilities.”

The section on the “PoW camp” laments the poor hygienic conditions of the Birkenau Camp, the lack of a general drainage system and of water supply, which created the danger of epidemics breaking out. The garrison physician declared that

“the huge danger of epidemics caused by the admissions from the East cannot be coped with properly owing to the scant control possibilities due to a lack of water and the lack of allocated quotas for the necessary drainage system.” (p. 86)

There was also the problem of the birth of 50 children per day in the gypsy camp, and the problem of caring for 10,000 sick inmates with very primitive medical facilities. Therefore, the physician concluded, the increase of the camp’s strength to more than 100,000 prisoners would be catastrophic (p. 87).

At this point in time, however, Dr. Wirths complaints had already been considered, because on 13 May, under the program for the improvement of the Birkenau Camp’s hygienic installations as inaugurated by Kammler on 7 May, Bischoff had authored a “report concerning the division of labor for the instant program in the POW camp Auschwitz,” which assigned to his subordinates their respective tasks in the scope of that program.²⁵⁶ Furthermore, as I already mentioned, starting on 16 May at the latest, the reports to Kammler began about the “special program in the PoW camp Auschwitz”²⁵⁷ or on “special measures in the PoW camp.”²⁵⁸

These special measures, as I mentioned above, were at times also called “immediate program” (*Sofortprogramm*), “special construction measures” (*Sonderbaumaßnahmen*) and “special operation” (*Sonderaktion*). This program also involved the crematoria of Birkenau, but not for “gassing” any detainees. The above-mentioned report of 16 May states in Step 6, “disinfestation facility”:²⁵⁹

“For the disinfestation of the clothing of prisoners, a disinfestation facility is planned in each of the individual camp sectors of BA II. In order to be able to perform a flawless body delousing of the prisoners, hot water heaters and boilers are being installed in the two existing prisoner baths in BA I, so that hot water is available for the existing shower facility. It is

²⁵⁶ “Bericht über die Arbeitseinteilung beim Sofortprogramm im K.G.L. Auschwitz,” 13 May 1943. RGVA, 502-1-83, pp. 336-338.

²⁵⁷ “Bericht über die getroffenen Maßnahmen für die Durchführung des durch SS-Brigadeführers und Generalmajor der Waffen-SS Dr. Ing. Kammler angeordneten Sonderprogrammes im KGL. Auschwitz.” 16 May 1943. RGVA, 502-1-83, pp. 309-311.

²⁵⁸ “Baubericht über die Sondermaßnahmen im KGL.” 30 May 1943. RGVA, 502-1-83, pp. 283-285.

²⁵⁹ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 311. On these real showers planned but only partly realized in Crematoria II and III at Birkenau see the documentation I have collected in 2009, pp. 138-142 (2019, pp. 134-140).

further planned to install heating coils in the waste incinerator of Crematorium III in order to obtain water for a shower facility to be built in the basement of Crematorium III. Negotiations to perform the construction for this installation were held with the Topf & Söhne firm.”

How can this project be reconciled with the alleged criminal purpose of Crematorium III?

[65] Document 73 (p. 253)

Even this is a well-known document which was already published by Pressac (1994, Document 21). It is a map with the headline “Overview of surveying the area of interest of CC Auschwitz” from 2 June 1943, in which an area is marked as an “off-limits zone.”²⁶⁰ I have thoroughly analyzed this document elsewhere in order to refute the French historian’s interpretation.²⁶¹ Hence I reiterate and expand on the main parts of that elaboration, and to make it understandable to the reader, I again reproduce this map (see DOCUMENT 26).

The map in question was drawn for topographical and cartographical reasons. In this respect the Central Construction Office had already become active in late 1942.²⁶² Preliminary work on the survey grid of the zone had been done by 13 January 1943, but other work still remained to be done.²⁶³ The map has a direct link with the enlargement of the area of interest of Auschwitz Concentration Camp, which took place the day before the map was drawn. It was announced in the *Amtsblatt der Regierung in Kattowitz*, the official journal of the Kattowitz region, which gave a detailed description of the new limits of the “area of interest.”²⁶⁴

The “off-limits zone” had a clear relationship with the various camp lock-downs decreed by Höss on account of the typhus epidemics. For example, in 1943, on 9 February, Höss gave a Garrison Order No. 2/43, in which he announced that the head of Office Group D of the SS-WVHA, SS-*Brigadeführer* Glücks, had ordered a “total lock-down of the camp” because of the spread of typhus cases.²⁶⁵ In Garrison Order No. 3 of 14 February, Höss defined the limits of the “off-limits zone for the total camp lock-down”:²⁶⁶

“In reference to Garrison Order 2/43 [recte: 25/42] cited in Garrison Order 25/42 [recte: 2/43], the former will be modified in the sense that the fol-

²⁶⁰ RGVA, 502-1-88, p. 8.

²⁶¹ 2009, Section 7.4, “Sperrgebiet,” pp. 195-197; I reproduced the map on p. 700, Document 36 (2019, pp. 191-193, 643).

²⁶² On 12 October 1942, a civilian employee of Zentralbauleitung went to Breslau on an official mission to discuss topographical and cartographical questions with the competent authorities. RGVA, 502-1-385, pp. 253-257.

²⁶³ Report by SS-*Schütze* Fischer of the surveying team of 23 Jan. 1943. RGVA, 502-1-385, pp. 47-49.

²⁶⁴ APK, Land 81 Go/S-467.

²⁶⁵ APMO, Standort-Befehl, D-AuI-1, p. 46.

²⁶⁶ *Standortbefehl* no. 3/43 of Feb. 14 1943. APMO, *Standortbefehl*, t. I, D-AuI-1, p. 48.

lowing area is defined as an off-limits zone for the total camp lock-down in accordance with indications on the map of CC Auschwitz area of interest: The off-limits zone is represented by the CC Auschwitz area of interest, limited in the north, west and east by the Vistula and/or Sola rivers [...].”

This having been clarified, let us now look at the map of June 2, 1943. The map shows, within an obliquely shaded area, a white zone labeled “off-limits zone” and “Birkenau PoW camp.” The latter zone corresponds more or less to the Birkenau Camp, whereas the one labeled “off-limits zone” extends some 950 m toward the Vistula River, north-northwest from the left side of the camp. If the “off-limits zone” was no larger than this, it included neither the location of the alleged “bunkers” nor their mass graves. My DOCUMENT 27 in the Appendix is a superimposition of the map of the Birkenau Camp on the map of 2 June 1943. The zones marked by circles indicate:

B1: area of the alleged “Bunker 1” and its mass graves.

B2: area of the alleged “Bunker 2.”

F: mass graves allegedly belonging to “Bunker 1,” actually graves of registered detainees who died in 1942 which the crematorium of the Main Camp could not incinerate.²⁶⁷

As shown by the superposition, the areas of the “bunkers” fall outside of the “off-limits zone” (the area of “Bunker 1” lies even inside the shaded zone). The area of the “off-limits zone” is surrounded by a curved line which corresponds to the one appearing on the “map of the area of interest of CC Auschwitz” of October 1943, in which also the area of the Birkenau Camp is indicated in a similar way.²⁶⁸ Actually, in the above document, the “off-limits zone” refers to the entire unshaded area, hence also to the Birkenau Camp. As early as 24 October 1942, Headquarters Order No. 21/42 mentioned the “off-limits zone Birkenau,” and specified the following (Frei *et al.* 2000, p. 190):

“Effective immediately, the area around Birkenau will be off-limits for civilians. Entering this space is authorized only in connection with official matters.”

We may therefore conclude that the “off-limits zone” of the map dated 2 June 1943 has no connection with the alleged Birkenau “bunkers.”

We are also dealing with a chronological problem: all the witnesses agree that the alleged activities at the “bunkers” stopped when Crematoria II, IV and V went into operation in early 1943. In my comments on Document 16 I already mentioned the related statements by F. Piper and Sz. Dragon.

Friedler, Siebert and Kilian, who have collected and examined the largest collection of testimonies of ex-members of the *Sonderkommando*, write about this as follows (Friedler *et al.* 2005, p. 104):

²⁶⁷ In this respect cf. the appendices with documents and explanations in Mattogno 2004a and 2005c.

²⁶⁸ “Plan vom Interessengebiet des K.L. Auschwitz Nr. 3203” of October 1943. APMO, negative no. 6189.

“In March 1943, the first of four new crematoria in Birkenau was operational. The mass destruction had thus reached a new, much more perfect dimension. The farmhouses converted to killing facilities were superfluous. The SS had Bunker 1 and the adjacent barn torn down, and the barracks erected there dismantled. Bunker 2, which admittedly constituted a primitive, yet highly effective ‘small’ murder factory, was probably shut down in May 1943, but not demolished.”

To this we can add the testimony of Milton Buki. During the 127th hearing of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial (14 January 1965) he testified that he was assigned to the *Sonderkommando* on 14 December 1942. Among other things, he was also asked about how long the “bunkers” operated (2004a, p. 116):

“P: How long were the two little houses used for gassing?”

B: Until the crematoria were built.”

There is also the testimony given at the Höss trial by Wilhelm Wohlfahrt, an inmate who was employed in the Central Construction Office’s “melioration” section, which was connected to the surveying section. He consequently could move around the camp rather freely. With reference to the alleged “Bunker 1” he declared (*ibid.*, p. 104):

“That cottage was demolished in 1943, when I went there at that time [month not given], the whole area had been plowed and the cottage was gone.”

Hence, if “Bunker 1” was demolished in May 1943 at the very latest, why would there be any reason to keep its vicinity off limits on a map of June 1943? The authors’ dirty trick – that is, their extending the alleged activities of the “bunkers” beyond the extreme chronological limit of May 1943 in order to eliminate the contradictions arising from their fallacious interpretation of various documents – is therefore puerile and in vain, because the version of history bandied about by the Auschwitz Museum itself and the testimonies it relies upon contradict such an extension. Hence we are not dealing with a “new” interpretation in the light of “new documents,” but with a risible interpretative sleight of hand.

It ought to be kept in mind that the whole story of the “bunkers” is based exclusively on testimonies, and that the documents adduced by the authors are more or less deliberately misrepresented by them exactly because of these testimonies, although those documents don’t provide even the slightest hint in favor of the existence of the legendary gassing “bunkers.” It is therefore absurd to try and “correct” the testimonies on the basis of these documents.

[66] Document 74 (p. 255)

This is a letter dated 10 June 1943, attached to which the company Baugeschäft Anhalt. Hoch-, Tief-, Eisenbetonbau of Berlin sent an invoice to the

Central Construction Office seeking payment of day wages for “construction site ‘special operation’” in the amount of 146.28 RM.²⁶⁹

The authors make no comment, and it is difficult to imagine what value this document might have for orthodox Holocaust historiography. It cannot have any relation to the “bunkers,” because at that time the alleged conversion of these existing structures to homicidal “gas chambers” had supposedly already taken place roughly a year earlier. It is therefore unclear what kind of work a company specializing in reinforced-concrete structures could have been involved in. The document cannot even have any relationship with the Birkenau crematoria, because the company *Baugeschäft Anhalt* was not among those who participated in constructing the Birkenau crematoria (those that did include: Robert Koehler, Huta, Vedag, *Continental Wasserwerk-Gesellschaft*, Karl Falk, Triton, Konrad Segnitz, *Industrie-Bau*, W. Riedel u. Sohn, Josef Kluge, and Hermann Hirt; Pressac 1994, pp. 161-163).

I have already published and discussed this document in one of my earlier books (2004b, pp. 75, 139, Document 26), although erroneously giving the year as 1944. It therefore does not fall within the context of “Special Operation Hungary,” but the “special operation” inaugurated by Kammler on 7 May 1943: the program to improve the hygienic and sanitary conditions at Birkenau mentioned earlier. In particular, the document is linked to the aforementioned letter by Bischoff to Kammler of 14 May 1943, which has as its object “Carrying out of the special operation – procurement of material.”

The company *Baugeschäft Anhalt* appears on the “List of all construction companies active in the camp. Construction Site Auschwitz” dated 9 April 1943, which comprises 29 companies, among them Koehler, Huta, *Continental*, Falk, Triton, *Industrie-Bau*, Riedel, Kluge and Hirt.²⁷⁰ Another, undated list, which includes 27 companies, relates that the company *Anhalt* had 60 skilled workers and 40 unskilled workers (camp inmates made available by the Central Construction Office) and also gives the company’s permit number: VI/42/PB/17.²⁷¹

The name “Construction Site Auschwitz” shows that the term “construction site” did not refer to a single structure (*Bauwerk*), but to the entire construction project (*Bauvorhaben*) Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp, as can be seen from the fact that many of the listed companies worked on many different structures precisely within the Birkenau Camp. This confirms that the “construction site ‘special operation’” was not a specific structure where a “special operation” took place, but a term referring to the entire camp complex.

²⁶⁹ Letter by *Baugeschäft Anhalt* to *Zentralbauleitung* of 10 June 1943. RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 258. The invoice has not been found.

²⁷⁰ RGVA, 502-1-96, p. 39.

²⁷¹ RGVA, 502-1-19, p. 88.

Chapter Two: Critical Analysis of the “Introduction”

My examination of the documents published by the authors makes it clear that their comments are characterized by superficiality and dilettantism. They start from the deep-seated prejudice, based on testimonies, that homicidal gassing facilities existed at Auschwitz and Birkenau, which they then try to substantiate with documents by systematically distorting their meaning, often quite evidently with malicious intent. Their presentation does not exhibit the slightest effort to really understand the documents. It furthermore ignores the historical and documentary context in which these documents are embedded and their mutual relations. Their *Introduction* does not add anything to the picture I have outlined; in fact, it makes it worse.

1. The Historical and Documentary Context

The authors argue that the documents submitted by them

“make it possible significantly to clarify the chronology of events and to confirm facts known until now only through witness accounts. It should nevertheless be noted that the documents do not usually refer directly to killings in the gas chamber, [...]” (p. 24)

Stop! This is a rather hypocritical understatement. In fact, the documents in question *never* refer, directly or indirectly, to killings in homicidal gas chambers! Resumed:

“[...] and interpreting the entries sometimes requires a detailed familiarity not only with other documents, but also with the reality of the camp. For instance, when analyzing a report on the inspection of Auschwitz in September 1942 by WVHA chief Oswald Pohl, it is necessary to know that the car carrying Pohl and his entourage of officers along the road from the camp would pass, in turn, the SS equipment warehouses (TWL)[Truppenwirtschaftslager], the building materials depot (Bauhof), the carpentry shops (DAW), the warehouses known as ‘Kanada I’ (‘Entwesung u. Effektenkammer – Aktion Reinhard’) for property plundered from Jews, the new stables, and the Birkenau camp—and that, carrying on along the same road, it would next come to gas chamber/bunker II, the so-called ‘Little White House’ (described in the schedule for the visit as ‘Station 2 der Aktion Reinhard’).” (p. 24)

In reality, however, this conjecture does not make much sense, because the report on Pohl’s visit mentions “Birkenau Camp,” “Station 2 of Operation Reinhard” and “Troop Camp Birkenau,” which was the eastern part of the camp where the guards were quartered. Therefore Pohl would have entered the

camp through the main entrance, located on the east side, about 400 meters away from “Troop Camp Birkenau,” would have crossed the entire camp to reach the elusive “Bunker 2,” then he would have gone all the way back in the opposite direction, but without going to “Bunker 1,” in order to finally enter the “Troop Camp Birkenau.”

The authors’ hypothesis proceeds from the assumption that a homicidal gassing facility called “Station 1 of Operation Reinhard” existed (the alleged “Bunker 1”), which does not appear in any document. Conversely, the term “Operation Reinhard[t]” appears only in relation to the “disinfestation chamber and storage of inmate belongings” and “Station 1.” Yet if the first facility was a simple disinfestation facility with attached warehouses even according to the authors, why should the latter have been a homicidal gas chamber?

As I demonstrated in my comments on Document 35, SS-*Sturmabannführer* Alfred Franke-Gricksch wrote explicitly that “Special Operation ‘Reinhard’” consisted of the seizure of Jewish personal effects, and that also applied whenever the word was used in the context of the Auschwitz Camp. It could not possibly mean the alleged extermination of the Jews at Auschwitz for the simple fact that the head of “Operation ‘Reinhard,’” SS-*Brigadeführer* Odilo Globocnik, had no jurisdiction over this camp. It follows that at Auschwitz the name “Operation Reinhard[t]” could refer only to the seizure of Jewish possessions, not the killing of their Jewish owners. Thus “Station 2 of Operation Reinhard” could not be a term referring to the elusive “Bunker 2.”

In reference to the alleged extermination of the Jews, the authors say:

“It must also be emphasized that the number of documents originating in the years 1941-1942 that confirm the commission of mass murder by Zyklon B in Auschwitz is significantly smaller in comparison to what the documents contain on the later period. This results—one might assume—from the fact that at first the SS men employed in the camp offices scrupulously observed orders to keep the extermination operation covert.” (p. 25)

After 1943, however, when the four crematoria of Birkenau went into operation, the SS realized according to the authors that it was impossible to continue keeping the claimed ongoing mass murder a secret:

“This is why the overall number of such entries rises significantly in this period, despite the continued formal use of the recommended code words (SB, Sonderbehandlung) in documents that were issued.” (p. 25)

The authors’ delusion is truly staggering. What documents are they writing about? There exists *not a single document* about the perpetration of mass killings by means of Zyklon B at Auschwitz, and those documents containing alleged code words have a completely different meaning. Only with a huge effort of deception and imagination do the authors manage to efface the documents’ real meaning over and over again.

2. Euthanasia at Auschwitz

Outlining the history of Auschwitz, the authors mention the alleged camp visit of a commission presided over by Dr. Horst Schumann on 28 July 1941, in consequence of which 575 detainees were “reviewed” in the hospitals and “transferred to the euthanasia center in Sonnenstein” to be murdered (p. 26).

But on the entire affair claimed to be the very beginning of the murder of inmates at Auschwitz, not a single document exists. Danuta Czech, who tells this story in her *Auschwitz Chronicle*, refers to multiple sources, all of which are anecdotal in nature (1990, p. 75). She mentions among others Volume VII, p. 474, of the collection of material from the camp’s resistance movement, in which, under the heading “Transport,” the following entry appears for 28 July 1941: “Dresden 575 gassings.”²⁷² This is obviously the source for the date of the alleged visit of the Schumann Commission. The choice, however, was not very judicious, because on that one single day, 28 July, the commission is said to have arrived, supposedly carried out the “selection” of the incurably sick inmates, and allegedly sent them off to their ostensible death: the Auschwitz SS would have been amazingly efficient, indeed! There is no evidence that the transport in question had gone to Sonnenstein. It is more likely that it went to Dachau instead, because the document records two previous transports to Dachau: on 6 December 1940 (68 detainees) and on 2 May 1941 (36 detainees).

Not to mention that the above message is in direct conflict with another earlier message from the resistance movement dated 2 July 1941, which states (Marczewska/Ważniewski 1968, p. 47):

“The first [pierwsze] use of the gas chambers took place in June 1941 [w VI. 1941]. It consisted of a transport of 1,700 ‘incurably sick’ who were [allegedly] sent to the sanatorium in Dresden, but in reality into the building converted into a gas chamber [do budynku przebudowanego na komorę gazową].”

Elsewhere I revealed that not a single document exists about this alleged historical event (2005b, pp. 70f.), and that the 2008 article by Jochen August – “The transport of 575 inmates from CC Auschwitz to Sonnenstein (28 July 1941). Reconstruction of the destroyed transport list” – quoted by the authors in support of their conjecture, confirms only that the Auschwitz Museum does not possess any documentary proof for the reality of this alleged transport to Sonnenstein.

²⁷² AGK, NTN, 155, p. 474; the actual Polish term used – *gazownia* – usually refers to a facility producing gaseous fuel, but here it apparently means “gassowanie” – gassing.

3. Injections with Phenol

This (alleged) crime – so the authors continue – “could only temporarily alleviate the problem of the overcrowding of the hospital blocks in Auschwitz,” so the SS, to avoid “bothersome transports to euthanasia centers in Germany,” undertook killing experiments right afterwards.

“Among the available poisons, the choice fell on phenol, a popular disinfectant that was injected directly into the chambers of the doomed prisoners’ hearts. From the end of the summer of 1941, hundreds of prisoners were murdered this way.” (p. 26)

Because the euthanasia centers allegedly used carbon-monoxide gas chambers to kill patients, it is unclear why a similar facility was not set up in Auschwitz as well, instead of resorting to bothersome individual injections. It goes without saying that not a single document exists on these alleged killings, and the whole thing is therefore relegated to suitable testimonies, as always. From a historical point of view, the whole story is unfounded and inconsistent.²⁷³

4. The “First Gassing” in the Basement of Block 11 at Auschwitz

Then the authors turn to the purported first homicidal gassing with Zyklon B in the basement of Block 11, which according to the orthodox version happened in the period between 31 August and 4 September 1941 – which allegedly results from the fact that the bunker’s registry does not contain any entries of newly interned prisoners in its prison cells for these days. During that gassing, 600 Soviet PoWs and 250 sick inmates were ostensibly killed. To back this up, the authors refer, among other things, to the report of the camp resistance from 24 October 1941 that “speaks of 850 POWs killed, which surely includes the sick prisoners taken from the camp hospital”; they also cite “later reports from November 15 and 17 [which] mention 600 murdered POWs.” (p. 27, note 7).

The first report states (Marczewska/Ważniewski 1968, p. 11):

“At Oświęcim [Auschwitz], in early October, 850 Soviet officers and noncoms (POWs) that had been taken there were killed by gas as a test of a new type of combat gas, which is to be used on the eastern front.”

As we see, the dating, the number of victims, and the purpose of the gassing are completely at odds with the Auschwitz Museum’s orthodox version. As to the authors’ claim that the “850 POWs” included “sick prisoners taken from the camp hospital,” this is clearly a lie. The report of 15 November speaks of “600 Soviet prisoners, among them several army ‘politruks’ [political com-

²⁷³ See in this regard Mattogno 2016c, Chapter 5.3, “‘Special Treatment 14 f 13’ and Phenol Injections in Auschwitz,” pp. 97-102.

missars]” and “about 200 Poles”; the gassing is claimed to have occurred “during the night of 5-6 September.” The report of 17 November refers to “600 civilian Soviet prisoners of war” and “about 250 Poles” supposedly gassed during the night of 5 to 6 September (*ibid.*).

These are only a few examples of the countless contradictions with which the orthodox narrative of the “first gassing” is riddled. In a study dedicated to this imaginary event I demonstrated that this narrative was concocted with great malice on the basis of the resistance movement’s reports and eyewitness accounts, which are all utterly contradictory on all essential points (location, date, preparations, type of victims, perpetrators, start time and duration of the gassing, the fate of the corpses; see Mattogno 2005b). There is therefore no need to dwell further on this aspect of the Auschwitz myth.

5. The “Gas Chamber” in Crematorium I at Auschwitz

Since the gas chamber in the basement of Block 11 had proved awkward to use – only a madman would have come up with the idea to carry out a homicidal gassing in the bunker cells – the murderous practice is said to have been moved to the crematorium, turning its morgue into a “gas chamber.” “The extent of the remodeling” necessary for this, the authors assure us, “was relatively small, limited to mounting two solid doors and punching four drop hatches in the flat roof” (p. 27). The first gassing is said to have been carried out in that morgue in September or October 1941. The authors explain:

“This information is confirmed by an order from the camp metalworking shop, dated September 25, for four airtight flaps (Luftdichte Klappen) for the crematorium building (doc. 5), which can be interpreted in two ways: either POWs had been murdered there earlier and the order resulted from the need to stop leaks, or—more probably—the covers were ordered ahead of time to prevent the gas from leaking out. The short time for the order to be filled is also noteworthy: the metalwork was finished the same day the order was submitted. It was treated as ‘urgent’ because the arrival of a transport of POWs was expected.” (p. 27)

The authors’ claims are really incredible. They claim that the morgue of the crematorium was equipped with two solid – presumably gas-tight – doors, but they do not provide the vaguest documentary clue for this. They assert that four holes were punched through the morgue’s ceiling, but again they do not even adduce a scrap of evidence for this. They nevertheless have the nerve to present the order for “four airtight flaps” as evidence for the existence of those four openings for pouring in Zyklon B through the morgue’s roof. They first talk about *pokrywy*, lids (p. 11), then *klapy*, trap doors, similar to the German term *Klappen*, hinged lids. Such speculation does not make sense, because these lids of sheet iron had to be mounted in frames set into the ceiling open-

ings, otherwise they could not have been closed hermetically. Such frames would have been manufactured by the inmate locksmith shop (what the authors call the camp metalworking shop). In other words, if the authors' hypothesis was sensible, Order No. 1714 of 25 September 1941 would have encompassed not only four (alleged) flaps, but also four frames.

That the order in question had been regarded as "urgent" is a mere whim of the authors, because nothing on the document indicates that it was. The space provided for the "degree of urgency" (*Dringl.-Grad*) at the top right is empty! And the fact that the order was completed within just one day only means that the workshop had at its disposal men and material to do this minor job right away.

This alleged urgency is a meaningless ploy even if viewed from the perspective of the orthodox narrative, because the authors do not in any way show that "the arrival of a transport of POWs was expected." In fact, after the alleged transport of 600 Soviet PoWs who were allegedly gassed in Block 11 on 3 September 1941, no other Soviet PoWs arrived at Auschwitz until 7 October, when 2,014 of them were transferred from the Lamsdorf camp (Brandhuber 1961, pp. 16-18). The authors' trick is foolish even from their own perspective because, as Czech explains lucidly, these Soviet PoWs were not intended indiscriminately for extermination. In November 1941 a special commission of the Gestapo came to Auschwitz, chaired by the head of the Gestapo in Katowice, Rudolf Mildner, who interrogated the Soviet PoWs and sorted them into four groups (Czech 1990, p. 102):

- "1. *Fanatic Communists—approximately 300 [PoWs]*
2. *Group A: politically suspect—approximately 700 [PoWs]*
3. *Group B: not politically suspect—approximately 8000 [PoWs]*
4. *Group C: suitable for habilitation—approximately 30 [PoWs]"*

Only the PoWs of the first group were eventually killed,²⁷⁴ but that could not have happened before November 1941, so it makes no sense that already on 25 September the Auschwitz SS attached a special urgency to the completion of an alleged killing device.

In reality, however, as I made clear in my comments to Document 5, the four "airtight flaps" were used for the crematorium's ventilation system, and the term reminds us of the one used by Grabner in the above-mentioned letter of 7 June 1941: "ventilation flap to the morgue," which confirms that the "flaps" were not some imaginary "lids" but in fact ventilation dampers.

The authors continue as follows:

²⁷⁴ On 15 November 1941, Glücks passed on to all the concentration camps, including Auschwitz, Himmler's order that the execution of Soviet PoWs transferred to the camps for the sake of execution, especially political commissars, will be postponed for those who are physically robust and thus capable of working in a quarry. See Mattogno 2005b, pp. 125f. (letter by Glücks and response by Grabner of 17 November 1941).

“Nor can there be any doubt that the gas chamber at crematorium I was used on at least several occasions over the following months to exterminate successive groups of Soviet POWs. Eyewitnesses, however, provide varying dates and numbers of transports. According to Marian [sic] Kula, 300 prisoners were killed on a certain day. Stanisław Gadomski recalled a ‘second or third gassing’ of about 400 POWs who arrived at the end of October 1941. Kazimierz Hałas mentioned a total of several thousand victims, and a resistance movement report from December 15 speaks of the killing of 500 POWs in ‘the concrete shelter.’” (pp. 27f.)

Here, too, the authors uncritically concoct a hodgepodge of anecdotal evidence, since there is no objective evidence supporting any of this. Quite to the contrary, the documents actually outright refute this narrative.

Michał (not Marian!) Kula stated the following:²⁷⁵

“In 1942, Höss became interested in the metal workshop, and particularly in the tools of the crime. Of course, he turned to us in the metal workshop. Ordered to do so by him, we fashioned various things, he supervised us personally. [...]

First there was the small crematorium in Auschwitz, for which a ventilator was made in our metal workshop. This ventilator was worked on by Maliszewski Stefan, Szablewski Stanisław, Stecisko Mieczysław, and by me. We worked until midnight. Before midnight, Höss came to see us, accompanied by Grabner. He made a big fuss, because the job was not yet done. It was about the ventilator for the aeration of the gas chamber; an opening had been made there, into which the ventilator was set to draw out the gas. Before midnight we raced to the crematorium with the ventilator, screwed it in, and we were taken back to the camp by the SS. Along the road to the crematorium, we met some 300 persons who ran towards the crematorium. They were Russian, because they spoke Russian. On that very night they were gassed.”

Since the temporary ventilation for the crematorium’s morgue, which had been request by Grabner, was installed in September-October 1941, and, as I explained earlier, because it required both an intake and an exhaust fan in order to function properly, it is a mystery what a fan supposedly built in 1942 for the “gas chamber” (the morgue, in fact) could have been used for.

Moreover, from the arrival of the first official transport of Soviet PoWs at Auschwitz on 7 October 1941 until the end of the Mildner Commission’s work in November or December of that year, no gassings could have been carried out, because the commission’s task was precisely to determine through interrogation which of the Soviet PoWs were to be executed eventually.

²⁷⁵ Statement by M. Kula of 15 March 1947. Höss Trial, AGK, NTN, 107 [vol. 25], pp. 481-483 [16-18].

This essential objection also applies to Stanisław Gadowski's statement. What's more, the only transport of Soviet PoWs that arrived at Auschwitz at the end of October 1941 contained 1,908 inmates (on Oct. 25; Czech 1990, p. 99), so the authors should at least explain why only 400 of them were "gassed" according to Gadowski. Kazimierz Hałgas's statement is entirely un-specific and therefore irrelevant. Finally, the report of the resistance movement is the "Appendix to Report No. 21 for the period from 1 to 15 December 1941," dated 15 December 1941, which states (Marczewska/Ważniewski 1968, p. 16):

"About 500 prisoners of war were poisoned in a concrete shelter [w betonowym schronie] by means of a war gas [za pomocą gazu bojowego]."

The term "shelter" is strange, but it may be a mistranslation of the German term "bunker," which can refer to both a shelter and a storage facility for bulk items. The building used by the SS as a crematorium used to be a storage building for munitions and at some point also for food items, and as such it was at times called a "bunker." Stranger still is the faulty reference to "war gas." The murder weapon claimed by orthodox historiography today, Zyklon B, was a disinfectant, a pest-control agent useless for battlefield applications.

The authors then say that, according to witnesses, in addition to Soviet PoWs, also transports of Jews were gassed in Crematorium I in late 1941 or early 1942, but they add:

"Unfortunately, this information is imprecise in relation to both the number of people murdered and the chronology of the transports. Pery Broad, a functionary in the KL Auschwitz Political Department, stated that he observed the extermination of a numerous group of Jews at the beginning of 1942.¹⁷ [...]"

¹⁷ [...] probably in January [...]" (p. 28, and note 17, *ibid.*),

The authors provide another proof of their superficiality and lack of a critical disposition. Broad was in fact transferred to Auschwitz only on 8 April 1942.²⁷⁶ How is he supposed to have "observed" an event which allegedly took place three months earlier?

They then invoke the testimony of Hans Stark, another member of the Political Department at Auschwitz, who "testified that he was present at the killing of 150 to 200 people in this gas chamber in October 1941" (p. 28). In their Footnote 18 they provide as a source for this: "ZStL, IV 402 AR-Z37/58 Sonderband 6, p. 970," in which, as we shall see below, the page number is wrong, and inform us: "Christopher Browning feels that, because Stark spent time away from Auschwitz between December 1941 and March 1942, he

²⁷⁶ Affidavit by P. Broad of 20 October 1947. NI-11984. Even the book published by the Auschwitz Museum to which the authors refer (Note 17 on p. 28, English text), clearly states in Broad's brief biography that he was sent to Auschwitz in April 1942. Bezwińska 1997, p. 222.

could have witnessed the event in October.” The authors have in fact misquoted Browning, who said:

“Since Stark was on leave from Auschwitz from December 1941 through March 1942, he could not have been confusing events from the fall of 1941 with those of early 1942.”

Browning refers to the same source, apparently simply copied by the authors, with the same page number error: ZStL, IV 402 AR-Z 37/58, Sonderband 6, p. 970 (Browning 2004, Note 211, p. 527; the correct page number is 948).

The authors once more blithely overlook the many ways in which Stark’s testimony contradicts the Auschwitz Museum’s orthodox narrative. For example, he spoke of “two openings of approximately 35 cm in diameter” – thus circular, which is in contrast with the four square or rectangular openings canonized by the Museum; he also mentioned one “hermetically sealed door,” but as is known, the crematorium’s morgue had two doors. For a thorough examination of Stark’s testimony I refer the reader to my specific study (2005a, pp. 62–65).

The next witness summoned by the authors is the former first chief of the Protective Custody Camp (*I. Schutzhaftlagerführer*) SS-Hauptsturmführer Hans Aumeier:

“Former Lagerführer Hans Aumeier testified shortly after the end of the war that he saw 50 to 80 Jews being murdered in the crematorium I gas chamber in November or December 1942, which the American researcher Christopher Browning is inclined to regard as a mistake, shifting the date of this event to 1941.” (pp. 28f.)

I have dealt with Aumeier’s statements in that same study (*ibid.*, pp. 48–50), from which I draw the following observations in order to primarily highlight once again the authors’ superficiality and lack of critical capacities.

In a report from 25 July 1945 prepared for the British, who had arrested him, he wrote:²⁷⁷

“As far as I remember, it was in November or December 1942 [sic!] that the first gassing of about 50–80 Jewish detainees was undertaken. This took place in the morgue of the crematorium in camp I, under the direction of the camp surgeon, of Untersturmführer Grabener [Grabner], of the L.K.^[278] and a number of medics. I was not present at the time and did not know beforehand that this gassing would take place either. Towards me, the LK was always very distrustful and taciturn. It was only the next day that the camp surgeon, Grabner, Untersturmführer Hessler [Hössler] Hauptscharführer Schwarz and I were called to the LK, who informed us that the order of the RFSS has come from RSHA-Berlin that all Jewish de-

²⁷⁷ TNA, File WO.208/4661. Statement by H. Aumeier of 25 July 1945, pp. 5f.

²⁷⁸ L.K., *Lagerkommandant*, commandant of the camp.

tainees unfit for work as well as the sick judged by the doctor as not being fit for work in the future are to be gassed in order to avoid the spread of epidemics. He stated further that the night before the first detainees had been gassed, but the crematorium had turned out to be too small and could not cope with the cremations, so that in the crematorium^[279] now under construction at Birkenau, gas chambers were being included. [...]

In the period that followed, some 3 or 4 gassings were still carried out in the old crematorium. This always took place in the evening hours. There were 2–3 air shafts in the morgue and 1–2 medics wearing gas masks poured bluegas through them. We ourselves were not allowed to get close, and the bunker was opened only the following day. As the doctor said, the people had died within 1/2 to 1 M.[inute].”

Browning limited himself to writing (2004, Note 211, p. 527):

“Hans Aumeier testified that the gassing of small groups of Jews (50-80) occurred in November or December 1942, but presumably he meant 1941. See Expert Opinion of Robert Jan van Pelt, Irving v. Penguin Books and Deborah Lipstadt, citing PRO WO 208/4661, p. 261.”

Van Pelt was just as laconic (1999, Note 29, p. 185):

“Aumeier is confused on this point. All the evidence points to the commencement of gassings in crematorium I a year earlier.”

He therefore merely notes the chronological contradiction, without trying to explain it. The authors simply attribute Aumeier’s date to a “mistake,” although that makes no sense, because according to Aumeier’s story, “the first gassing of about 50-80 Jewish detainees” was carried out while he was in Auschwitz, but he was transferred to the camp only on 16 February 1942, so he could not have committed a “mistake” by confusing 1941 (when he was not yet in Auschwitz) with 1942.

The authors themselves point out “that Aumeier arrived in Auschwitz somewhat later, on February 1 [sic], 1942,” and that “he testified in a Polish court on another occasion,” during the trial of the camp garrison, “that Jews were already being killed in the gas chamber in the Main Camp when he ‘took up his post in Auschwitz,’ and that there were at least several events, of this type” (p. 29).

This is a rather curious way of resolving this anachronism: since Aumeier stated in a later deposition that there had been gassings prior to his arrival at Auschwitz, his initial claim about the first gassing having taken place in November or December 1942, while he was stationed at Auschwitz, is no longer anachronistic but rather a simple “mistake”? In reality, in reference to this date, he spoke explicitly of the “first gassing,” so that the authors have simply reported yet another internal contradiction between Aumeier’s statements. Not

²⁷⁹ German: “*der Krematorium*,” plural article, but singular noun.

to mention that, in his first statement to his British captors on 29 June 1945, Aumeier flatly denied that homicidal gassings had occurred at Auschwitz.²⁸⁰

"In the Main Camp there was a crematorium consisting of two furnaces.^[281] Corpses were burned there. The crematorium was under the responsibility of the head of the Political Department and the camp surgeon. During my time, 2 or 3 crematoria were under construction at Birkenau. I have no knowledge of gas chambers, and during my time no detainee was gassed. At the time of my transfer, there were some 54,000 detainees at Auschwitz and Birkenau, among them about 15,000 women and children. Detainees who fell ill were moved to the infirmary, which was under the exclusive responsibility of the camp surgeon."

One could of course claim that these were mere lies as a defensive strategy. But as I have shown in yet another study (2004a, pp. 133-136), he "confessed" the alleged gassings only when he realized that the "gassings" were deemed an unquestionable and undeniable fact by the British interrogators, and he simply adjusted his defensive tactics accordingly, since denying it would have been a useless defense strategy.

Aumeier's statements contain other contradictions and absurdities which are no less serious. I refer the reader to my studies cited above. For example, the gassings allegedly occurred by pouring gas through 2 or 3 (!) "air shafts" (rather than through the canonical four openings formed especially for this purpose); by means of "bluegas" (*Blaugas*)²⁸² (!), and the gassing procedure is said to have lasted only 1 to 1½ minutes (!), not to mention the anachronistic dating of the claimed gassing order by Himmler (November-December 1942!).

The authors then mention a virtually unknown witness, Karl Bara, an "SS medical orderly [...] posted to the SS hospital," located right next to the crematorium, "in March 1942." He "testified that at that time he could see through the window how people were being led to their death in the gas chamber at the crematorium" (p. 29), which is a historically commonplace statement lacking any detail, thus making any critical assessment of it impossible.

Finally the authors adduce Engineer Kurt Prüfer of the Topf company:

"who probably visited Auschwitz at the beginning of February 1942, testified after the war that on that occasion he saw many corpses (Menschenleichen) lying in various poses on the floor of the room next to the furnace

²⁸⁰ TNA, File WO-208/4661, handwritten document starting "Gefangener Oslo, den 29 Juni 45", p. 5. These documents were discovered by David Irving, who posted it on his website <http://www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/Aumeier/>.

²⁸¹ The third furnace was installed in April 1942.

²⁸² "Blaugas" was "fuel gas, a lighting gas, named after its inventor, [a man by the name of] Blau." Lenz/Gaßner 1934, p. 15. This claim is similar to homicidal-gassing claims made by other witnesses, such as Walter Petzold in his "Report about the first gassing of prisoners in German concentration camps" of 17 May 1945. See Mattogno 2005b, pp. 37-40.

hall in crematorium I, and that the SS man accompanying him explained that the place was a gas chamber.” (p. 29)

As their source the authors cite a book by Annegret Schüle (which they misspell as Schülle), *Industrie und Holocaust. Topf & Söhne – Die Ofenbauer von Auschwitz*. Wallstein Verlag, Göttingen, 2010, from which they have taken the German word “*Menschenleichen*.” It is apparent that they don’t even know that the protocols of Kurt Prüfer’s interrogation (like those of the other Topf engineers Karl Schultze, Fritz Sander and Gustav Braun), which were conducted by investigators of the Soviet SMERSH counterintelligence service between 1946 and 1948, are all written in Russian, so it makes no sense to quote a German word as ostensibly being part of the original text, as that text isn’t in German to begin with!

For a full discussion of the matter, I refer the reader to my specific study (2014a), on which my subsequent elaborations are based. First of all, the document in question is Prüfer’s interrogation of 4 March 1948. The Topf engineer declared there (*ibid.*, pp. 34–36):

“In the spring of 1942 I went to Auschwitz at the request of the SS Construction Office in order to review the construction project of a new crematorium planned in the Auschwitz camp sector, to set out my conclusions and also to inspect the site where the construction of this crematorium was planned.

I inspected the specified construction site, accompanied by an SS man.

When we passed the first crematorium, I saw in one of the rooms of the crematorium, through a half-open door, human corpses lying on the floor in various positions. They were more than ten. When I approached the room, someone from inside quickly slammed the door. Because I was unfamiliar with the purpose of this room in Crematorium I, I asked the SS man accompanying me about it. He replied that a gas chamber had been set up in that room and that detainees were poisoned in it by gas.”

The authors explain their dating thusly:

“Dated on the basis of a letter from the Topf company to the camp construction administration on a request for the supply of a ventilation system, which indicates that Prüfer was at Auschwitz shortly before Feb. 10, 1942.” (Footnote 23 on p. 29)

In fact, however, as I have documented elsewhere (2014a, p. 31), Prüfer went to Auschwitz to discuss with Bischoff the project of the new crematorium (the future Crematorium II) between late October and late November 1941, not “in the spring of 1942,” or “shortly before Feb. 10, 1942,” so that the authors are not even able to properly date the visit in question.

I also revealed that the story told by Prüfer is completely invented. In fact, he claimed to have seen in a room of the crematorium – that is, the “morgue,” as becomes clear from its subsequent identification with the “gas chamber” –

“through a half-open door” “more than ten” corpses. Prüfer pretended to have been “unfamiliar with the purpose of that room,” which is not true, because he had gone to Auschwitz already on 19 November 1940 to discuss “on-site” the “extension of the crematorium,” that is to say, the construction of the second double-muffle cremation furnace. Together with deputy head of construction, SS-*Rottenführer* Walter Urbanczyk, he had inspected the furnace room in order to establish the location of this second furnace, and on the basis of this inspection he drew Topf Blueprint No. D 57999 on 30 September 1940, showing precisely the position of the second furnace. On that occasion, Prüfer also inspected the “morgue” right next to the furnace room. He therefore could not possibly have been surprised to have seen “more than ten” corpses in the morgue of a crematorium (if he had actually seen them in the condition described). After all, seeing morgues with corpses was daily business for an engineer specializing in cremation furnaces.

To make matters worse, Prüfer couldn’t possibly have seen what he claims, because the front door of Crematorium I opened into the “*Vorraum*” (vestibule), after which, on the right wall, a door led to the morgue (the alleged gas chamber). It was therefore invisible from the outside through the front door. However, according to Prüfer, exactly “that room” which he had allegedly seen from outside and where “a gas chamber had been set up,” was precisely this “*Vorraum*.”

After the authors have adequately “corrected” other evidence adduced by them (Tadeusz Pietrzykowski: he does not remember the exact date of the gassing alleged by him, but the authors ordain that it took place “at the end of 1941 or the beginning of 1942”; Ignacy Golik: he claims the gassing occurred in early spring of 1943, but, so the authors aver, this is “surely a mistake—it was 1942,” pp. 29f.), the authors conclude:

“Presumably, therefore, the gas chamber at crematorium I was used only sporadically to exterminate groups of newly arrived Jews at the turn of 1942/1943, and the total number of victims—in comparison to the period when mass extermination began in Birkenau—was small.” (p. 30)

Since it is unknown who the victims of these alleged gassings were, the authors resort to the assumption that these were Jews who had become unable to work and who had been transferred to Auschwitz by the Organization Schmelt in order to be “gassed.” I have demonstrated in another study (2016b, pp. 96-100) that this thesis, first developed by Robert van Pelt, is not backed up by any documents. Suffice it to note here that in the *Auschwitz Chronicle* the name Schmelt appears for the first time in a footnote under the date of 28 August 1942 in connection with Jews fit for labor being taken off a train at Cosel, precisely for the Organization Schmelt. These Jews were “exchanged for unfit or dead prisoners” (Czech 1990, p. 229). In addition, Rudolf Höss, in his remarks on the Organization Schmelt of November 1946, does not make the

slightest reference to the alleged gassing of prisoners who were unable to work.²⁸³

6. The “Bunkers” at Birkenau

According to the authors’ conclusion, there is no evidence that any preparations were being carried out before the winter of 1941-1942 to establish an extermination center in the vicinity of the Auschwitz Camp. According to them, it is also doubtful that the SS ever had “intentions to kill large groups of deportees in the gas chamber at crematorium 1: Using it would have created numerous difficulties for the SS: a number of undesired eyewitnesses in the camp among prisoners and civilian workers [...], and the limited capacity of the crematorium furnaces.” Therefore, in order to carry out the alleged extermination of the Jews, a different location had to be found, and the choice fell on the village of Brzezinka (Birkenau) and a farmhouse belonging to the Harmata family, which was transformed into the “gas chamber”: thus was born the legendary “Bunker 1” (p. 31).

The authors then scramble to somehow justify the date conjured up by Danuta Czech: 20 March 1942:

“Two different accounts of the beginning of the extermination of Jews in Auschwitz can be found in the Autobiography of commandant Rudolf Höss: it occurred in December 1941/January 1942, or in the spring of 1942. Appearances notwithstanding, both versions are probably accurate, with the former referring to the killing in the gas chamber at the crematorium in the main camp of small groups of Jews arriving, as already mentioned, from the Organisation Schmelt camps, and the latter to the start of mass murder in bunker I in Birkenau.” (p. 31)

And they add:

“Höss is more specific elsewhere about the arrival dates of these transports, placing them before the creation of the women's camp (March 26, 1942).” (p. 32)

This interpretation of Höss’s statement is somewhat misleading. Here is what the Auschwitz commandant wrote about this:

“I am unable to recall when the destruction of the Jews began – probably in September 1941, or perhaps not until January 1942. At first we dealt with the Jews from Upper Silesia.” (Paskuly 1992, p. 31)

“During the spring of 1942 we were still dealing with small police actions. But during the summer the transports became more numerous and we were forced to build another extermination site. The farm area west of Cremato-

²⁸³ Höss Trial, vol. 21, pp. 180f. The Korherr Report of 27 March 1943, subsequently edited (28 April), refers to 50,570 Jews belonging to the Organization Schmelt. NO-5194, p. 13.

ries IV and V,^[284] which were built later, was chosen and prepared.” (*ibid.*, p. 32; that points to “Bunker 2”)

“Originally, all the Jews transported to Auschwitz by the authority of Eichmann’s office were to be destroyed without exception, according to Himmler’s orders. This also applied to the Jews from Upper Silesia. But during the arrival of the first transports of German Jews, the order was given that all able-bodied men and women were to be separated and put to work in the arms factories. This occurred before the construction of the women’s camp, since the need for a women’s camp in Auschwitz only arose as a result of this order.” (*ibid.*, p. 34)

In this context, Höss also mentions the alleged first gassing in the basement of Block 11 and a gassing in the morgue of Crematorium I at Auschwitz, but both involved exclusively Soviet PoWs (*ibid.*, p. 30). He knew nothing about an extermination of Jews in the alleged gas chamber of Crematorium I, and in this context also never mentions the Jews from the Organization Schmelt. So the most consistent dating (if we credit Höss’s statements) would be January 1942, and for that very reason D. Czech, in the first edition of her *Auschwitz Chronicle*, dated the start of “Bunker 1” with January 1942, asserting: “They started killing Jews from Upper Silesia with gas” (Czech 1960, p. 49). The editor of the German edition of Höss’s memoirs, Martin Broszat, stated in a note:

“The deportation of Jews from Upper Silesia to Auschwitz occurred in early 1942. For instance, according to information sent from the Internat. Tracing Center to the Institute for Contemporary History [in Munich] from 27 March 1958, the Jews from Beuthen were deported on 15 February 1942.^[285]” (Broszat 1981, note 3, p. 127)

It therefore makes no sense to posit that the claimed activities of “Bunker 1” began in the spring of 1942, since Höss explicitly declares that the Jews of Upper Silesia were gassed in “Bunker 1” (Paskuly 1992, p. 31). Hence, according to the Auschwitz commandant’s chronology, “Bunker 1” began its alleged activities no later than January 1942, while “Bunker 2” was set up in the summer due to an increase in deportations.

But this contradicts what Höss himself wrote about it (Paskuly 1992, pp. 142, 147):

“The original order of 1941 to annihilate all the Jews stated, ‘All Jews without exception are to be destroyed.’ It was later changed by Himmler so

²⁸⁴ The original German text mentions “III and IV,” which was changed by Paskuly to match the common numbering of all crematoria at Auschwitz.

²⁸⁵ In fact, the letter from the tracing center states that ‘deportations of Jews from Beuthen could only be established from 15 May[!] 1942’; cf. Longerich 2010, Note 169, pp. 551f. Of course, this date neither jibes with Czech’s earlier dating of Bunker 1’s startup, which is based on Höss, nor with the currently claimed date of March 20, 1942.

that those able to work were to be used in the arms factories. This made Auschwitz the assembly point for the Jews to a degree never before known. [...]

When the transports of Jews from Slovakia began (March 26, 1942), within a few days the women's camp was crammed full to the rafters. Washing and toilet facilities were barely able to satisfy even the smallest needs for one third of them."

So in the summer of 1942 the intensification of Jewish transports led to overcrowding in Auschwitz, but that could be the case only if the arriving Jews were *not* murdered in masses, so what then would have been the need for the creation of "Bunker 2"?

According to Czech's *Auschwitz Chronicle*, "Bunker 2" began its operations on 30 June 1942. Until this date, 18 real, documented Jewish deportation trains arrived at Auschwitz, whose members were *all* duly registered, according to the table below as taken from Czech's *Auschwitz Chronicle*. Hence not a single soul coming off these trains was gassed on arrival, as the orthodox narrative suggests.

Date dd/m	#	From	Registered men		Registered women	
			#	ID nos.	#	ID nos.
26/3	999	Slovakia	/	/	999	1000-1998
28/3	798	Slovakia	/	/	798	1999-2796
30/3	1,112	Compiègne	1,112	27533-28644	/	/
2/4	965	Slovakia	/	/	965	2797-3761
3/4	997	Slovakia	/	/	997	3763-3812
						3814-4760
13/4	1,077	Slovakia	634	28903-29536	443	4761-5203
17/4	1,000	Slovakia	973	29832-30804	27	5204-5230
19/4	1,000	Slovakia	464	31418-31881	536	5233-5768
23/4	1,000	Slovakia	543	31942-32484	457	5769-6225
24/4	1,000	Slovakia	442	32649-33090	558	6226-6783
29/4	723	Slovakia	423	33286-33708	300	7108-7407
22/5	1,000	KL Lublin	1,000	36132-37131	/	/
7/6	1,000	Compiègne	1,000	38177-39176	/	/
20/6	659	Slovakia	404	39923-40326	255	7678-7932
24/6	999	Drancy	933	40681-41613	66	7961-8026
27/6	1,000	Pithiviers	1,000	41773-42772	/	/
30/6	1,038	Beaune-La Rolande	1,004	42777-43780	34	8051-8084
30/6	400	KL Lublin	400	43833-44232	/	/
Total	16,767		10,332		6,435	

Absurdly, this means that "Bunker 2" is said to have been prepared for – and put into – operation while all deported Jews, without exception, were normally

registered, which means that not a single one of them had been slated to be gassed on arrival.

In addition to these real transports, Czech also lists other, purely invented deportation trains, totally devoid of any documentary confirmation,²⁸⁶ which are listed in the following table:

Date	Transport from	#
5-11 May	Dombrowa [Dąbrowa Górnica], Bendsburg [Będzin], Warthanau [Zawiercie], Gleiwitz	5,200
12 May	Sosnowitz	1,500
2 June	Ilkenau	?
17 June	Sosnowitz	2,000
20 June	Sosnowitz	2,000
23 June	Kobierzyn	566

However, even from the perspective of the orthodox Holocaust narrative, this makes no sense. If the last Jewish transport murdered in “gas chambers” arrived at Auschwitz on 23 June, with which Jewish transport was “Bunker 2” inaugurated on 30 June?

Here we discover yet another of Czech’s deceptions, who writes in reference to the entire month of June 1942 (1990, p. 189):

“2,289 Jews, 1,203 Poles, including 100 reeducation prisoners, 149 Czechs, 49 Germans, and one Gypsy die in Auschwitz-Birkenau. A total of 3,683 prisoners have lost their lives. Most of the 2,289 Jewish prisoners were killed in the gas chamber.”

These are all regularly registered detainees, as is confirmed by the alleged source: the *Stärkebuch* (register of the men’s camp strength). The registered Jews allegedly gassed would have to have been “selected” by SS doctors as unfit for work, but for the entire month Czech does not record a single “selection,” which means that this story is not supported by any evidence.

If we consider that the only transport allegedly gassed on arrival prior to the fictitious Jewish deportation trains of the period of May 5 to 11 is the other fictitious deportation train from Beuthen arriving at Auschwitz on 15 February 1942 but that these Jews are said to have been gassed not in “Bunker 1” but in Crematorium I (*ibid.*, p. 135), one has to wonder with which Jewish transport “Bunker 1” could have been inaugurated, given that, according to Czech, no Jews arrived at Auschwitz prior to this, and that all deportees from the three deportation trains arriving in March 1942 were all duly registered, hence not gassed.

²⁸⁶ As I have shown in Mattogno/Kues/Graf 2014, vol. I, Chapter 4. [48], pp. 540-543.

7. Documents on the “Bunkers” at Birkenau

After this bizarre presentation of the origins of the alleged homicidal gassings at Auschwitz, the authors finally begin to discuss the documents they present.

They claim that the date of March 1942 in relation to “Bunker 1” is confirmed by a 1944 document “that refers to the initiation in March 1942 of the construction of the extermination center” (p. 32). This is their Document 36, the “construction request for the expansion of the PoW camp of the *Waffen-SS* at Auschwitz Upper Silesia. Installation of 3 barracks for special measures” from 26 May 1944. As I have shown above, they misleadingly interpret it as a “re-erecting” of the three undressing barracks at the elusive “Bunker 2.”

According to the tenets of the orthodox Holocaust narrative, “Bunker 2” was the only one of the “bunkers” put back into operation in 1944. But with a fatuous sleight of hand, the authors claim that the document in question is “indirect evidence that bunker I dates from and began operating in March 1942” (p. 152). In other words, they use a date given in a document which, in their contorted logic, deals with “Bunker 2” and apply it to “Bunker 1”! Not to mention that their Document 36 only mentions “3 barracks for special measures” without the slightest reference to the alleged modification of an existing house (the alleged “Bunker 1”). Hence their guess is doubly fallacious, and only with blatant dishonesty can they speak in this regard about an “extermination center,” a term that basically refers to the alleged gassing facilities, although there is no trace about it in the document.

The authors then claim to know that “by the middle of April 1942 at the latest a Birkenau *Sonderkommando* was in existence (Doc. 52), and it would und[o]ubtedly have been employed in the operation of the bunker” (p. 32). This argument, like all those referring to the presence of the term *Sonderkommando* in a document, is based on the lie that only one type of *Sonderkommando* existed at Auschwitz, and that it was exclusively used for criminal purposes. This legend is as dear to the Auschwitz Museum and its acolytes as it is false and unfounded. As I pointed out above, the authors completely hush up the actual recipient of the supplies in question, which was “BW. 4 Sonderk. Bir.,” which means “Structure 4 of the Birkenau *Sonderkommando*.” BW 4 Birkenau referred to the construction of 14 barracks for logistical maintenance. I will return later to the supply of 300 kg of cement to this *Sonderkommando*.

The authors then continue by asserting:

“We know about the appearance of bunker I only on the basis of eyewitness accounts, above all that of Szlama Dragon. In the SS records, there are two extant documents containing the information that the two gas bunkers originated as a result of the adaptation of existing houses (doc. 17 and 18).” (p. 32)

These are the “Explanatory report on the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S” of 30 September 1943 and the respective “Cost estimate for extension of POW camp of the *Waffen-SS* in Auschwitz,” which, among other things, mention twice the “Remodeling of an existing house for special measures” with reference to the Birkenau Construction Sectors II and III, respectively. The authors distort the meaning of these two documents, clumsily attributing projects allegedly carried out in the past (the elusive “bunkers,” allegedly remodeled in the first half of 1942) to projects not yet carried out which obviously were to be implemented only in the future. This is exactly the reason why both of these houses and the related barracks appear for the first time in these two documents: they simply did not yet exist as projects for anything before 20 September 1943.

Referring to the mythical “bunkers,” the authors write:

“It is noted that no plans for the remodeling [of the pre-existing houses into “gas chambers”] were drawn up, which might suggest the limited scope of the work that was carried out using bricks from the demolition of houses in nearby villages, costing 14,242 RM. Aside from financial and material savings, this might have had the additional benefit that there was no need to inform the bureaucrats who handled supply matters about the intended use of these facilities.” (p. 32)

Here, as usual, they distort the meaning of the invoked document, as I showed with my comments on their Document 18. I add that the hypothesis that the two houses in question, which were not and could not have been the imaginary “bunkers,” had been remodeled using bricks from the demolition of other houses has no special significance, because the entire Birkenau Camp was built in this way, as is explicitly stated in a file memo of 22 May 1943, published by the authors themselves (Document 70):²⁸⁷

“In the year 1940, the Auschwitz Camp came into existence in the delta estuary between the Vistula River and the Sola River after the evacuation of 7 Polish villages, through the reconstruction of an artillery-barracks site and much construction of extensions, reconstructions and new buildings, utilizing large quantities of material from buildings that had been demolished.”

In addition, there is also no relation to the estimated cost of RM 14,242.

The claim that “there was no need to inform the bureaucrats who handled supply matters about the intended use of these facilities” is meaningless in this context, because a potential blueprint of the two houses (outlining the outer walls, partitions and height in order to calculate the volume and thus the related costs for remodeling them) would not have provided any information “about the intended use of these facilities.”

²⁸⁷ “Aktenvermerk” (file memo) of 22 May 1943. RGVA, 502-1-26, p. 85.

Next, in an attempt to somehow explain the 300 kg of cement delivered to the *Sonderkommando* of BW 4a (Document 52), the authors are forced to resort to a huge nonsense:

"Some of the work [to remodel "Bunker 1"] was done by prisoners from the Sonderkommando who, as bearers of secrets, were condemned in advance to death." (p. 33)

And in a note they explain:

"On Apr. 23, 1942 they received an allotment of 300 kg of cement (doc. 52)"

Given that "Bunker 1," according to Danuta Czech and the authors themselves, was completed and went into operation in March 1942, are we to believe that this "some of the work" was started on 23 April? On the other hand, the claim that the construction work was carried out by a *Sonderkommando* charged with assisting with the claimed mass murder instead of a special detail or *Sonderkommando* from the Central Construction Office is simply foolish and is also not confirmed by any testimony.

The barracks erected in Birkenau rested on concrete slabs, and the 300 kg of cement assigned to BW 4a served precisely for creating this slab (and for the barracks' brick-and-mortar heating stoves).

Another sleight of hand should also be noted. On the line following the entry of their Document 52 discussed here, there is an entry dated 15 July 1942. It reports another delivery of 1,000 kg of "simple concrete" (*Zement einfach*). The recipient is referred to as "Ba 4" (or "Be 4") followed by repetition marks (– " –) meant to repeat the line "Sonderk.[ommando] Bir.[kenau]" three lines above (see my DOCUMENT 28). It follows that the *Sonderkommando* received another 1,000 kg of cement on 15 July 1942. What could have been the point of that, if, as the authors claim, the Lenz company had installed "gas-tight doors" in "Bunker 2" on 8 July, so that it had been operational since?

Continuing their methodical work of distorting the sources, the authors state that in May 1942 "two wooden barracks of the stable type were erected outside bunker I to serve as temporary storage for the belongings of the people murdered" (p. 33). The reference is to Document 21, *i.e.*, the "Construction Report for the Month of May 1942," which, in the job description for the PoW camp, contains the entry:

"In addition, 2 barracks (horse-stable barracks) were erected outside the PoW camp"

That these two barracks had been installed at the elusive "Bunker 1" and that they served to store personal belongings of the alleged victims is based on nothing, since this stems entirely and exclusively from the delusional rantings of the Holocaust orthodoxy.

The authors continue as follows:

"In May 1942 it also turned out, when the mass extermination of Jews transported from the Dąbrowa Basin began, that the bunker I gas chamber was sometimes too small to hold all the deportees. For this reason, according to extant accounts by former prisoners, some transports continued to be sent to the gas chamber next to [the furnace room of] crematorium I in the main camp." (p. 33)

This refers to the invented deportation trains during May-June 1942 as listed above, including 6,700 fictitious deportees between 5 and 12 May, and 4,566 between 17 and 23 June (I will address the invented train of 2 June later).

Here the authors mock their readers in three different ways, first because these transports are invented, next because their star witness Szlama Dragon had declared that "Bunker 1" could hold "fewer than 2,000 naked persons,"²⁸⁸ while the capacity of its claimed incineration trenches was 7,000-8,000 per day.²⁸⁹ Consequently all the invented deportees from the Dąbrowa Basin could have been processed by "Bunker 1" in less than two days, if one is inclined to believe Dragon, as the authors obviously are.

In addition, not even the minimum requirements were given to keep the "gassings" a secret which are supposed to have been carried out inside Crematorium I at the Main Camp. On 13 May the head of the Garrison Administration asked the Central Construction Office to "repair the crematorium's chimney and the motor housing."²⁹⁰ The work was carried out on 14 and 15 May. The first repair covered the flue duct connecting the three furnaces to the chimney. Fifty refractory bricks were replaced with the use of 50 kg of refractory mortar.²⁹¹

During the second half of the month, various external works were carried out at the crematorium: the courtyard in front of the crematorium was fenced in and closed with two wooden entry gates (*Einfahrtstore*) 4 meters wide and 3.20 high, and the old pavement was replaced.²⁹²

On 30 May SS-*Oberscharführer* Josef Pollock informed Bischoff that the chimney's steel bands had become loose and that the masonry had cracked.²⁹³ The next day the chimney was indubitably inspected and tested.

²⁸⁸ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by investigating Judge Jan Sehn, 10 & 11 May 1945. Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 104

²⁸⁹ GARF, 7021-108-8, p. 18.

²⁹⁰ "Verwaltung KL Auschwitz. Bestellschein Nr. 451" of 13 May 1942. APMO, BW 11/5, p. 3: "Den Kamin und das Motorenhaus des Krematoriums instandzusetzen." "Motorenhaus" was the small structure adjacent to the chimney housing the motor for the forced-draft blower.

²⁹¹ "Aufstellung der ausgeführten Bauarbeiten." 20 May 1942. APMO, BW 11/5, pp. 5f., and "Bericht über ausgeführte Arbeiten im Krematorium" of 1 June 1942. APMO, BW 11/5, pp. 1f.

²⁹² Zentralbauleitung, "Auftrag Nr. 436, Arbeitskarte Nr. 20" for the "Tischlerei" (joinery) of 13 May 1942: construction of two entry gates ("Einfahrtstore") of 4m × 3.20m; work done from 21 to 25 May. RGVA, 502-2-1, p. 24. Work description: "Tätigkeitsbericht für den Monat Mai 1942," RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 299, and "Baubericht für Monat Mai 1942," RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 261.

²⁹³ RGVA, 502-1-314, p. 12 & 502-1-312, p. 64.

Between 12 June and 8 August 1942, Crematorium I was a big construction site swarming with people – 688 inmates and 123 civilian workers, who demolished the old chimney, built the new chimney and replaced the smoke ducts – accompanied with a great to and fro of trucks hauling away tons of debris of the old chimney and ducts, and delivering tons of materials – 31 tons of refractory bricks alone.²⁹⁴

The authors, with their typical deceitfulness, hide this context and all the work carried out at Crematorium I at this time, and cite only what suits their thesis, with reference to their Document 6:

“It was probably for this reason that the wooden fence around the yard outside the crematorium (where these Jews had to undress) was replaced at this time by a more solid one made of concrete panels (doc. 6).”

To top it off, the claim that the alleged victims had to undress in the yard of Crematorium I is itself a convenient interpretation, because Höss, for example, in his description of the alleged gassing of 900 Soviet PoWs, says that they “had to undress in the vestibule and proceeded quietly into the morgue, as they had been told that they would all be deloused there.” (Broszat 1981, p. 126).

In light of the massive construction activities carried out at Crematorium I during that time, the claim of the authors and their “eyewitnesses” about alleged “gassings” in Crematorium I during May and June 1942 exposes the true, fictitious nature of their stories.

Before proceeding any farther, allow me to come back to the invented deportation train of 2 June from Ilkenau. Danuta Czech describes it as follows:

“In Bunker 1 in Birkenau, men, women, and children sent from Ilkenau are killed with Zyklon B gas.”

In a note she gives as her source: “Szternfinkiel, *Jews of Sosnowitz*, p. 35.” (1990, p. 173).

In this novelistic work, which contains simple chit chat without the slightest documentary evidence, we read in this regard (Szternfinkiel 1946, p. 35):

“In early June, a ‘resettlement’ took place in Olkusz [Ilkenau]. All local Jews were brought to Auschwitz; only a handful of privileged survivors were taken to Sosnowiec.”

Czech has therefore not only invented the date of this fake transport, but also the alleged gassing of its deportees in “Bunker 1.”

Continuing their imaginary reconstruction, the authors state:

“Furthermore, it would seem, Höss had already been informed that he should expect the arrival in the near future of numerous new transports from Western Europe. This is probably why the decision was made at the

²⁹⁴ Handwritten note “Schornstein-Krematorium. BW 11” of 7 December 1942. RGVA, 502-1-318, pp. 4f.

beginning of June 1942 to convert another house at the edge of the woods in Brzezinka into a gas chamber.” (p. 33)

This comment highlights the authors’ historiographic ineptitude and lack of familiarity with the documents. First of all, they do not explain at all why the 18 Jewish transports which arrived at Auschwitz until 30 June 1942 – 16,767 people – were all duly registered, but why then, starting on 4 July 1942, all of a sudden the “selection” of the deportees would have been introduced resulting in the “gassing” of those unable to work (while those allegedly deported from the Dąbrowa Basin would have been gassed indiscriminately, including those fit for labor). Secondly, the justification for the creation of “Bunker 2” is a holocaustic fable, because it is known that the decision to deport to Auschwitz “numerous new transports from Western Europe” was made on 22 June 1942, when Adolf Eichmann wrote a letter to Franz Rademacher, an official at the German Foreign Office, with the subject “Labor deployment of Jews from France, Belgium and the Netherlands,” which states:²⁹⁵

“Starting in mid-July or rather at the beginning of August of the current year, it is planned to initially deport, in daily scheduled special trains to the Auschwitz Camp for labor deployment, about 40,000 Jews from the occupied French territory, 40,000 Jews from the Netherlands, and 10,000 Jews from Belgium.

The group of people to be apprehended comprises Jews able to work, as long as they are not living in mixed marriage and are not citizens of the British Empire, the USA, of Mexico, of the enemy countries of Central and South America, as well as of the neutral and allied countries.”

As we see, the plan was to send to Auschwitz Jews capable of work, which cannot be reconciled at all with the authors’ exterminationist crazes, and even less with their fictitious chronology “at the beginning of June 1942,” because at that time Höss could not possibly have known anything about this plan yet, which was only drawn up three weeks later. Hence he consequently could not make any decision on setting up the elusive “Bunker 2,” a decision all the more anachronistic since the plan called for the deportation of precisely those Jews who were fit for work, hence who were *not* to be exterminated even according to the orthodox point of view: whom then would Höss have “gassed” in his “Bunker 2”?

The authors then carry on unfolding their mythical Holocaust narrative:

“Three wooden barracks to hold the belongings of the murdered were to be erected next to it (doc. 23). Bunker II was presumably put into operation after July 8, the day when the Lenz firm installed gas-proof doors there (doc. 8).” (p. 33)

²⁹⁵ NG-183; reproduced in Kempner 1961, p. 199.

In my comments on Document 8, I have already explained that associating this document with “Bunker 2” is based on a blatant misinterpretation (unless it is a deliberate deception): The authors in fact mistranslated “*in d.[er] Gaskammer*” (“in the gas chamber”) as “*in 2 Gaskammer*” (“in 2 gas chamber”), then they turned the non-existent “2” into “second,” so that the phrase “the gas chamber” obtained the invented meaning “in the second gas chamber” by adding *ex cathedra* an ordinal, *et voila!*, with this sleight of hand they created “Bunker 2” out of thin air!

Even the claim about the erection of three barracks is a simple feint, resulting from a flawed interpretation of their Document 22 (not 23), which says:

“For the special treatment of the Jews, the camp commandant of the concentration camp, SS Stubaf. Höss, has applied orally for the erection of 4 horse-stable barracks for the accommodation of personal effects.”

Here, the authors commit an additional error, because the letter in question is dated 9 June 1942, so even according to their twisted logic it could refer only to “Bunker 2,” which at that time was not yet operational. If Höss was planning ahead, it would have been more logical to provide undressing barracks for the victims near the allegedly planned additional gassing facility.

The authors then report on Himmler’s visit to Auschwitz on 17 and 18 July 1942, which they obviously interpret in a criminal way, since the *Reichsführer-SS* is claimed to have ordered the intensification of the alleged extermination. By so doing, he allegedly turned Auschwitz from a “regional center for the extermination of the Silesian Jews” into a European extermination center (p. 33). But Höss had to be aware of these plans already, “because the decision to build bunker II and introduce systematic selection was surely made before Himmler’s July 17-18, 1942 visit” (note 37, p. 33). Indeed, as I have shown above, even before the decision had been made to deport European Jews in masses to Auschwitz. A beautiful timeline! Höss no doubt possessed a holocaustic crystal ball enabling him to predict the future.

The content of the talks between Himmler and Höss is known only based on the Auschwitz commandant’s post-war account, which is known to contain such huge blunders that it must lead the critical researcher to doubt his entire narrative. In particular, he stated that Himmler witnessed a gassing in one of the two “bunkers,” but based on what is documented, this is simply impossible (see Mattogno 2004b, pp. 17-25). Moreover, Höss claims that Himmler visited “the Gypsy camp” at Birkenau (Paskuly 1992, p. 287), which was only created in February 1943, as is well-known, and he declared (*ibid.*, p. 290):

“The Gypsies are to be exterminated. With the same relentlessness you will exterminate those Jews who are unable to work.”

But, thanks to his proverbial “clairvoyance,” Höss had begun to “select” the Jews unable to work already a fortnight earlier, on 4 July (according to Czech 1990, pp. 191f.).

8. “Sonderkommando”, “Cremation Pits” and Barracks Near the “Bunkers”

Next the authors claim:

“Soon after Himmler’s visit, an order arrived from Berlin to exhume the bodies from the mass graves and burn them on wooden pyres.” (p. 34)

If that was indeed Himmler’s order, then the question arises, from an orthodox point of view, why Höss visited the “field furnaces Operation Reinhard” on 16 September, hence almost two months later: is the advice of the layman Blobel supposed to have been indispensable for the erection of wooden pyres, even though one of Germany’s leading experts in cremation technology, the Engineer Kurt Prüfer, was present at Auschwitz on 19 and 20 August precisely to discuss cremation and crematoria?

The mass graves are said to have been excavated by men of the *Sonderkommando*, and that is allegedly proven by authors’ Document 9, which states that on 17 August 500 men were assigned to a *Sonderkommando* (p. 34). Here emerges the authors’ superstitious craze about the term *Sonderkommando*, or if you will, the malicious fiction according to which only one *Sonderkommando* existed at Auschwitz, which of course was in charge of “gassing,” mass graves, exhumations and open-air cremations.

According to the authors, this assignment of 500 prisoners to the *Sonderkommando* “was probably connected with the need to prepare the pits in which the corpses recovered from the mass graves were to be burned” (p. 34). This is yet another anachronism which presupposes that Höss knew ahead of time what the cremation method was going to be before he had even visited the “field furnaces Operation Reinhard.”

The authors emphasize:

“It is not known how long this work went on, but the employment of such a large group of prisoners suggests that it took only a few days to complete the assigned tasks. This would explain Arnošt Rosin’s testimony that he worked ‘in the Sonderkommando’ but later managed to obtain a transfer to a different labor detail.” (p. 34)

The source adduced by them is “Höss Trial Collection, vol. 6, p. 114,” although Rosin did not testify during that trial, but rather during the trial against the personnel of the Auschwitz camp garrison. Regarding the subject of interest here, he declared:²⁹⁶

“In 1942 I was taken to the Auschwitz Concentration Camp, where I stayed three days, after which I was transferred to Birkenau. A week later I was assigned to the so-called ‘Sonderkommando.’ At the beginning, our work consisted in the excavation of mass graves. In this period our Kom-

²⁹⁶ Trial of the Auschwitz camp garrison, Vol. VII, pp. 6f.

mandoführer was the defendant Plagge. Initially we did not know for what purpose these pits were excavated, until the day when the first gassing took place in the small gas chamber at Birkenau [pierwsze gazowanie w małej komorze gazowej w Brzezince], in the morning, before going to work, we found that our pits had been filled with people, but partially naked bodies could be seen."

The witness then said that this *Sonderkommando* was exterminated on 3 December 1942. It is unclear how Rosin managed to escape death. In any case, this testimony contains an element that upsets the authors' fictitious history. As Danuta Czech informs us, Rosin had the serial number 29858, which was assigned on 17 April 1942 (1990, pp. 635, 157). If we follow his timeline, he was transferred to Birkenau on the 20th, and assigned to the *Sonderkommando* on the 27th of that month. The "first gassing" "in the small gas chamber at Birkenau" must therefore have been later than that, so not before 27 April. This dating is incompatible with both "Bunker 1" (March 1942), and "Bunker 2" (July 1942).

On another note, what was the "small gas chamber at Birkenau" supposed to have been? From this expression we can deduce two incontrovertible facts: 1) the witness (like all the others) did not know the term "bunker"; 2) he did not even know that there should have been two "bunkers."

As we see, the authors rely once more on an utterly unreliable witness.

They then continue to embroider their imaginary "historical reconstruction" with the same method of distorting the meaning of the documents:

"On August 20, 1942, 50 more prisoners were added to the Sonderkommando roster (doc. 12). Finally, as indicated by the contents of an August 22, 1942 report by the electricians' Kommando, they laid electrical cable that day for the purpose of providing the Sonderkommando with illumination at 'nineteen burning places,' which doubtless means the pits mentioned above (doc. 11)." (p. 34)

I already mentioned above that the authors omit the key information that the request for 50 detainees was made by "Administration of Inmate Property" (*Gefangenen-Eigentumsverwaltung*), which means that its *Sonderkommando* dealt with sorting and storing inmate belongings, not with the excavation of mass graves. As for Document 11, I revealed the authors' fatuous deception, who want us to believe that the German term *Brennstellen*, in this context concerning electricians, refers to "cremation pits" instead of to utterly mundane lighting outlets.

Here, again, they don't just scoff at the reader, but also at the "eyewitnesses." In his deposition given to Soviet investigators, Szlama Dragon declared in fact that there were a total of 10 (not 19) cremation pits near the "gas cham-

bers” (gazokameri/газокамеры) 1 and 2.²⁹⁷ These pits could allegedly burn no fewer than 17,000 to 18,000 corpses per day, with peaks of up to 27,000 to 28,000.²⁹⁸ Such magical capacities raise the question why the SS wasted so much of their financial and material resources to build four crematoria which had a considerably inferior extermination and cremation capacity!

So, if their document proves that there were 19 cremation pits, where were the remaining nine cremation pits? Who testified about them?

Next there is the chronological contradiction about the beginning of the outdoor cremations, which also applies to the revised version of this story proposed by Setkiewicz, one of the three editors of the book under review, as I pointed out in my comments on Document 13:

“The cremation of corpses in pits or on pyres began at Birkenau probably around the turn of August to September [1942], initially using firewood stock (wood waste), but later, around 7-8 September, also systematically by beginning to bring in wood from outside.”

If therefore the cremation began as soon as possible, “around the turn of August to September” (but Czech says it started on 21 September), how can it be that on 22 August there were already “nineteen burning places” at Birkenau?

But that’s not all. Maurice Schellekes was deported to Auschwitz from the Dutch Westerbork camp on 11 August 1942, and soon after his arrival at the camp he was transferred to Birkenau and assigned to the *Sonderkommando*, whose task was to dig graves and bury the corpses of people who had been killed “in a white farmhouse in the woods.” The witness pointed out: “All this happened during the heat of the summer” (Friedler *et al.* 2005, pp. 79f.). The story of the “nineteen burning places” is therefore a crude deception which distorts even the tenets of orthodox Holocaust historiography and its “eyewitnesses.”

The authors conclude their fanciful presentation with a remark which is no less preposterous:

“It can be concluded from this that the Auschwitz commandant’s office regarded the removal of the corpses from the graves as a priority task that had to be carried out day and night regardless of the rigorous regulations on observing the blackout. The removal of the bodies from the graves and the burning must therefore have begun around August 20, or soon after.” (p. 34)

Incredibly, on the basis of a vulgar deception (the *Brennstellen* passed off as “burning places” in the face of “eyewitnesses” saying the contrary), the authors revise the orthodox chronology of the beginning of outdoor cremations and backdate it to 20 August 1942!

²⁹⁷ At that time the witnesses were still ignorant of the term “bunker.”

²⁹⁸ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by Military Judge Levin, 26 February 1945. GARF, 7021-108-8, p. 19.

Thus they also distort Höss's story (which Czech adhered to): "shortly after Himmler's visit, [...] Blobel [...] arrived at Auschwitz with [Himmler's] orders to exhume all buried bodies, burn them, and scatter the ashes" (Piper 1994, p. 163; based on Höss's story, Paskuly 1992, p. 33). At the time Blobel was allegedly engaged in cremation experiments at Chelmno, and by order of Eichmann had to show his devices to Höss. They therefore went to Chelmno and saw "different auxiliary furnaces" constructed by Blobel. This alleged visit, he remembered, occurred on 16 September 1942. Cremation at Auschwitz began after Höss had returned to the camp, at the "end of the summer" (Paskuly 1992, pp. 32f.). And precisely from this statement Czech inferred the exact date of 21 September: the end of summer and beginning of autumn!

The distortion of a document thus led to a (pseudo-)historical distortion.

Even the claim that the wire installed by the electricians served to illuminate anything whatsoever is devoid of any foundation, as I have shown above. In this context one could refer to the witness Moshe Garbarz, who was deported to Auschwitz on 17 July 1942 from the French camp at Drancy. He claims to have been assigned to the electricians' detail, and at an unspecified time he was sent with his detail to install floodlights in a place that does not match either of the two imaginary "bunkers":

"We had seen a kind of barn, closed on three sides, of the type where the farmers store their hay, and not far from there three or four pretty buildings, like country houses, of which only the first, fairly close, was clearly visible. The convoys arrived, adult men and small children together, women, girls, and babies together. They moved, completely naked, in groups of twenty towards the cottage."

The floodlights were used while mass graves were being dug. The cremation of corpses, as this "direct witness" reported, came much later, but not in "cremation pits" (Garbarz/Garbarz 1983, pp. 109-116; see my analysis in 2004a, pp. 114f.):

"When the first crematorium furnaces became operational [early 1943], the victims were recovered to be burned: I was part of the Kommando made to dig out the dead, thousands of dead."

"Two months later I met a detainee still employed at digging out the dead. Not just mud: the ground was frozen. They had to break the ground and the dead with pick-axes."

9. The Genesis of the Crematoria at Birkenau

The authors continue with a long discussion of the file memo of 21 August 1941 (Document 10), which the authors interpret in an utterly deceptive and misleading way, as I have shown in my commentary. Here I examine another important aspect of the matter: the decision to build four crematoria at Birke-

nau. The fundamental question is: did this decision depend on the alleged mass extermination, as the authors claim, or was it a result of the extremely high “natural” mortality caused by the camp’s primitive sanitary and hygienic conditions and the subsequent epidemics?

The authors’ interpretation that, during his visit on 17 and 18 July 1942, Himmler ordered the intensification of the alleged extermination by turning Auschwitz into a European extermination center, contrasts sharply with the actual genesis of the Birkenau crematoria. According to this orthodox perspective, on the one hand Höss, by virtue of his notorious “clairvoyance,” established “Bunker 2” by early July 1942 so he could carry out Himmler’s extermination plan announced two weeks later, and on the other hand Himmler ordered the cremation of those allegedly gassed. As a result, the allegedly intensified extermination plan needed to be matched by an equally intensified, corresponding cremation capacity. However, even as late as 3 August 1942, only the one crematorium initially designed for the Main Camp was planned for Birkenau.²⁹⁹ The “Explanatory Report on the preliminary draft for the new construction of the prisoners-of-war camp of the *Waffen-SS* Auschwitz, Upper Silesia” of 30 October 1941 stated in this regard:³⁰⁰

“On account of the high [projected] occupancy (125,000 prisoners) a crematorium is built. It contains 5 pcs. muffle furnaces with three muffles each for 2 men, so that 60 men can be incinerated in one hour. Furthermore an underground morgue and a waste incinerator will be built. The crematorium will be erected on the grounds of the CC.”

Originally this facility was to be built in the Auschwitz Main Camp, but on 27 February 1942 it was decided to build it in the Birkenau Camp.³⁰¹ This change, by the way, took place before the creation of the alleged “Bunker 1,” which confirms that the decision had nothing to do with imaginary extermination plans. Not even the authors dare to explicitly state that this crematorium was designed for extermination, which would be absurd to claim after Jean-Claude Pressac’s fundamental studies. Therefore the future Crematorium II initially had a purely hygienic and sanitary purpose. Hence, if as of 3 August 1942 this was the only crematorium in the pipeline, then this means that the decision to build the remaining three Birkenau crematoria had also no relation to the alleged extermination of the Jews.

The map of the Birkenau Camp of 15 August 1942 shows only the future Crematoria II and III (labeled 1 and 2; Pressac 1989, p. 203), but the first known blueprint of Crematorium IV/V was drawn the day before and shows in the furnace room an eight-muffle cremation furnace (*ibid.*, p. 393), the

²⁹⁹ Letter by Bischoff to Kammler of 3 August 1942. GARF, 7021-108-32, p. 37.

³⁰⁰ “Erläuterungsbericht zum Vorentwurf für den Neubau des Konzentrationslagers der *Waffen-SS*, Auschwitz O/S.” RGVA, 502-1-233, p. 20.

³⁰¹ Letter by Bischoff to Kammler of 30 March 1942. RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 174.

model of the Mogilev contract. Ertl's file memo of 21 August says two important things in this regard:

"(2) Regarding the installation of 2 three-muffle furnaces each at the 'bathing facilities for special operations,' it was proposed by engineer Prüfer that the furnaces be diverted from an already completed shipment to Mogilev [in White Russia], and the administrative director, who was at the SS Main Office of Economic Administration in Berlin, was immediately informed of this by telephone and asked to make further arrangements.

3) Concerning the erection of a 2nd crematorium with 5 triple-muffle furnaces as well as aeration and de-aeration installations, results of the negotiations on assignment of materials, already under way with Reichssicherheitshauptamt (RSHA), must first be waited for."

The document in question contains a handwritten note by Bischoff saying:³⁰²

"24 Aug. 42 by phone notified Herr Prüfer that 2 pieces 8-muffle furnaces can be diverted from delivery Mogilev. Herr Prüfer imparted that SS-Stubaf. Lenzner has told him that already."

Hence, if Prüfer had proposed to provide two 8-muffle cremation furnaces for "bathing facilities for special operations," a proposal that was accepted within a few days, and if a blueprint of Crematorium IV/V existed already on 14 August showing an 8-muffle furnace, the logical conclusion is that "bathing facilities for special operations" was a term used to describe the future Crematoria IV and V, which were indeed equipped with this kind of furnaces.

As I have shown elsewhere (2019, pp. 158-162), "water installations" were installed in these crematoria. These were undoubtedly two shower facilities operated with water heated by means of heating coils incorporated into the design of the room's heating stoves. Hence these were sanitary facilities rather than extermination facilities. In this context, "special operations" consisted of receiving and accommodating the arriving deportees, which was also called "immediate operation" or "immediate measure." The first term appears in Garrison Order No. 31/43, which states as follows:³⁰³

"As recognition for the labor performed by all SS members during the special operation of the last few days, the commandant has ordered that from 1300 hours on Saturday evening, 7 August 1943, through Sunday, 8 August 1943, inclusive, there will be a rest from every operational duty."

Since *all* SS men of the *entire* Auschwitz Camp had participated in this "special operation" (and not just a selected few allegedly deployed during homicidal gassings), it is clear that the term referred to the entire deportation procedure with all operations involved in receiving, sorting and accommodating the deportees.

³⁰² RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 160.

³⁰³ AGK, NTN, 94, p. 179.

It remains to explain why the “bathing facilities for special operations” had a close relationship with the crematoria. This derived from the catastrophic sanitary situation prevailing inside the camp in August 1942. After the first cases of typhus had manifested themselves among civilian workers of the Lenz and Huta companies between late June and early July,³⁰⁴ a typhus epidemic quickly broke out which spread to the entire camp complex of Auschwitz-Birkenau. The mortality rate among prisoners skyrocketed to frightening heights, reaching 8,600 deaths in August.³⁰⁵ Pressac himself spoke of

“[...] absolute panic that seized the SS in July/August 1942 when they were confronted with a raging typhus epidemic and were in a situation where they had to combat this by every possible means.” (Pressac 1989, p. 227)

This was precisely the reason for the decision to build three additional crematoria at Birkenau, in addition to the order issued by Himmler after his visit to Auschwitz on 17 and 18 July 1942 to increase the camp’s occupancy to a dizzying 200,000 inmates (see Rudolf/Mattogno 2017 pp. 157-162). Precisely the risk of an epidemic breaking out in a camp holding 200,000 inmates led the SS authorities to agree to construct three more crematoria. From October 1941 (the month in which the first draft of the PoW camp was released) to August 1942, the death rate at the camp rose from 2,128 (Czech 1990, pp. 102) to 8,600 deaths per month, a fourfold increase. But the ratio of muffles to detainees was increased less than twofold compared to that for the originally planned camp for 125,000 PoWs (from 1:4,350 to 1:8,350). Seen this way, the camp surely was *not* over-equipped with cremation capacity in relation to the expected or rather feared mortality rates.

In conclusion, Ertl’s file memo of 21 August 1941 referred to crematoria planned for registered inmates who were dying at the camp in large quantities, particularly as a result of the catastrophic typhus epidemic. It had nothing to do with corpses of anyone allegedly gassed.

Not to mention the absurdity of the orthodox version’s suggestion that the SS would have planned between October 1941 and the summer of 1942 to build a modern crematorium with five triple-muffle furnaces in order to tracelessly incinerate the inmates who had died a mere “natural” death, while at the same time planning to simply bury their mass-murder victims of the alleged extermination of the Jews in mass graves!

³⁰⁴ Letter by “Staat. Gesundheitsamt für den Kreis Bielitz” to the commandant of CC Auschwitz dated 3 July 1942. RGVA, 502-1-332, pp. 148f.

³⁰⁵ The *Sterbebücher* of Auschwitz (register books of deceased inmates) contain 8,507 death certificates for the month of August 1942 (Grotum/Parcer 1995, p. 249), with some gaps. The certificates’ numbers range from 17789 to 26388, so the actual number of deaths was about 8,600.

10. “Sonderaktion,” “Aktion Reinhard” and Open-Air Cremations

The authors then distort the meaning of other documents in order to forcibly adapt them to their holocaustic predilections, while being indifferent to – or unable to resolve – the resulting contradictions:

“The next problem that the SS authorities had to solve in connection with the arrival of numerous transports of Jews designated for extermination was the lack of a sufficient number of trucks to carry the selected persons from the ramp to the gas chambers. A request was therefore submitted for the allocation of five trucks required for ‘special operations,’ and the WVHA approved the request by the end of the month (doc. 60). At the same time, 12 SS clerks were transferred from Oranienburg to Auschwitz to administer the plundered property of the victims (Operation Reinhard) (doc. 61). Simultaneously, the supply of firewood from the Pszczyna forests (Radostowice, Kobiór and Międzyrzecze) was organized (doc. 13). On September 16, accompanied by Franz Hössler and Walter Dejaco, Höss set out on a business trip to the extermination center at Chelmno on the Ner (Kulmhof) to learn about the experiences of SS men who ran the burning pits there. (doły spaleniskowe, p. 20).” (pp. 35f.)

As I have shown above, the claim that the five trucks “for special operations” served to transport the alleged victims “from the ramp to the gas chambers” has no basis. The most likely use of those trucks was for transporting the inmates’ belongings from the Auschwitz railway station to the disinfestation and storage facilities inside the camp, which is confirmed by the transfer of 12 non-commissioned SS officers and soldiers to Auschwitz “for operation ‘Reinhard,’” which was ordered on 25 September 1942 by the WVHA, eleven days after the request for the trucks. Since the term “special operations” also described the reception of trains full of deportees, it does not exclude the possibility that the trucks also served to transport some of the deportees, mainly the disabled and elderly, as attested to by a witness.

The transport which left the Netherlands on 9 October 1942 was subjected to a selection on the old ramp (*alte Rampe*) at the Auschwitz railway station, which was located halfway between Auschwitz and the Birkenau Camp. This can be gleaned from the testimony of “one of the returnees” of these transports published by the Dutch Red Cross. According to this, a group of young women was “selected” (*geselecteerd*) for work on arrival, while “the group of women and children and elderly men were loaded onto three large trucks with trailers, and they also left in the direction of Auschwitz I” (*Het Nederlandse... 1952, p. 72*). This group of people unable to work was therefore also sent in the direction of Auschwitz – rather than toward Birkenau to be “gassed” in the two alleged homicidal “bunkers.”

The “supply of firewood,” presumably for the open-air cremation of the corpses of those allegedly gassed, began already on 7 September (Document

13), so the authors claim, hence even before Höss visited Blobel in order to learn the cremation technique. Here they also eliminate the embarrassing reference to the Feldöfen Aktion Reinhard “field furnaces Operation Reinhard,” which (as far as Höss knew) could also work with coke and did not require firewood. They replace them instead with totally invented “cremation pits.”

For the subsequent period, the authors claim:

“The sequence of events that unfolded at this point is not completely clear.”

Hence they force and manipulate it to suit their interpretative agenda:

“Presumably, the prisoners whose job it had been to disinter the corpses from the mass graves were murdered first, as a consequence of which the prisoners who manned the gas chambers organized several escapes out of fear for their lives. The SS then decided to murder all the remaining members of the Sonderkommando in the gas chamber at crematorium I in Auschwitz, and to form a new Sonderkommando (December 9, 1942) from transports that arrived at this time.” (p. 36)

To lend credibility to their escape stories, the authors mention in a footnote that “it is known that there were escapes by two prisoners from *Sonderkommando* II on December 7, and 6 from *Sonderkommando* I on December 9” (Note 43, p. 36), with reference to the report by the officer on duty of 9 to 10 December 1942, which I analyzed earlier (their Doc. 31). With another sleight of hand worthy of them, the authors carefully avoid explaining what the *Sonderkommando* 1 and *Sonderkommando* 2 actually were. They are explicitly mentioned in the file memo of 10 February 1943 (Document 31). From the perspective of orthodox Holocaust historiography, there are only two options:

1) *Sonderkommando* 1 was the first *Sonderkommando*, and its members were “gassed” in Crematorium 1 at the Auschwitz Main Camp, and then replaced by *Sonderkommando* 2. In this case, as I pointed out earlier, they could not co-exist. In particular, the alleged gassing of the first *Sonderkommando* took place on 3 December 1942 according to Danuta Czech, so the six detainees in question could not escape from it on the 9th, as all its members had already been “gassed” six days before. And the escape of the other two detainees from *Sonderkommando* 2 on 7 December would also have been impossible, because that *Sonderkommando* was only formed two days later on 9 December. Of course, to avoid these contradictions, the authors may change the dates as they please, but that would invalidate the testimonies these alleged events are based upon: the date of 3 December 1942 (the “gassing”) was in fact declared by Arnošt Rosin,⁵⁷ that of 9 December (formation of the new *Sonderkommando*) by Szlama Dragon.³⁰⁶

³⁰⁶ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by investigating Judge Jan Sehn, 10 & 11 May 1945. Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 102.

2) *Sonderkommando* 1 is said to have been deployed at “Bunker 1,” while *Sonderkommando* 2 operated at “Bunker 2.” In this case, leaving aside the chronological contradictions reported above, new *Sonderkommandos* 1 and 2 would have been formed on 9 December, although Dragon speak generically of a single *Sonderkommando*. Here one could certainly invoke the testimony by Milton Buki, who declared during the 127th session of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial (15 January 1965):³⁰⁷

“The 200 inmates were divided in Sonderkommando I and Sonderkommando II. 100 inmates belonged to each Sonderkommando. The one Sonderkommando was in charge for the one house in which the people were gassed, and the second Sonderkommando was in charge of the second house in which the people were gassed.”

It should be considered, however, that this statement, which moreover lacks the term “bunker,” was made in 1965, more than 20 years after the claimed events, while Dragon spoke less than three years after the alleged events. Given that the two witnesses were supposedly assigned to the same *Sonderkommando* on the same day, 6 December 1942 (Czech 1990, p. 280), Dragon’s testimony must have an obvious priority, both for chronological reasons, and because the Auschwitz Museum considers him to be the witness *par excellence* with regard to the “bunkers” of Birkenau.

Fact is, however, that a thorough analysis of the documents in question does not reveal the faintest connection between these two *Sonderkommandos* and the elusive “bunkers.” On the one hand, the duty officer’s report on the events of the night from 9–10 December 1942 merely tells us about prisoners having escaped from *Sonderkommandos* I and II. The file memo of 10 February 1943, on the other hand, explicitly speaks of barracks for personal effects installed at the *Sonderkommandos* 1 and 2. This contradicts Dragon’s respective statements in two ways. In fact, he stated that there were only two barracks (not three) both near “Bunker 1”³⁰⁸ and “Bunker 2,”³⁰⁹ and that they were used as changing rooms, not for storing the belongings of the alleged victims, which were taken away on the day after the alleged gassing:³¹⁰

“[The gassing] happened like this: the people were brought to the barracks with trucks. We who were assigned to assist helped the sick to come down from the truck and to undress in the barracks. In fact, all the deportees undressed in the barracks. The barracks and the space between the barracks and the chamber were surrounded by SS with dogs. Those who had undressed went naked from the barracks to the chambers. [...]

³⁰⁷ “Aussage des Zeugen Buki betreffend den Angeklagten Kaduk,” 14 Jan. 1965. Fritz Bauer Institut *et al.* 2005, pp. 27936–27937.

³⁰⁸ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by investigating Judge Jan Sehn, 10 & 11 May 1945. Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 104.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

The next day a special Kommando took away the items left behind in the barracks by those gassed, sorted them and transported them to the Effektenkammer at Auschwitz.”

Was this “Kommando” the alleged *Sonderkommando* of the “bunker”? The authors say nothing in this regard. Milton Buki claimed to have been part of a *Sonderkommando* whose task it was to “gather, tie together and sort the clothes.” It consisted of 400 detainees, and its main task was to “burn the corpses”; the witness explained that “before the construction of the crematoria the corpses were burned in corpse pits. The bodies were brought on trucks to the pits.”³¹¹ It is unclear where the collection of clothes was done.

Another witness, Simon Gotland, who arrived at Auschwitz on 30 to 31 July or 1 August 1942, claimed during the Frankfurt Auschwitz trial to also have worked in the *Sonderkommando*.³¹²

“We had to dig graves in a size of 10 times 8 meters, in which the gassed corpses were laid. We had to scatter lime and sand on these corpses. Then I have been in various Kommandos, including twice in the Kommando Kanada. When a transport had arrived at the ramp, it was my job – while I was in the Kommando Kanada – to open the cars and chase the people out of the cars. The packages and suitcases the people had with them we had to throw onto the ramp.”

Because the members of the *Sonderkommando* were “carriers of the secret” who lived isolated from the rest of the prisoners – according to the orthodox Holocaust narrative – it would make no sense to put them in charge of bringing the belongings of those allegedly gassed to the Kanada storage area, or to deploy them at the ramp to collect the deportees’ luggage. For this same reason it is also absurd to claim that they could easily switch from the doomed *Sonderkommando* working at the “bunkers” to other *Kommandos*, so they could blurt out the “terrible secret” they carried.

Gotland clearly stated, however, that a separate “Kommando Kanada” existed which collected the personal belongings of the deportees. Defendants and witnesses at the Auschwitz trial not only confirmed the existence of this *Kommando*, but they specified that it was actually a *Sonderkommando*.

Victor Capesius, chief of the camp pharmacy at Auschwitz, declared.³¹³

“When a transport happened to arrive during my stay [in Auschwitz], the physician present at the ramp instructed the ‘Sonderkommando’ working at the ramp to have physicians step out with their luggage.”

Another defendant, Franz Hofmann, gave further details:³¹⁴

³¹¹ “Aussage des Zeugen Buki betreffend den Angeklagten Kaduk,” 14 Jan. 1965. Fritz Bauer Institut *et al.* 2005, pp. 27839, 27842f.

³¹² “Aussage des Zeugen Gotland Simon betreffend den Angeklagten Baretzki,” 70th session (27 July 1964). *Ibid.*, pp. 13401f.

³¹³ “Richterliche Vernehmung des Angeklagten Victor Capesius,” 10/11 Jan. 1962. *Ibid.*, p. 3568.

“The luggage left behind in the cars and on the ramp were collected by an inmate Sonderkommando under the supervision of the garrison administration and brought into the camp. There the items were then sorted. I have never observed that the luggage would have been sorted or pre-sorted already on the ramp; there wouldn’t have been any time for this anyway.”

Robert Mulka, who had been an adjutant of Commandant Höss, stated:³¹⁵

“During the arrival of transports, the supervision service was carried out by a ‘Sonderkommando’ specifically assembled and sworn-in for this, which consisted of about 60 men. It was block leader personnel.”

The witness Helmut Bartsch asserted the following:³¹⁶

“The suitcases and belongings of arriving inmates were hauled off the cars by a Sonderkommando and brought to the Kanada camp.”

Karl Hykes made the following statement:³¹⁷

“Defense lawyer Gerhardt: Mr. Witness, you said that you were involved with the belongings on the ramp. Hauling them off was a different matter, you said. My question: Can you specify what your work with the belongings consisted of?

Witness Karl Hykes: Yes, it consisted of the following: We stood there and had to make sure that the inmates loaded onto the wagon the luggage which the transports had brought along. [...] That was our task.

Defense lawyer Gerhardt: Now another question. Where did those inmates come from who carried out this work?

Witness Karl Hykes: That was a ‘Sonderkommando’.”

The witness added:³¹⁸

“The office managing the inmates’ money, where I was temporarily employed, charged us with making sure that the luggage was properly loaded up and taken to ‘Kanada.’ This loading was done by a Sonderkommando which most of the time had been brought to the ramp already beforehand, led by a block leader.”

The witness Leopold Heger made a similar deposition:³¹⁹

“Presiding Judge: What do you mean by ‘Sonderkommando’?”

³¹⁴ “Staatsanwaltschaftliche Vernehmung des Angeklagten Franz Hofmann vom 27.04.1961.” *Ibid.*, pp. 3942f.

³¹⁵ “Richterliche Vernehmung des Angeklagten Robert Mulka vom 11./12./13.9.1961 in Frankfurt am Main.” *Ibid.*, p. 4274.

³¹⁶ “Aussage des Zeugen Bartsch, Helmut zu Allgemeines,” 26th session (13 March 1964). *Ibid.*, p. 5883.

³¹⁷ “Aussage des Zeugen Hykes Karl betreffend Allgemeines,” 58th session, (22 June 1964). *Ibid.*, p. 11484.

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 11497f.

³¹⁹ Deposition by Leopold Heger. 88th session (11 Sept. 1964). *Ibid.*, p. 17710.

Witness Leopold Heger: A Kommando which had to stand by for a certain purpose.

Presiding Judge: Yes. And for what purpose was this 'Sonderkommando' provided?

Witness Leopold Heger: Just for the ramp."

The witness Karl Bracht also stated:³²⁰

"At that moment the 'Sonderkommando' was busy cleaning up the ramp."

This brief overview of witness statements, which the authors could have done very easily as well, confirms that their conjecture concerning barracks for inmate belongings erected near the "bunkers" is completely unfounded, and that there was yet another *Sonderkommando* whose task it was to pick up the luggage of the deportees and bring it to the disinfestation facility.

11. "Sonderkommando" and "Bunkers"

Continuing their shoddy work of distorting documents, the authors say:

"Much more material on the functioning of the bunkers from the subsequent months is extant, including two receipts for the delivery of coal to Sonderkommando II from December 18, 1942 and February 26, 1943. Dating from this same period are a request for the assignment of two guards to the Sonderkommando (January 19, 1943) (doc. 55), a request for dentists for 'special operations' (February 10, 1943) (doc. 56), and a letter on the subject of lengthening the ramp where 'special transports' arrived (April 12, 1943) (doc. 48)." (p. 36)

The authors haphazardly bring together documents which have nothing to do with the elusive "bunkers." The only thing these documents have in common is that they refer more or less to the same period of time.

Regarding the supply of coke, the authors propose a second interpretation, in addition to that for heating of the "gas chambers," which I already examined (see their Document 54):

"It is not known what this coal was used for; perhaps attempts were made to sprinkle it on the burning pyres at times of a shortage of firewood, or it may have been used to heat the interior of the gas chambers because Zyklon B did not release poisonous gas at low temperatures." (Note 44, p. 36)

One could argue that, in this case, Zyklon B would have been completely unnecessary, because it is generally known that, if properly operated, braziers produce lethal carbon monoxide, as is tragically attested to by countless fatalities.

³²⁰ "Vernehmungsprotokoll des Zeugen Karl Bracht vom 28.2.1962." 73th session (3 Aug. 1964). *Ibid.*, p. 14079.

However, even the alleged use of coke for the cremation was unknown to Dragon, who spoke exclusively of firewood:³²¹

“At the bottom big wooden logs were laid down, then increasingly smaller wood across, and eventually dry branches.”

As for the “shortage of firewood,” evidently the authors have forgotten the “Pszczyna forests.”

Nothing shows that the “*Sonderkommando Nr. 2*” mentioned in Document 54 had any connection with the “bunkers,” and not surprisingly, the authors avoid revealing who the recipient of the coke supply was, that is, who signed beneath the words “recipient’s signature”: it was SS-*Rottenführer* Goß, who is absolutely unknown as a member of the SS deployed at the “bunkers.”

Because the barracks at Auschwitz-Birkenau were equipped with coke-fueled heating stoves, the most-logical explanation is that the supply in question simply was destined to heat the workplaces and lodgings of *Sonderkommando Nr. 2*.

The “Request for 2 guards for *Sonderkommando*” of their Document 55, has nothing whatsoever to do with the legendary “bunkers,” as I have demonstrated in my earlier comments. The authors can sustain their argument to the contrary only by omitting that the request had been made by the “Administration of Inmate Property,” as is the case for Document 12. This *Sonderkommando* was therefore involved in the sorting and storage of the inmates’ personal belongings, as is confirmed by Document 31, the file memo of 10 February 1943.

With another cunning sleight of hand, the authors pretend that the “Request for dentists to the special operation” (Document 56) is clear in and of itself and does not require any explanation. What could be the holocaustic value of this document? Are they seriously suggesting that the practice of extracting gold teeth from the corpses of those “gassed” was introduced only after 10 February 1943? However, their star witness Szlama Dragon refers to it at the very beginning of his activity in the *Sonderkommando*, that is to say in December 1942:³²²

“Now, when corpses lay in the courtyard, a dentist, assisted by an SS [man], extracted the [gold] teeth [...]”

Seen from the perspective of the orthodox Holocaust narrative, this activity of extracting teeth was different from that pursued by the Inmate Dental Center. During the Frankfurt Auschwitz trial, the witness Männe Kratz said there was a “‘*Sonderkommando*’ of the SS dental station” whose task it was to “melt down the teeth extracted from the dead. And the bars of gold resulting from

³²¹ Interrogation of Sz. Dragon by investigating Judge Jan Sehn, 10 & 11 May 1945. Höss Trial, vol. 11, p. 104.

³²² *Ibid.*, p. 103.

this were then sent to the SS Reich Security Main Office in Berlin, as far as I knew.”³²³ Here is another *Sonderkommando* ignored by the authors.

Finally, what relationship the reference to the “lengthening the ramp where ‘special transports’ arrived,” dated 12 April 1943, may have with the “bunkers” (which were out of service at the time, according to the Auschwitz Museum’s orthodox version of history) or, more generally speaking, with the alleged extermination of the Jews, it is not even specified by the authors’ inscrutable imagination.

They then babble about additional documents that allegedly contain “references to the extermination of Jews in Birkenau,” in particular “notes about the progress of various construction projects in the vicinity of the gas bunkers or the newly erected crematoria.” Here they invoke the additional allocation of guards to “the prisoners employed in transporting materials designated for the construction of facilities to be used in carrying out ‘special undertakings,’” which is mentioned in their Document 67, and “the problem of invoices for work by prisoners and civilian workers employed in the vicinity of places where ‘special operations’ were taking place (doc. 72).” (p. 37).

In their lackluster summary they do not add anything new to their respective comments adjacent to the documents in question, which therefore remain unexplained. As usual, the authors are satisfied by the mere presence of the magic terms “special measures” and “special operation” in those documents.

They do not explain what relationship there could possibly be between the transport to Birkenau of construction materials destined for heating stoves as part of “special measures” consisting in “accommodating the announced transports of 10 to 31 January 1943” on the one hand, and on the other hand what they call “the progress of various construction projects in the vicinity of the gas bunkers or the newly erected crematoria.” Here their delusional fantasy goes rampant by interpreting housing measures for prisoners as extermination measures!

When it comes to Document 72, I emphasize that the authors, as a result of their sloppy superficiality, have committed a colossal blunder. The reference is not to work alleged performed by inmates and civilian workers near places where “special operations” were carried out. Instead, this referred to work which the civilian workers of the company Baugeschäft Anhalt were *unable* to carry out due to a “special operation.” This operation consisted of the interrogation of all civilian workers employed in the camp by the camp’s Political Department, which lasted four days and had been triggered by a simple workers’ strike. This resulted in the loss of four working days, for which the civil companies demanded reimbursement from the Central Construction Office. The authors’ interpretation is really painful nonsense.

³²³ “Vernehmung des Zeugen Männe Kratz,” 122th session (21 Dec. 1964). Fritz Bauer Institut *et al.* 2005, p. 27049.

12. When Did the Activity at the “Bunkers” Stop?

The authors, all tangled up in their false and contradictory interpretations of the documents, clearly do not address this question. After the Birkenau crematoria went into operation in the spring of 1943, they say,

“the two bunkers were no longer used. The office of the commandant undoubtedly intended to liquidate them at this point. As early as April, heads of camp administrative units began requesting the allocation of the now unused wooden barracks that had served until then as temporary storage for the property of the murdered (doc. 32, 33).” (p. 37)

The *Sonderkommando* II mentioned in Document 32 is undoubtedly identical with the *Sonderkommando* 2 of Document 31, but like *Sonderkommando* 1, it is mentioned in the context of barracks and buildings which at the time were used as warehouses for inmate belongings. Only lots of malice or fantasy permits associating them with the elusive “bunkers.”

Document 33 contains a passing reference to a “Special Operation 1,” which the authors do not explain at all. They simply associate it with “Bunker 1” by writing “*Sonderaktion* 1 (Bunker 1),” and the readers are left to content themselves with that “authoritative” equation. But from what fact do they deduce that “*Sonderaktion* 1” was connected to the alleged “Bunker 1”?

The authors also claim that “Bunker 2” was left intact to deal with possible malfunctions of the Birkenau crematoria:

“In fear of further malfunctions, which could even lead to the halting of the extermination process, it was therefore decided to retain the bunkers on a temporary basis and treat them as reserve installations.” (p. 37)

This reasoning starts out with “Bunker 2,” but then, tacitly and inexplicably, also includes “Bunker 1,” despite testimonies that the latter was demolished in March/April 1943. This reasoning is nonsensical, however, because according to the witnesses, as interpreted by Piper, the “cremation pits” of “Bunker 1” and “Bunker 2” were leveled in the spring of 1943, after the crematoria had been started up (see my comments on their Document 16). It stands to reason that, if the SS at Auschwitz really feared that the crematoria might malfunction, they would have left the “cremation pits” at the two imaginary “bunkers” intact, but these were allegedly leveled; to what end, then, would they have kept “Bunker 2” or even both “bunkers” operable?

The argument that follows shows very obviously and once again the authors’ pretentious historical and documentary ineptitude:

“The register of trips by truck to the Pszczyna forests and the receipts for the delivery of firewood to the Sonderkommando in the period from June to September 1943 indicate that the remains of the murdered people were then being burned not only in the crematoria, but at times also on pyres.

This surely occurred when the transports of deported Jews were unusually numerous.” (pp. 37f.)

The authors refer to a page in an article by Setkiewicz saying (2011b, p. 64):

“Instead, in the trip register of the camp’s motor pool, 29 trips to Kobiór by various vehicles (almost exclusively trucks) are logged from mid-June to mid-September (64 days). For 23 of them the task or purpose of the trip is specified, also including:

- Sonderkommando – seven times*
- DHW (?) Sonderkommando – twice*
- Sonderkommando – Holz [wood] – twice.*

In addition, a few times the transport of firewood (Tr. Holz, Holzhof, Holz fahr., Schlager Holz) is given as the trip’s reason, without actually describing in more detail what this wood was meant to be used for. It seems beyond doubt, however, that these trips – as before – were related to the supply of wood to cremate the corpses of prisoners.”

No archival reference is given for this. The purpose for the wood deliveries cited by Setkiewicz (the cremation of corpses) is purely conjectural; there is not even a clue in its favor. Seen from an orthodox point of view, cremations on pyres “when the transports of deported Jews were unusually numerous” could apply only to August 1943, the month in which about 42,500 victims were allegedly gassed. However, it would not make sense for June (less than 6,000 claimed gassing victims from the middle of the month), July (440 claimed gassing victims!) and the first fortnight of September (some 5,000 claimed gassing victims). In August 1943, the mortality among registered inmates was 2,380 inmates (1,442 men and 938 women).³²⁴ Together with those allegedly gassed, this would have amounted to about 44,900 deaths. Even if we take these gassing allegations as fact,³²⁵ given that Setkiewicz accepts, albeit with reservation, the fairy tale about the cremation capacity of Crematoria II/III of 1,440 corpses per day (Setkiewicz 2011b, p. 57), Crematorium III alone – the only of the four crematoria in operation in August 1943 – could have cremated 44,640 bodies, hence virtually every corpse, *i.e.* both the real and those fictitious ones, and there would have been no need for pyres. Piper even assumes a cremation capacity of 2,500 corpses per day for each of the Crematoria II and III (Piper, 1994, p. 171), so that in his opinion Crematorium III alone could have cremated 77,500 bodies in August 1943!

In addition, the authors do not provide the slightest bit of evidence that the *Sonderkommando* receiving the truckloads of wood was a *Sonderkommando* involved in cremations.

³²⁴ PS-1469.

³²⁵ The figure includes two alleged “selections” among registered inmates, one of 498 prisoners (21 Aug.), the other of 4,000 (29 Aug.), but both are purely fictitious, as I have documented in my study on health care and selections at Auschwitz (Mattogno 2016c, pp. 117-120).

Apparently they do not realize that, with their references to wood supplies, they destroy the orthodox story about open-air cremations of the corpses of alleged gassing victims. And here is why:

They state that “in the period from March 1942 to April 1943, about 250,000 people perished inside” the elusive “bunkers” (p. 38), a figure to which I shall return soon. The cremation of these bodies (as I explained in my comments on Document 13) would require $(250,000 \text{ bodies} \times 320 \text{ kg/body} =) 80,000$ metric tons of firewood, equivalent to 8,000 trips of an average truck with a trailer. The documentary series *Fahrbefehl* (travel orders) should therefore contain a huge number of travel orders of this magnitude. However, the trips for firewood collection mentioned by the authors are only these:

- 7 September 1942: 1
- 8 September 1942: 1
- 9 September 1942: 1
- from mid-June to mid-September 1943: 29.

Hence a total of 32 travel orders seem to be extant, most of which, 29, from a time period when the activities of the alleged “bunkers” had ceased. As I pointed out above, the reference cited by the authors shows that the Auschwitz Museum possesses at least two volumes of these documents, and that the first of them has at least 673 pages. The explanation for such a small quantity of wood supplies to the Auschwitz Camp therefore cannot be attributed to the potentially fragmentary nature of these documents, the rest of which the authors never mention.

Now back to the claimed figure of 250,000 victims. The numbers allegedly gassed in the “bunkers” can be extrapolated to some degree from the data given in Czech’s *Auschwitz Chronicle*. Most of Czech’s entries state the exact number of “gassing” victims, but not all. There are a number of entries for deportation trains where only the number of inmates admitted to the camp is known, but not how many deportees were included in that particular transport. In a number of these cases Czech does not even indicate whether any of those not registered were “gassed” in the first place. If we assume, for the sake of argument, that all those deportation trains with an unknown number of deportees had 1,000 of them (the most common strength among such trains), and that all inmates not admitted/registered were “gassed,” then the following numbers result (there are no gassings claimed for March and April 1942):

– May 1942:	6,800
– June 1942:	6,900
– July 1942:	4,700
– August 1942:	36,000
– September 1942:	20,500
– October 1942:	20,900
– November 1942:	20,900
– December 1942:	16,800
– January 1943:	45,800
– February 1943:	18,800
– 1-13 March 1943:	8,800
<hr/>	
Total:	206,900

Of course, these numbers also include all the gassings that might have taken place in Crematorium I, according to orthodox historiography. Czech rarely indicates where the claimed gassings are said to have occurred. She usually only writes that the victims were killed “in the gas chambers.” Only in a few cases is she more specific by pointing to the “bunkers.”

One could try to resort to Höss’s testimony, who declared that some 107,000 victims had been buried in the mass graves near the “bunkers” until open-air cremations began in late summer 1942. These victims, however, also included an unknown fraction of victims other than those allegedly gassed in the “bunkers,” according to Höss (Paskuly 1992, p. 32). Looking at Czech’s data of allegedly gassed victims until the late summer of 1942 reveals, however, that fewer than 70,000 are said to have been killed this way in Crematorium I and the “bunkers” together, so Höss’s number is way too high and thus unreliable, which isn’t surprising, considering that unreliability is the hallmark of Höss’s various statements.

Another unclear point is when exactly gassings are supposed to have ceased in the “bunkers” in early 1943. From testimonies we can derive that the “bunkers” were taken out of commission when the new crematoria became operational, which would make perfect sense. The first gassing in those new crematoria is claimed to have occurred on 13 March 1943 (Crematorium II, 1,492 claimed victims; Czech 1990, p. 352). If we take that as the cut-off date for the operation of the “bunkers,” then we arrive at a maximum of some 207,000 victims. Even if we take March 22 as the cut-off date (the day Crematorium IV went into operation; *ibid.*, p. 357), then this number would increase only by some 4,600. In any case, it doesn’t seem possible to considerably exceed 210,000 gassing victims in total for the time period mentioned by the authors, and most certainly not anywhere close to this for the “bunkers,” since some ten thousand of these victims are said to have been killed in the alleged “gas chamber” of Crematorium I, not in the “bunkers” (Pressac 1989, p. 132).

It is therefore unclear how the authors arrived at their figure of 250,000 “bunker” victims for 1942-1943.

Coming back to the claimed firewood deliveries, what is decisive here is that even a considerably lower “bunker” death toll still leads to incredibly high firewood requirements to cremate these corpses on pyres. Even if we assume only some 150,000 alleged “bunker” victims for the years 1942-1943, the demand for wood for their cremation would still have been (150,000 corpses \times 320 kg wood/corpses =) 48,000 metric tons, equivalent to 4,800 trips of a 5-ton truck with a 5-ton trailer.

Hence, if what the authors have published about documented wood deliveries to the camp is all that is extant, then these travel order registers drastically contradict the story of the huge 1942/43 outdoor cremations of corpses allegedly gassed.

In another contradiction to the orthodox history of the Auschwitz Museum based on testimonies, the authors state:

“On the basis of the extant documents, it is impossible to determine with complete certainty when the demolition of bunker I began. There are many indications, however, that this occurred only in February 1944 as the construction of the nearby third part of the Birkenau camp (BIII, ‘Meksyk’) progressed. That was when the adjacent wooden barracks were dismantled (doc. 34) and the narrow-gauge tracks (for the carts used to transport corpses from the gas chambers to the burning pits) were removed (doc. 57, 58). The bunker building itself was completely demolished, and even the bricks from the foundation were taken away so that no trace of it would remain.” (p. 38)

As I pointed out above, if “Special Operation 1” mentioned in Document 33 referred to “Bunker 1,” as the authors claim, then two of the three barracks of *Sonderkommando* I had already been dismantled and taken away as a result of the order mentioned in the file memo of 9 May 1943. In this case a single barrack would have remained at *Sonderkommando* I, but then, why did Bischoff asked for the return of three barracks on 4 February 1944? It certainly cannot be argued that Bischoff, as head of the Construction Inspectorate “Silesia,” was unaware of the removal of the two barracks around 9 May 1943, because he himself had remained the head of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office until 30 September of the same year.

We should, however, back up the relationship that existed between *Sonderkommando* I and the crematoria with more documents. The opening sentence of the letter, which I repeat for clarity, says (see my comments on Document 34):

“For carrying out a special measure, I once made available 3 horse-stable barracks from Construction Sector III of the PoW camp on a loan basis. After the crematoria have been completed long time ago and have been

handed over to your administration, the above-mentioned barracks allocated on a loan basis are no longer needed at Sonderkommando I."

The completion of the crematoria thus made superfluous three barracks at *Sonderkommando I*, but why? The authors' criminal interpretation of their Document 74 no doubt has its own logic: the undressing barracks near "Bunker 1" became unnecessary following the entry into operation of the crematoria's undressing rooms *cum* "gas chambers." But this presupposes a criminal interpretation of the crematoria's morgues, which, however, is contradicted by documents showing that the SS considered the crematoria exclusively as sanitary facilities.

As I mentioned above, on 20 March 1943 the garrison physician, SS-*Hauptsturmführer* Eduard Wirths, made this request to the camp commandant:³²⁶

"Two covered push-carts must be made available for the removal of the corpses from the detainee sick-bay to the crematorium, each one allowing the transportation of 50 corpses."

And on 4 August Bischoff wrote to Wirths:³²⁷

"SS-Standartenführer Mrugowski declared in the meeting of 31 July that the corpses are to be removed to the morgues of the crematoria twice a day, i.e. in the morning and in the evening, which renders unnecessary the additional installation of morgues in the various subsections."

These provisions, which relate to the corpses of the registered prisoners who had died in the camp, are completely at odds with a logic of extermination. They categorically exclude the possibility that the morgues of the crematoria, filled with deceased inmates as they must have been, could have been used as "gas chambers."

Above I mentioned Bischoff's report of 16 May 1943 which stated (see my comments on Document 17):³²⁸

"Also planned is the insertion of heating coils into the garbage incinerator at Crematorium III for the production of [hot] water for a shower unit to be installed in the cellar of Crematorium III. Negotiations for the implementation of this unit have taken place with Topf & Söhne Co., Erfurt."

Already three days earlier Bischoff had charged the civilian engineer Rudolf Jährling with the task of installing "showers in the undressing room of Crematorium III,"³²⁹ which was a "project for heating water for some 100 show-

³²⁶ Letter by the SS garrison physician to the commandant of CC Auschwitz dated 20 March 1943 with the subject "Häftlings-Krankenbau – KGL." RGVA, 502-1-261, p. 112.

³²⁷ Letter by Bischoff to Wirths of 4 August 1943 with the subject "Hygienische Sofortmassnahmen im KGL: Erstellung von Leichenhallen in jedem Unterabschnitt." RGVA, 502-1-170, p. 262.

³²⁸ RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 311.

³²⁹ "Bericht über die Arbeitseinteilung beim Sofortprogramm im K.G.L. Auschwitz" by Bischoff, dated 13 May 1943. RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 338.

ers.”³³⁰ Hence, it is difficult to explain the meaning of the document under discussion without any further documentation.

Two issues still ought to be pointed out, though. First, it is not very likely that the barracks for the alleged “Bunker 1” would have been granted “on a loan basis,” *i.e.* that this supposed extermination installation would not even have been provided with its own proper barracks.

Second, the three barracks came “from Construction Sector III” of the Birkenau Camp. Now, according to the logic of the authors, two of these three barracks were those which had been erected outside the Birkenau Camp in May 1942 (see their Document 21), but at the time the work in Construction Sector III had not yet begun. They were mentioned for the first time in the “Construction Report for the month of September 1942,” which states:³³¹

“Construction Sector III: Extension of the open trenches for drainage of surface water has begun.”

The “distribution list of barracks” of 8 December 1942 states that for Construction Sector III of the Birkenau Camp 36 barracks of the Type 260/9 are required, “only latrine, wash and storage barracks,” of which 12 were already installed and 24 still pending.³³² If the three barracks given to the *Sonderkommando* were part of the pending 24 in Construction Sector III, then the loan was made several months after the alleged entry into operation of “Bunker 1.”

The request dated 24 December 1943 for handing back over the field railway which had been given to *Sonderkommando* I does not prove anything homicidal either, because we know nothing about this railway. The only documented information on this *Sonderkommando* is that it had to do with the inmates’ personal belongings.

³³⁰ APMO, BW 30/34, p. 40.

³³¹ RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 138.

³³² RGVA, 502-1-275, p. 207.

Conclusions

The authors' comments on their documents end here. They close their introduction by stating that Auschwitz grew "in the years 1942-1943 from a medium-sized concentration camp to the largest mass-extermiation center," a "radicalization" that arose not "from a single decision" but was the result of many factors (p. 38). By so doing, they openly contradict Höss's statements, according to which the alleged extermination of the Jews depended on two fateful decisions, one by Hitler in June 1941 (the alleged order to exterminate the Jews), and the other by Himmler in July 1942 (the alleged extension from a regional extermination center for Jews to one of European proportions).

As for the "bunkers," the authors claim that 250,000 people fell victim to them from March 1942 to April 1943, but the most miraculous thing is that this immense extermination is said to have occurred without leaving the slightest documentary trace.

In the present study I have shown that none of the 74 documents published by the authors has any relation to the "bunkers" in particular and to the alleged extermination of the Jews in general. I also demonstrated that, in order to create fictitious relations, the authors have systematically misrepresented and distorted documents, ignored their meaning and their context, provided totally inconsistent and fanciful interpretations, while showing a remarkable superficiality and historiographical ineptitude. But the greatest reproach that must be leveled against them, far more serious than their childish and foolish tenet about "code words," is their fundamental deception according to which there existed merely one kind of *Sonderkommando* at Auschwitz, so that every document containing this term turns into an apparent proof for the existence of the elusive "bunkers" of Birkenau, and this despite the numerous documents stating the contrary which they obviously never cite.

The authors' work, however, has also a meritorious aspect: having published a selection of documents that, taken in their context, help to shed light on still-unclear aspects of the history of Auschwitz.

This my present study can therefore be considered to be an update and completion of my book *Special Treatment in Auschwitz: Origin and Meaning of a Term*, whose theses are thus confirmed and consolidated, thanks to the documents submitted by the authors.

Appendix

Bibliography

- August, Jochen, “Transport 575 więźniów KL Auschwitz do Sonnenstein (28 lipca 1941 roku). Rekonstrukcja zniszczonej listy transportu” In: *Zeszyty Oświęcimskie*, no. 24, 2008, pp. 111-160.
- Bartosik, Igor, Łukasz Martyniak, Piotr Setkiewicz, *The Beginnings of the Extermination of Jews in KL Auschwitz in the Light of the Source Materials*, Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, Oświęcim, 2014
- Bezwińska, Jadwiga (ed.), *Auschwitz in den Augen der SS*. Staatliches Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau, 1997.
- Bezwińska, Jadwiga, Danuta Czech (eds.), *KL Auschwitz Seen by the SS*, Howard Fertig, New York, 1984.
- Bezwińska, Jadwiga, Danuta Czech, Franciszek Piper *et al.* (eds.), *Inmitten des grauenvollen Verbrechens. Handschriften von Mitgliedern des Sonderkommandos*. Verlag des Staatlichen Auschwitz-Birkenau Museums, 1996.
- Brandhuber, Jerzy, “Die sowjetischen Kriegsgefangenen im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz”, in: *Hefte von Auschwitz*. Wydawnictwo Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, 4, 1961.
- Broszat, Martin, (ed.), *Kommandant in Auschwitz. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen des Rudolf Höss*. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, Munich, 1981.
- Browning, Christopher R., *The Origins of the Final Solution*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln/Yad Vashem, Jerusalem, 2004.
- Cole, David, “David Cole in Auschwitz: David Cole Interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper, Director, Auschwitz State Museum”, VHS video, 1993;
www.codoh.com/library/document/1001.
- Czech, Danuta, “Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau”, in: *Hefte von Auschwitz*. Wydawnictwo Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, 1960.
- “Deportation und Vernichtung der griechischen Juden im KL Auschwitz im Lichte der sogenannten “Endlösung der Judenfrage”, in: *Hefte von Auschwitz*. Verlag des Staatliches Auschwitz-Museum, 11, 1970,
- Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939-1945*. Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1989.
- Auschwitz Chronicle 1939-1945*. Henry Holt, New York, 1990.
- “The Auschwitz Prisoners Administration,” in: Yisrael Gutman, Michael Berenbaum (eds.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1994.
- Długoborski, Waław, Franciszek Piper (eds.), *Auschwitz 1940-1945. Studien zur Geschichte des Konzentrations- und Vernichtungslagers Auschwitz*. Verlag des Staatlichen Museums Auschwitz-Birkenau. Oświęcim, 1999.
- Faurisson, Robert, “The ‘Problem of the Gas Chambers’,” *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (summer 1980), pp. 103-114.
- Felderer, Dietlieb, “Lids and Openings,” *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (fall 1980), pp. 255-266.

- Frei, Norbert, Thomas Grotum, Jan Parcer, Sybille Steinbacher, Bernd C. Wagner (eds.), *Standort- und Kommandanturbefehle des Konzentrationslagers Auschwitz 1940-1945*. K.G. Saur, Munich, 2000.
- Freyer, Anne, Jean-Claude Pressac (eds.), *L'Album d'Auschwitz*. Editions du Seuil, Paris 1983.
- Friedler, Eric, Barbara Siebert, Andreas Kilian, *Zeugen aus der Todeszone: Das jüdische Sonderkommando in Auschwitz*. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, Munich, 2005.
- Fritz Bauer Institut, State Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau (eds.), *Der Auschwitz Prozeß*, Digitale Bibliothek, Verlag der Directmedia Publishing GmbH, Berlin 2005.
- Garbarz, Moshé, Élie Garbarz, *Un survivant*. Éditions Plon, Paris, 1983.
- Graf, Jürgen, Carlo Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek: A Historical and Technical Study*, 3rd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield, 2016.
- Greif, Gideon, *Wir weinten tränenlos... Augenzeugenberichte der jüdischen "Sonderkommandos" in Auschwitz*. Böhlau Verlag, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna, 1995.
- Grotum, Thomas, Jan Parcer, "EDV-gestützte Auswertung der Sterbeeinträge", in: Staatliches Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau (ed.), *Die Sterbebücher von Auschwitz*. K.G. Saur. Munich/New Providence/London/Paris, 1995.
- Het Nederlandsche Roode Kruis. *Auschwitz. Deel III*. Uitgave van het hoofdbestuur van de vereniging het Nederlandsche Roode Kruis. 's-Gravenhage 1952.
- Igounet, Valérie. *Histoire du négationnisme en France*, Editions du Seuil, Paris 2000.
- Kempner, Robert M., *Eichmann und Komplizen*. Europa Verlag. Zurich/Stuttgart/Vienna, 1961.
- Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands, Stadt und Kreis Leipzig (eds.), *Das war Buchenwald! Ein Tatsachenbericht*, Verlag für Wissenschaft und Literatur, Leipzig, undated.
- Lamock, Henri Joseph, *Die Sackkalk-Herstellung*, Verlag der Tonindustrie-Zeitung, Berlin 1911.
- Lasik, Aleksander, "Die Organisationsstruktur des KL Auschwitz", in: Długoborski/Piper 1999, vol. I.
- Lenz, Otto, Ludwig Gaßner, *Schädlingsbekämpfung mit hochgiftigen Stoffen*. Heft 1: *Blausäure*. Verlagsbuchhandlung von Richard Schoetz, Berlin, 1934.
- Longerich, Peter, *Holocaust: The Nazi Persecution and Murder of the Jews*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010.
- Marczevska, Krystyna, Władysław Ważniewski (eds.), "Obóz koncentracyjny Oświęcim w świetle akt Delegatury Rządu R.P. na Kraj." In: *Zeszyty Oświęcimskie*, Special Number I, Auschwitz, 1968.
- Mattogno, Carlo, *La "Zentralbauleitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz."* Edizioni di Ar, Padua, 1998.
- "Sonderbehandlung" ad Auschwitz. *Genesi e significato*. Edizioni di Ar, Padua, 2001.
- *The Bunkers of Auschwitz: Black Propaganda versus History*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2004a; as *Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz*, 2nd, revised ed. Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016.
- *Special Treatment in Auschwitz: Origin and Meaning of a Term*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004b; 2nd, revised ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield

2016.

- “The Openings for the Introduction of Zyklon B, Part 1: The Roof of the Morgue of Crematorium I at Auschwitz,” *The Revisionist* 2(4) (2004c), pp. 411-419.
- Auschwitz: Crematorium I and the Alleged Homicidal Gassings*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005a; 2nd, revised ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016.
- Auschwitz: The First Gassing. Rumor and Reality*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005b; 3rd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016.
- Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005c; 2nd, revised ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016.
- The Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz: Organization, Responsibilities, Activities*. Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005d; 2nd, revised ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015.
- “Azione Reinhard” e “Azione 1005” Effepi, Genoa, 2008.
- Le camere a gas di Auschwitz. Studio storico-tecnico sugli “indizi criminali” di Jean-Claude Pressac e sulla “convergenza di prove” di Robert Jan van Pelt*. Effepi, Genoa, 2009.
- I forni crematori di Auschwitz-Birkenau. Studio storico-tecnico con la collaborazione del dott.ing. Franco Deana*. Effepi, Genoa, 2012.
- I verbali degli interrogatori sovietici degli ingegneri della Topf*. Effepi, Genoa, 2014a.
- The Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz: Organization, Responsibilities, Activities*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015.
- Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz*, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016a.
- Inside the Gas Chambers: The Extermination of Mainstream Holocaust Historiography*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield, 2016b.
- Health Care at Auschwitz*, Castle Hill Publishers, Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2016c.
- “The Elusive Holes of Death,” in: Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz Lies*, 4th ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2017, pp. 291-407.
- The Real Case for Auschwitz: Robert van Pelt’s Evidence from the Irving Trial Critically Reviewed*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2019.
- Mattogno, Carlo, Franco Deana, *The Cremation Furnaces of Auschwitz: A Technical and Historical Study*, 3 vols., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015.
- Mattogno, Carlo, Thomas Kues, Jürgen Graf, *I “campi di sterminio” dell’ “Azione Reinhardt.”* GP. Carrara, 2014.
- The “Extermination Camps” of “Aktion Reinhardt”—An Analysis and Refutation of Factitious “Evidence,” Deceptions and Flawed Argumentation of the “Holocaust Controversies” Bloggers*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2015.
- McCalden, David, Andrew Allen, *The Holocaust Revisited, Part I: Auschwitz* (1987); <https://archive.org/details/youtube-7CK1DDxQbrk>.
- Meyer, Fritjof, “Die Zahl der Opfer von Auschwitz. Neue Erkenntnisse durch neue Archivfunde”, in: *Osteuropa. Zeitschrift für Gegenwartsfragen des Ostens*, no. 5, May 2002.

- Morris, Errol, *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.*, Fourth Floor Productions, May 12, 1999; VHS: Universal Studios 2001; DVD: Lions Gate Home Entertainment, 2003; <https://youtu.be/DgtBKpSF8lo>.
- Müller, Filip, *Sonderbehandlung. Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz*, Verlag Steinhausen, Munich, 1979.
- Nowak, Hans Jürgen, Werner Rademacher (= Willy Wallwey), “‘Gasdichte’ Türen in Auschwitz,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1998), pp. 248-260.
- Paskuly, Steven (ed.), *Death Dealer. The Memoirs of the SS Kommandant at Auschwitz*, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, N.Y., 1992.
- Pelt, Robert J. van, *The van Pelt Report*, Expert Opinion presented during the British libel case of David Irving against Penguin Books Ltd and Deborah E. Lipstadt, unpublished court document, Waterloo, Ont., 1999; www.hdot.org/vanpelt_toc/.
- Perz, Bertrand, Thomas Sandkühler, “Auschwitz und die ‘Aktion Reinhard’ 1942-1945. Judenmord und Raubpraxis in neuer Sicht”, in: *Zeitgeschichte*, Vol. 26, No. 5, (1999), pp. 283-318.
- Phillips, Raymond, *Trial of Josef Kramer and Forty-Four Others (The Belsen Trial)*. William Hodge and Company, Limited. London/Edinburgh/Glasgow, 1949.
- Piper, Franciszek “Gas Chamber and Crematoria”, in: Yisrael Gutman, Michael Berenbaum (ed.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1994.
- *Arbeitseinsatz der Häftlinge aus dem KL Auschwitz*. Verlag Staatliches Museum in Oświęcim, 1995.
- “Vernichtung”, in: Długoborski/Piper 1999, vol. III.
- Pressac, Jean-Claude, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*. The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York, 1989.
- *Les crématoires d’Auschwitz: La machinerie du meurtre de masse*. CNRS, Paris 1993.
- *Le macchin dello sterminio: Auschwitz 1941-1945*. Feltrinelli, Milan, 1994.
- Rudolf, Germar, *Das Rudolf Gutachten: Gutachten über die Bildung und Nachweisbarkeit von Cyanidverbindungen in den ‘Gaskammern’ von Auschwitz*, Cromwell Press, London 1993.
- (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 3rd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield 2019.
- *The Chemistry of Auschwitz*, 4th ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield, 2020a.
- “The Thin Internal Walls of Krematorium I at Auschwitz,” January 2020b; <https://jan27.org/the-thin-internal-walls-of-krematorium-i-at-auschwitz/>; *Inconvenient History*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (2020).
- Rudolf, Germar, Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz Lies: Legends, Lies, and Prejudices on the Holocaust*. 4th ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Uckfield, 2017.
- Sehn, Jan, “Obóz koncentracyjny i zagłady Oświęcim”, in: *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Niemieckich w Polsce*, I, Poznań, 1946.
- *Oświęcim-Brzezinka (Auschwitz-Birkenau) Concentration Camp*, Wydawnictwo Prawnicze, Warsaw, 1961.
- Setkiewicz, Piotr, “Podobóz Kobiór (Aussenkommando Kobier) i pszczyńskie komanda leśne (Fortskommandos Pless)”, in: *Zeszyty Oświęcimskie*, no. 26, 2010.
- *The Auschwitz Crematoria and Gas Chambers*. Auschwitz-Birkenau State Muse-

um, 2011a.

- “Zaopatrzenie materiałowe krematoriów i komór gazowych Auschwitz: koks, drewno, cyklon” (The supply of materials to the crematoria and gas chambers at Auschwitz: coke, wood, Zyklon), in: *Studia nad dziejami obozów koncentracyjnych w okupowanej Polsce*. Państwowe Muzeum Auschwitz-Birkenau, Oświęcim, 2011b.
- Strzelecki, Andrzej, “Der Raub der Habe der Opfer”, in: Długoborski/Piper 1999, Vol. II.
- Szternfinkiel, Natan Eliaz, *Zagłada Żydów Sosnowca*. Katowice, 1946.

Archives

- AGK** *Archiwum Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej*, Archive of the Central Commission of Inquiry into the Crimes against the Polish People – National Monument, Warsaw
- APK** *Archiwum Państwowego w Katowicach*, State Archive Katowice
- APMO** *Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum Oświęcim-Brzezinka*, Archive of the National Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau, Oświęcim
- BAK** *Bundesarchiv Koblenz*, German Federal Archives Koblenz
- GARF** *Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoi Federatsii*, State Archive of the Russian Federation, Moscow
- NARA** National Archives and Records Administration, Washington D.C.
- RGVA** *Rossiiskoi Gosudarstvennoi Voennyi Arkhiv*, Russian State War Archive, Moscow
- TNA** *The National Archives*, Kew, Richmond, UK, former *Public Record Office*
- VHA** *Vojenský Historický Archivum*, Archive of Military History, Prague

Documents

D-AuII-3/4

Konz.-Lager Auschwitz II Auschwitz II, den 17. Juli 1944

Dienstplan für Dienstag, den 18.7.1944

Blockführer v. D.	Botz-Scherer	Lagerdienst	Maier-Koleritsch
Hilfsblockführer	Weiß-Reiber	Lagerpolizei	Lahn
Wechselgraben	Umlauf	Zeiflagebetriebe	Rohloff
Lager B II c	Baretzki	Lager B II f	Schneider
Rollwagen	Grapatin	Gleisanschluß	Lisner
Torkontrolle	Müller	Sonderkommando	Buch, Kelm, Schulz
dienstoffrei	Hartwecker, Wolf		Bickel
Abschnitt I	Heidel	Schreibstube	Kramer, Metzger
Abschnitt II	Götke	krank:	Bruns, Stadler
Abschnitt III	Hage		Beß
Abschnitt IV	Korzeniowski	Urlaub:	Pospischil
Lager B II a	Kurpanik, Bardo, Dargelis, Wendel, Bainski, Lang		
Lager B II b	Buntrock, Kolberg, Kaiser, Schenk, Weitmann		
Lager B II c	Bonigut, Hertl, Blass, Padiak, Widenka, Zielke		
Der Rapportführer:		Der 1. Schatzhaftlagerführer:	
4-Unterscharführer		4-Oberturmführer	

DOCUMENT 1: “*Dienstplan für Dienstag*”; duty roster for Tuesday, 18 July 1944, dated 17 July. APMO, D-AuII-3/4.

Konz.-Lager Auschwitz II

Birkenau, den 4. Oktober 1944

3

Dienstplan für Donnerstag, den 5.10.1944

Blockführer v. D.	Pospisachil	Lagerdienst	Schneider
Hilfsblockführer	Mergl	Lagerpolizei	Lahn
Isierlegebetriebe	Rohloff, Heidl,	Kolaritsch	
Weichselgraben	Fritsche	Rollwagen	Linzer
Lager B II f	Korianski	Torkontrolle	Maier
Luftschutzgraben	Wolf, M.	Kontrolle	Kurpanik
Transportbereitschaft	Kolberg, Lang, Baratski, Hartwecker		
Sammelkommando	Grapatin, Fejtschitj	Brlaub	Kaiser, Batz
dis.	Steiner, Bardo	Schreibstube	Kramer, Metzger
ander Kommando	Buch	Sela, Hütte	Kelm
Lager B II a	Csapla, Beer, Weiss, Dargelis, Götze, Hage		
Lager B II b	Kainradl, Stadler, Zielke, Scherer, Weitmann		
Lager B II c	Hertl, Blase, Fediuk, Widenka, Hauer, Lichtner		

Der Rapportführer:

Der 1. Schutzhaftlagerführer

Unterscharführer

ges. Schwarzhuber

1. Obersturmführer

DOCUMENT 2: "Konz.-Lager Auschwitz II. Birkenau, den 4. Oktober 1944. Dienstplan für Donnerstag, den 5.10.1944"; Concentration Camp Auschwitz II, Birkenau. Duty roster for Thursday, 5 October 1944, dated 4 October. GARF, 7021-108-59, p. 3.

Häftlings-Einsatz			
vom			
27. Februar 1942.			
Baustelle	Berufe	Fach.-A. Hilfs.-A. Ges.-Zahl	
Schutzhaftlager	Techniker	9	9
Häftlingsunterkunfts-	Mechaniker	2	2
neubauten.	Maurer	80	80
	Zimmerer	9	9
	Tischler	3	3
	Hilfsarbeiter	205	205
	Kanal-Arbeiter	17	17
	Pflasterer	15	15
	Maurer-Schule	300	300
	(Hilfsarb.) Sandgrube	108	108
	" Kiesgrube	251	251
Baustelle Wäscherei	Zaunbau	23	23
	Schachtkommando	23	23
Landwirtsch. (Harmense)	Maurer	10	15
" "	Zimmerer	11	11
"Gärtnerei Ralsko	Maurer	4	4
" "Gewächshaus"	Abbruch	40	40
Wirtschaftsbaracke	Heiz.-Monteure	13	13
"	Hilfsarbeiter	20	20
Umbau Deutsches Haus	Abbruch	50	50
	Parkettleger	3	3
Haus 152	Ofensetzer	2	2
Aufbaukdo. v. der Sola-			
brücke bis Bahnhof	Abbruch	150	150
Sprengkdo. am Führerheim	"	15	15
Wasserversorg. Gästehaus	Maurer	2	6
Gärtnerkdo. a. d. Weichsel	Gärtner	3	20
Laubbüro	Techn. u. Kaufm.	33	47
Bauhof (Materialverwalt.)	Zaunbaukdo.	30	30
"	Ständ. Kdo.	11	253
"	Entladekdo.	200	200
Werkstätten	Schlosser	117	157
"	Auto-	12	12
"	Tischler	150	161
"	Zimmerer	20	111
"	Elektriker	35	43
"	Installateure	34	45
"	Glaser	12	12
"	Maler	20	30
"	Betonkol.	91	91
"	" Transportkdo.	13	13
"	Dachdecker	14	40
"	Kanal-Arbeiter	5	16
		597	2086
			2683

DOCUMENT 3: "Häftlings-Einsatz vom 27. Februar 1942"; inmate deployment of 27 February 1942. RGVA, 502-1-67, pp. 94f.

- 2 -

Baustelle	B e r u f e	Fach.-A.	Hilfs.-A.	Gesamtzahl
	Übertrag:	597	2086	2683
Kriegsgefangenen- lager.	Dachdecker	8	40	48
	Brunnenbohrer		7	7
	Kabelleger	1	11	12
	Zimmerer		20	20
	Backsteinreiniger		200	200
		606	2364	2970
Kriegsgefangenen- lager.	<u>Kriegsgefangene</u>			
	Schachtbohr.		300	300
	Backsteinreiniger		100	100
	Kiesgrube		100	100
	Insgesamt:	606	2864	3470

DOCUMENT 3: continued.

Enschiedt den *18.8.* 19*42* 2102 *
 Auftrag von *1888/215*
 für *Hilfselektriker* *88*
 Bedingungen:
 Lieferzeit:
Petz. Installation des Sonderkommandos
Birkenau-BW 20 KGL
 Installation und Zuleitung für
 das Sonderkommando bestehend aus:
 19 Brennstellen
 1 Zuleitung 200m Zuleitung $\times 3 \times 252$
 und 600m Kabel $4 \times 10 \square$
 1000 m
 22. Aug. 1942
 Wertstättenleiter
 B/0011

DOCUMENT 4: Auftrag; Order no. 1888/215 of 18 August 1942 for the inmate electricians' detail. RGVA, 502-1-316, p. 33.

Bauleitung der Waffen-
und Polizei
Auschwitz OS.-Oswiecim

Auftrag Nr. 98/291
Auschwitz, den 20 November 1942

Arbeitskarte

An die

Tischlerei	Zimmerei
Schlosserei	Betonkolonne
Installateure	Malerei
Elektriker	Glaserei
Maurer	Dachdecker

Für Betrifft: Krematorium II - BW Nr. 30 im 2. St.
ist folgende Arbeit auszuführen:

Baufeldleitung im Krematorium II, sowie
Einstellung der Kleinrepar für Nacharbeit
1 Protokolle

Angefangen: 15. 1. 1943 Beendet: 23. 1. 1943

14 Facharbeiterstunden

28 Hilfsarbeiterstunden

 Schweißerstunden

DOCUMENT 5: “Arbeitskarte”; work report for Order no. 98/291 of 20 November 1942 for the inmate electricians’ detail. RGVA, 502-2-8, pp. 1-1a.


Materialverbrauch:

Menge	Dim.	Bezeichnung	Einzelneis	Gesamtneis	
			Aufmaß A.M. PP	Berechnungen A.M. PP	
700	m	190T - Leitung 2.5 mm ²	‰ 88 00	61	60
1000	m	190T - Leitung 4 mm ²	‰ 119 00	119	00
11	Stk	Stromschalter a/P	‰ 68 00	7	48
4	Stk	Hebel-Schalter 150T	4 50	4	50
1	Stk	Verteiler 3 pol.	3 46	3	46
24	Stk	Fassungen mit Glaskappen	- 66	15	84
20	Stk	Fassungen m. Halterungen in Ringen	2 00	40	00
6	Stk	Nippel	‰ 7 30	0	44
8	Stk	Scheinwerfer mit Fassungen / 300 W	38 50	308	00
4	Stk	Strahler für 300 W	18 50	74	00
20	Stk	Tiefstrahler komplett	20 30	406	00
30	Stk	Glühlampen 100 W	2 90	87	00
20	Stk	Glühlampen 200 W	3 95	79	00
14	Stk	Glühlampen 300 W	5 50	77	00
		Zusammen:		1283	32
		10% Materialanfall:		128	34
		42 Häufungsarbeitsstunden:	0 05	2	10
		<u>Insgesamt:</u>		<u>1413</u>	<u>76</u>

Kolonnenführer:

Capo
L. V. F. 1944


Werkstättenleiter:




DOCUMENT 6: “*Bebauungsplan für den Auf- u. Ausbau des Konzentrations-
lagers u. Kriegsgefangenenlagers, Plan Nr. 2215*”; Development Map for
the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No.
2215, dated March 1943. RGVA, 502-1-94, p. 2.




DOCUMENT 7, 7a: “Bebauungsplan für den Auf- u. Ausbau des Konzentrationslagers u. Kriegsgefangenenlagers, Plan Nr. 2215”; Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215, dated March 1943. RGVA, 502-2-93, p. 1. Detail enlargement of the area of the alleged “Bunker 2” (7) and of the map’s stamp imprint (7a).



DOCUMENT 8, 8a: “Bebauungsplan für den Auf- u. Ausbau des Konzentrationslagers u. Kriegsgefangenenlagers, Plan Nr. 2215”; Development Map for the Erection and Extension of the Concentration and POW Camp, Map No. 2215, dated March 1943. RGVA, 502-1-94, p. 2. Detail enlargement of the area of the alleged “Bunker 2” (8) and of the map’s stamp imprint (8a).




DOCUMENT 9: “*Lageplan des Interessengebiets K.L. Auschwitz Nr. 1733*”
Situation map of the area of interest Auschwitz Concentration Camp no.
1733 of 5 October 1942. RGVA, 502-2-93, p. 13.



DOCUMENT 10: “*Lageplan des Interessengebiets K.L. Auschwitz Nr. 1733*”; “Situation map of the area of interest Auschwitz Concentration Camp no. 1733” of 5 October 1942. RGVA, 502-2-93, p. 13. Detail enlargement of the claimed area where the alleged “Bunker 1” is said to have been.

✓ BW 12 d/	12 Blockführerbaracken	Typ IV/3
✓ BW 34 a/	4 Kammerbaracken	" 260/9
✓ BW 33 ✓	25 Effektenbaracken	" 260/9
✓	5 Effektenbaracken	" 501/34
	Ausbau eines vorhandenen Hauses für Sondermassnahmen	
✓	3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen	Typ 260/9
<u>Querschnitt VII:</u>		
BW 3e	114 Krankenbaracken	Typ 501/34
BW 4a (e)	5 Wirtschaftsbaracken	
BW 4c ✓	2 Wirtschaftsbaracken	" 260/9
BW 4f	13 Vorrats- u. Ascheroidbaracken	Typ 260/9
BW 4g	4 " " "	" 501/34
BW 5e	4 Entwesungsbaracken	" VII/9
✓ BW 7c ✓	11 Pflegerbaracken (Schweiserbar.)	
✓ BW 12b	12 Baracken f. Schwerkranke	501/34
✓ BW 12d ✓	2 Blockführerbaracken	Typ IV/3
	Ausbau eines vorhandenen Hauses für Sondermassnahmen	
✓ BW 32a ✓	3 Baracken f. Sondermassnahmen	Typ 260/9

DOCUMENT 11: "Erläuterungsbericht zum Ausbau des Kriegsgefangenenlagers der Waffen-SS in Auschwitz O/S"; Explanatory report on the construction project Concentration Camp Auschwitz O/S of 30 September 1943. RGVA, 502-2-60, p. 81, section enlargement.



DOCUMENT 12: “K.L. Auschwitz – Bauabschnitt III Häftlingslazarett u. Quarantäne-Abt.”; CC Auschwitz – Construction Sector III inmate infirmary a. quarantine section.” RGVA, 502-2-110, p. 36. Section enlargement.




DOCUMENT 13: as DOCUMENT 6. Detail enlargement.




DOCUMENT 14: Map of the area of Auschwitz-Birkenau without caption. 1941. RGVA 502-2-93, p. 15a.



DOCUMENT 15: “Bebauungsplan für den Auf- u. Ausbau des Konzentrationslagers u. Kriegsgefangenenlagers, Plan Nr. 2215” (see my DOCUMENT 7) as reproduced in Bartosik/Martyniak/Setkiewicz 2014, Doc. 15 on p. 83.



DOCUMENT 16: as DOCUMENT 7, with area of the alleged “Bunker 1.”



DOCUMENT 16A: as DOCUMENT 7; detail enlargement of the area of the alleged “Bunker 1”

Häftl. <u>MALEREI</u>		370
<u>Arbeitsleistung</u>		777
in der Zeit vom 26. III. - 25. IV. 1942.		
10 St. Malerleiter Holzgrund gestr. 2 gr. Rahmen mit je 2 Flügel mit Holzgrund gründiert. 6 Kalkkisten mit Malerfarbe gestr. 6 Betten mit Malerfarbe gestr.		
Stahlgelände:	Kümmern sämtl. Räume f. d. Unter- kassverwaltung.	
Z.ilarbeiter	Wand u. Deckenflächen der a/s. Büro	
unterkass Büro:	Räume m. Ölfarbe gestr. sowie Türen.	
Fahrbereitschaft:		
Zentral-Bauhof:	11 Rollwagen auf Motorrollern gestr. u. Beschriftet.	
Haus V: 151 }	Maler arbeiten im gange	
- " - - 136 }		
- " - - 1	Küche mit Leinwand gestr. Sockel m. Ölfarbe angebohrt. Treppenhaus m. Leinwand - " - u. Waschküche m. Kalk gestr.	
Haus V: 25.	Maler arbeiten im gange	
Haus V: 130 }	Sämtliche Malerarbeiten m. ausbesser- ungen fertig gestellt.	
- " - - 132 }		

DOCUMENT 17: “Arbeitsleistung in der Zeit vom 26.III.- bis 25.IV.1942”;
 “Work done in the period 26 March to 25 April 1942” of the inmate painter
 detail (Häftlings-Malerei). RGVA, 502-1-24, pp. 370f.

Auschwitz, den 9/10. 42.
Führer v. Dienst: 44. Oberscharf. Wagner

Parole: „Siemens“

Vorkommnisse:

12¹⁵ wurde gemeldet das beim Sonderkommando I
 6 Häftlinge geflüchtet sind. Die Bereitschaft mit
 35. 44 Männern u 16 44. Männern den 7. Komp. wurden zur
 Suchaktion eingesetzt.

Um 16⁴⁵ wurden v. den 5. Komp. 1 Untf. 10 44. Männer
 zum Abholen von 70 Häftlingen v. Bahnhof Auschwitz
 eingesetzt.

Die Suchaktion war ohne Erfolg, die Bereitschaft rückte
 um 17⁰⁰ ein.

20¹⁰ wurde v. Harmenze angerufen, das dort 2 Häftlinge
 aufgegriffen worden sind. Die selben wurden mit Auto
 u 2 Posten den Hauptwache abgeholt. Es waren die beiden
 Juden häftlinge N° 36816 + 38513 welche am 7. 12. 42 früh
 am Sonderkom. II geflüchtet sind.

Um 5⁰⁰ wurde die Bereitschaft zum Abholen eines Transp.
 eingesetzt. 5¹⁵ wurden 1 Untf. 23 Män. d. 6. Komp. zur Abholung
 1 Reg. umhang übergeben fr. Bahnhof Auschwitz

Dienst richtig

übergeben:

Wagner

44. Oberscharf.

(158)

übernommen:

Wagner

www.auschwitz.org.pl

499
 873

Bauausgabebuch

der Bauleitung: _____

Bauvorhaben: _____

Bauwerk (BW): 54 = 3 Baracken für Sondermaßnahmen

in _____

Haushalt: Waffen - 94 194

Kapitel 21/2 & Titel (Bau) 65

Dieses Buch enthält _____, wörflich: _____ Seiten.

_____, den _____ 194_____

Dieses Buch ist geführt von:

	vom	bis
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

H.-Humboldt - Bau - 23 „Bausungabebuch“, Tischlager.
 16-Vertriebsring W. F. Meyer, Münster (Kaiser, Geklebst) 15000

DOCUMENT 20: “*Bauausgabebuch*”; construction expense ledger of structure BW 54. RGVA, 502-1-111, pp. 573-573a.

Bauinspektion der Waffen-SS
und Polizei "Schlesien"

Kattowitz O/S, den 11. Juli 1944.
13.7.44, 52997/44.

Az:BI-Sch/au/KGL/74/9540/44/III.

Betr: Bauantrag zur Errichtung von 3 Baracken für Sondermaßnahmen
im K.L. II Auschwitz -

Bezg: Rahmenbaubefehl Nr. 1239 v. 13.1.44 - Az: C V/1-So-2/2b/Ma/
Fz - u. dort. Schreiben v. 19.6.44 - Az: Sttg. Nr. 51851/44/Tel/L.

Anlg: 1 geprüfter Bauantrag 2-fach.

An die

Zentralbauleitung der
Waffen-SS und Polizei

A u s c h w i t z

Baubefehl Nr. 61.

Auf Grund der eingereichten Unterlagen erteile ich hiermit den
Baubefehl zur Errichtung von 3 Baracken für Sondermaßnahmen im KL.
Lager II Auschwitz.

Ich bemerke hierzu folgendes:

- 1.) Der Antrag auf Ausnahme vom Bauverbot ist noch vorzulegen.
- 2.) Die eingereichten Unterlagen wurden bautechnisch und bauwirtschaftlich geprüft. Die Prüfungsvermerke sind zu beachten.
- 3.) Die benötigten Baumittel in Höhe von
RM. 51.000.-
(i.W.: Reichsmark Einundfünfzigtausend)
werden bei Kapitel 21/7b (Bau) 65/61 bereitgestellt. Das Bauwerk
ist mit Rahmenbaubefehl Nr. 1239 v. 13.1.44 - Az: C V/1-So-
2/2b/Ma/Fz.- des SS-Wirtschafts-Verwaltungshauptamtes bereits
genehmigt.
Die auszahlungsanweisende Baudienststelle, die Zentralbauleitung
der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz muss über den obigen Betrag
eine Haushaltsüberwachungsliste führen. Der Leiter der Zentral-
bauleitung haftet für Auszahlungen oder Zahlungsverpflichtungen,
die über den zugewiesenen Betrag hinausgehen. Vor Verwendung der
restlichen lo v. H. der zugewiesenen Mittel ist dem Amt C V zu
melden, dass diese zur Deckung aller anfallenden Ausgaben aus-
reichen; andernfalls ist ein begründeter Nachantrag zu stellen.
- 4.) Die Zuweisung der erforderlichen Kontingente erfolgt im Rahmen
der Zuweisung durch den G.B.-Bau.
- 5.) Die Übergabe des Baues an die hausverwaltende Dienststelle ist
mir gemäß Verfügung des SS-Wirtschafts-Verwaltungshauptamtes
Amt C VI, v. 13.1.44 - Az: C VI/3-Allg./61/e (neu) Ta/Ka/Tgb.Nr.
208 - zu melden.

Der Leiter der Bauinspektion
der Waffen-SS und Polizei "Schlesien"


gez: Bischoff

SS-Sturmabführer.

F.d.R.d.A.

Müller 26.

DOCUMENT 21: "Baubefehl Nr. 61"; Construction Order No. 61 of 11 July 1944. RGVA, 502-1-281, p. 54.



DOCUMENT 22: “*Bauantrag zum Ausbau d. Kriegsgefangenenlagers d. Waffen-SS in Auschwitz O/S. Errichtung von 3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen*”; construction request for the expansion of the PoW camp of the *Waffen-SS* at Auschwitz Upper Silesia. Installation of 3 barracks for special measures; dated 26 May 1944. RGVA, 502-2-125, pp. 227-229.

Verwaltungsbericht

zum Ausbau d. Kriegsgefangenenlagers d. Raffen- in Auschwitz n/s.

Errichtung von 3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen.

Hausliche Veranlassung : Das Kriegsgefangenenlager wird auf Befehl des Reichsführer- und Chef der Deutschen Polizei ausgebaut.
Siehe nachgeheftete Abschrift d. Rahmenbaubefehls.

Beschaffung u. Beschaffenheit d. Baustelle : Das zur Errichtung des Kriegsgefangenenlagers bestimmte Gelände liegt westlich der Eisenbahnlinie Wien-Krakau, südlich des Bahnhofs Auschwitz und ist am 4. Mai 1941 von der Heeresstandortverwaltung Kattowitz der Kommandantur des K.L.II kostenlos zur Verfügung gestellt worden.

Baugrund : Die Bodenbeschaffenheit ist schlecht. Unter einer 25 cm starken Humusschicht tritt lehmig-sandiges weiches Kies und Sandlinsen von geringer Mächtigkeit eingebettet sind.
Der Grundwasserstand schwankt zwischen 0,30 und 1,20 m. Das Gelände ist zum Teil versumpft.

Entwurfsanordnung : Auf dem vorhandenen Gelände sind zu errichten:

I. Bauten

3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen Typ 250/9 3.5

Baracken in verlegbarer Bauweise errichtet.
Genau Einzelheiten gehen aus den beiliegenden Zeichnungen hervor.

Lageplan : Die Anordnung der Gebäude auf dem zur Verfügung stehenden Gelände geht aus dem beigelegten Lageplan hervor.

Baukosten : Diese gehen aus dem beiliegenden Kostenanschlag hervor.

Bauzeit : Mit den Arbeiten wurde im März 1942 begonnen.
Die Bauten sind fertiggestellt und der Standortverwaltung zur Benutzung übergeben.

Aufgestellt:

Auschwitz, den 26.5.1944

Teil. / n.



Der Leiter der Zentralbauleitung
der Raffen- und Polizei, Auschwitz.

[Handwritten signature]
Obersturmführer (?)

<u>Kostenvoranschlag</u>		
zum Ausbau d. Kriegsgefangenenlagers d. Waffen- in Auschwitz O/S		
Errichtung von 3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen		
<u>A. Erwerb d. Grundstückes:</u>		
Das Kriegsgefangenenlager wird auf reichseigenem Gelände errichtet.	RM	- . -
<u>A. Erwerb d. Grundstückes:</u>	RM	- . -
<u>B. Erschliessung d. Baugrundstückes:</u>		
Für Planierungsarbeiten von etwa 1200 qm Bodenfläche, Entfernung v. Wildwuchs usw. einschl. Vermessung für 1 qm RM 1,20 - z.B.N.	RM	1.440,-
<u>B. Erschliessung d. Baugrundstückes:</u>	RM	1.440,-
<u>C. Bauten u. Aussenanlagen:</u>		
<u>I. Bauten</u>		
3 Baracken für Sondermassnahmen Typ 250/9 Z.5		
Grundfläche: 40.76 x 9.56 •	389.66 qm	
Barackenhöhe: 2.65 m		
Unbauter Raum: 389.66 x 2.65 =	1032.60 cbm	
Kosten für 1 cbm: RM 18,-		
1032.60 x 18,- = RM 18.586,-		
für 3 Baracken = RM 18.586,- x 3 =	RM 55.758,-	
<u>II. Aussenanlagen:</u>		
wird ein besonderer Bauantrag gestellt:	RM	- . -
<u>Zusammenstellung</u>		
I. Bauten	RM 55.758,-	46467,-
II. Aussenanlagen	RM	- . -
insgesamt	RM 55.758,-	46467,-
C. Bauten u. Aussenanlagen:	RM 55.758,-	46467,-

23

D. Hauptinsgemein:

5 v.H. aus den Kosten

von Abschnitt B = RM 1.440,--

von Abschnitt C = RM 55.750,-- 46462,--

5 v.H. von

47407,--
RM 57.190,-- =

2395,--

RM 2.900,--

D. Hauptinsgemein U. zur Abrundung:

RM 3.802,--

3093,--

Hauptszusammenstellung

A. Erwerb d. Grundstückes

RM - . . .

B. Beschliessung d. Baugrundstückes

RM 1.440,--

C. Bauten u. Aussenanlagen

RM 55.750,-- 46462,--

D. Hauptinsgemein

RM 3.802,-- 3093,--

Gesamtsumme

RM 61.000,-- 51000,--

Aufgestellt:

Auschwitz, den 26.5.1944

Teil./En.

Der Leiter der Zentralbauleitung
der Waffen- und Polizei, Auschwitz



[Signature]
H-Obersturmführer (F) *[Signature]*

Abschrift.

Bauinspektion
der Waffen-SS und Polizei
"Schlesien"

Mattozitz O/S, den 26.7.1944.
Eing: 26.7.44.

Befehlsg. 53476/44

Az:BI-Sch/Au/KOL/74/9999

Betr: Bauantrag zur Errichtung von 3 Pferdestallbaracken
für Sondermaßnahmen.

Bezg: Dort. Schreiben vom 15.6.44, Az:Stfgb.Nr. 51848/44/Ts1/R.
Anlg: 1 geprüfter Bauantrag 2-fach

An die

Zentralbauleitung der
Waffen-SS und Polizei

A u s c h w i t z

Baubefehl Nr. 63.

Auf Grund der eingereichten Unterlagen erteile ich hiermit den
Baubefehl zur Errichtung von 3 Pferdestallbaracken für Sonder-
maßnahmen im KL Lager II Auschwitz.

Ich bemerke hierzu folgendes:

- 1.) Für das Bauvorhaben ist noch der Antrag auf Ausnahme vom
Bauverbot vorzulegen.
- 2.) Die eingereichten Unterlagen wurden bautechnisch und bau-
wirtschaftlich geprüft. Die Prüfungsvermerke sind zu be-
achten.
- 3.) Die benötigten Baumittel in Höhe von

RM 41 000.-

(1.W.: Reichsmark Einundvierzigtausend)

werden bei Kapitel 21/7b (Bau) 65/63 bereitgestellt.

Die auszahlungsweisende Baudienststelle, die Zentralbau-
leitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz muss über den
obigen Betrag eine Haushaltsüberwachungsliste führen. Der
Leiter der Zentralbauleitung haftet für Auszahlungen oder
Zahlungsverpflichtungen, die über den zugewiesenen Betrag
hinausgehen. Vor Verwendung der restlichen 10 v.H. der zu-
gewiesenen Mittel ist dem Amt C V zu melden, dass diese zur
Deckung aller anfallenden Ausgaben ausreichen; andernfalls
ist ein begründeter Nachantrag zu stellen.

- 4.) Die Zuweisung der erforderlichen Kontingente erfolgt im
Rahmen der Zuweisung durch den G.B.Bau
- 5.) Die Übergabe des Baues an die hausverwaltende Dienststelle
ist mir gemäß Verfügung des SS-Wirtschafts-Verwaltungshaupt-
amtes, Amt C VI, v.18.1.44 - Az: C VI/3 Allg.-61/e (neu) Ta/
Ka/Stg.Nr. 208 - zu melden.

Der Leiter der Bauinspektion
der Waffen-SS und Polizei "Schlesien"

gez: Bischoff
SS-Sturmabführer.

F. P. A. A.
M. Hinger
Z. A. A.



DOCUMENT 24: “Bauvorhaben Kriegsgefangenenlager Auschwitz (Durchführung der Sonderbehandlung”); Construction project Prisoner-of-War Camp – implementation of special treatment. VHA, Fond OT 31(2)/8, p. 9.

- 5 -

Übertrag: 14.674,00 m³ RM 7.485.300,00Schornsteine:

je Krematorium 2 Schornsteine:

I u. II: 3,70 x 2,30 x 16,00

a 4 = 544,00 "

III u. IV: 1,50 x 1,50 x

17,50 x 4 = 158,00 "

13 b) 4 Leichenhallen:

28,80 x 13,60 x 3,15 x 4 =

4.935,00 "

20.311,00 m³Kosten für 1 m²: RM 50,00

20.311,00 x 50,00 = 1.015.550,-

10 Stck. Dreimuffel-

öfen Kosten für

1 Stück: RM 20.000,-

20.000,- x 10 = 200.000,-

2 Stück Achtmuffelöfen

Kosten für 1 Stück:

RM 30.000,- 60.000,-

4 Stück Be- und Ent-

lüftungsanlagen

Kosten für 1 Stück:

RM 15.000,-

15.000,- x 4 = 60.000,-

Zuschlag für Schornstein-

fundamente, Fuchsmauer-

werk, sowie für das nicht

feuerfeste Material der

Öfen 64.450,- " 1.400.000,-

16 a) Entwesungsanlage

1. für Sonderbehandlung

Grundfläche: 50,00 x 20,00 = 1000,- m²

Gebäudehöhe: 6,20

Umbaute Raum:

1000,00 x 6,20 = 6.200,- m³

Kellerteil:

35,00 x 20,00 x 3,20 = 2.240,- m³zusammen 8.440,- m³Kosten für 1 m³ RM 28,00

8440,00 x 28,00 = 236.320,00

Zuschlag für Heiz-,

Brause- u. Desinfek-

tionsanlage RM 73.680,00 310.000,-

16 b) 2. für die Wachtruppe

Grundfläche:

12,25 x 12,65 + 12,40 x

8,70 = 262,84 m²

Gebäudehöhe: 2,80 m

Umbaute Raum:

262,84 x 2,80 = rd. 736,- m³VOJENSKÝ HISTORICKÝ
ARCHIVkopie materiálu
žlatožÜbertrag 262,84 m² RM 9.195.300,-

16 a) Entwesungsanlage

1. für Sonderbehandlung

Grundfläche: $50,00 \times 20,00 = 1000,- \text{ m}^2$

Gebäudehöhe: 6,20

Umgebauter Raum:

 $1000,00 \times 6,20 = 6.200,- \text{ m}^3$

Kellerteil:

 $35,00 \times 20,00 \times 3,20 = 2.240,- \text{ m}^3$ zusammen $8.440,- \text{ m}^3$ Kosten für 1 m^3 RM 28,00 $8440,00 \times 28,00 = 236.320,00$

Zuschlag für Heiz-,

Brause- u. Desinfek-

tionsanlage


RM 73.680,00

310.000,-


DOCUMENT 24: continued.

Blatt 7				
Bauvorhaben (Bauwerke)	Gesamt- kosten	Bewil- ligte Mittel	Gesamtaufwand für den G. B. Bau ohne Absag. der Mfktl. Arb.	Beiz bei Absag. der Mfktl. Arb. u. Kosten d. Baracken
<u>G. B.-Bau Nr. VIII Up a 2</u>				
10. 182 Unterkunfts-, Eff. und Vorratsbar. 3.823.600			3.823.600	1.200.000
11. 27 Wasch-u. Abort- baracken 675.000			675.000	250.000
12. 10 Wirtschaftsbar. je 3 Stck. IV/3 365.000			365.000	120.000
13. 12 Revierbaracken 130.000			130.000	30.000
14. 10 Blockführerbar. 109.000			109.000	20.000
15. 3 Waschbaracken (dopp- elt, aus 6 Stck.) 73.200			73.200	30.000
16. 6 Abortbaracken 52.200			52.200	20.000
17. 3 Wirtschaftsbaracken (je 2 Stck. VII/5 aus 6 Stück) 105.600			105.600	30.000
18. 11 Kommar-, Revierbar. (schw. Baracken) 33.000			33.000	20.000
19. 16 Mannschaftsbar. (Bar. vorh., nur Fol- geanlg.) 360.000			160.000	100.000
20. 2 Kommandanturbar. (passiv) 166.300			166.300	100.000
21. Lagerhaus 257.000			257.000	155.000
22. Molkerei 550.000			550.000	350.000
23. Drahtbahn u. Wachtürme 270.000			270.000	135.000
24. Wasserversorgung 800.000			800.000	550.000
25. Entwässerung 1.000.000			1000.000	500.000
26. Gleisanschluss 540.000			540.000	250.000
27. Elektr. Lichtanlage 310.000			310.000	210.000
28. Alarm-u. Telef. anlg. 60.000			60.000	50.000
29. Kochkessel u. Heizöfen 950.000			950.000	940.000
30. 4 Krematorien und 4 Leichenhallen 1.400.000			1.400.000	1.000.000
31. Entwässerungsanlage a) f. Sonderbehandlung b) f. für Truppe (Sauna und Desinfektion) 320.000			310.000	210.000
32. 2 Notstromaggregate 220.000			220.000	200.000
33. 2 Transform. stationen 160.000			160.000	145.000
12.550.700			12.550.700	6.642.000

DOCUMENT 25: "Bauten der Zentralbauleitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz im 3. Kriegswirtschaftsjahr"; Structures of the Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz in the 3rd budget year of war. 15 November 1942. RGVA, 502-1-85, p. 119.



DOCUMENT 26: “Überblick der Geländeaufnahmen im Interessengebiet des K.L. Auschwitz”; Overview of surveying the area of interest of CC Auschwitz.” 2 June 1943. RGVA, 502-1-88, p. 8.



DOCUMENT 27: Superimposition of a map of the Birkenau Camp with the map of 2 June 1943 (my DOCUMENT 26). The areas of “Bunker 1” and “Bunker 2” are marked with an encircled B1 and B2, respectively.

April 1942				
23.4.42	11	310	BW 4. Zement Br.	Zement kg 300 ✓
"	14	"	"	Sackkette " 400 ✓
Juli 1942				
15.7.42	11	614	BW 4.	Zement eingef. kg 1000 ✓
Oktober 1942				

DOCUMENT 28: “Ausgabezusammenstellung”; compilation of expenses for materials at the Birkenau Camp, April, July, October 1942, reproduced in Bartosik/Martyniak/Setkiewicz 2014, Doc. 52 on p. 201. 300 kg cement and 400 kg bagged lime for BW 4 on 23 April 1942, and another 1,000 kg of cement for BW 4 on 15 July 1942.

Index of Names

Individuals only. Page numbers of entries in footnotes are set as italics.

— A —

Alstine, Mark van: 121
August, Jochen: 156
Aumeier, Hans: 162-164

— B —

Balbin, Andre: 58
Bara, Karl: 164
Baretzki, Stefan: 188
Bartosik, Igor: 17, 38, 41, 223, 243
Bartsch, Helmut: 189
Bezwińska, Jadwiga: 31, 59, 62, 161
Bialas, inmate: 50
Bilan, Wladimir: 100
Bischoff, Karl: 53, 54, 72, 77, 78, 80, 82, 90-92, 94, 95, 98-100, 104, 106, 109-114, 118, 119, 123, 125, 126, 132, 133, 135-137, 139, 141-147, 149, 153, 165, 174, 182, 183, 197, 198
Blobel, Paul: 63, 64, 71, 134, 135, 137, 178, 181, 186
Borenstein, Bar: 101
Borenstein, Nojeh: 101
Bracht, Karl: 190
Brandhuber, Jerzy: 159
Braun, Gustav: 165
Broad, Pery: 31, 161
Broszat, Martin: 168, 175
Browning, Christopher: 161-163
Brzybylski, Alfred: 73
Buch, Hermann: 59, 60
Buki, Milton: 103, 152, 187, 188
Bürger, Willi: 99

— C —

Capesius, Victor: 188
Căsar, Joachim: 77, 111
Chasan, Shaul: 88, 121
Cole, David: 15, 16
Culer, Samul: 101, 102

Czech, Danuta: 13, 31, 56, 57, 58, 61-64, 71, 90, 101-103, 110, 120, 123, 136, 137, 138, 147, 156, 159, 161, 166-170, 173, 175, 177, 179-181, 184, 186, 187, 195, 196

— D —

Dawidowski, Roman: 30
Deana, Franco: 45, 46, 52, 65, 134
Dejaco, Walter: 63, 134, 135, 185
Długoborski, Wacław: 7
Dragon, Szlama: 74, 79, 86, 87, 103, 113, 128, 131, 151, 171, 174, 179, 180, 186, 187, 191
Dudziński, inmate: 50
Dyntar, Józef: 50

— E —

Eichmann, Adolf: 137, 168, 176, 181
Eicke, Theodor: 46
Eisenschmidt, Eliezer: 88, 131
Ertl, Fritz: 65, 70, 183, 184

— F —

Faurisson, Robert: 13, 15, 37
Feinsilber, Alter: see Jankowski, Stanisław
Felderer, Ditlieb: 15
Fischer, SS-*Schütze*: 150
Franke-Gricksch, Alfred: 114, 155
Frei, Norbert: 59, 71, 115, 151
Friedler, Eric: 61, 62, 151, 180
Fritzsche, Karl: 47, 48

— G —

Gabai, Jaacov: 88

Gadomski, Stanisław: 160, 161
Garbarz, Moshe: 181
Gaßner, Ludwig: 164
Gerhardt, lawyer: 189
Globocnik, Odilo: 155
Glücks, Richard: 45, 135, 150, 159
Golik, Ignacy: 166
Goß, SS-*Rottenführer*: 191
Gotland, Simon: 188
Grabner, Maximilian: 47, 48, 50, 51, 159, 160, 162
Graf, Jürgen: 24, 26, 71, 95, 170
Greif, Gideon: 88
Grotum, Thomas: 184

— H —

Hałgas, Kazimierz: 160, 161
Harmata, Józef: 77, 167
Heger, Leopold: 189, 190
Himmler, Heinrich: 64, 65, 69, 95, 124, 137, 147, 159, 164, 168, 177, 178, 181, 182, 184, 200
Hitler, Adolf: 124, 200
Höcker, Georg: 99, 100, 133
Hofmann, Franz: 188, 189
Höss, Rudolf: 18, 26, 27, 30, 31, 47, 63, 64, 69-71, 87, 91, 92, 94, 103, 106, 111, 133-135, 138, 148, 150, 152, 160, 166-168, 175-178, 181, 182, 185, 186, 189, 196, 200
Hössler, Franz: 63, 69, 135, 162, 185
Hunt, Eric: 8
Hykes, Karl: 189

— I —

Irving, David: 164

— J —

Jährling, Rudolf: 198

Janisch, Josef: 107, 109, 130
 Jankowski, Stanisław: 31, 59,
 62, 87
 Josten, Heinrich: 53, 55
 Jothann, Werner: 54, 55, 76,
 91, 116-118, 122

— K —

Kaduk, Oswald: 187, 188
 Kammler, Hans: 81, 82, 100,
 109-111, 113, 114, 117,
 119, 123-125, 142, 143-
 145, 148, 149, 153, 182
 Kelm, SS-Unterscharführer:
 59, 60
 Kempner, Robert: 176
 Kilian, Andreas: 151
 Kirschnek, Hans: 78, 109-
 111, 124, 143
 Klapper, clerk: 68
 Kłodziński, Stanisław: 120
 Knapp, Ladislav: 101, 102
 Korherr, Richard: 167
 Kramer, Josef: 110
 Kranz, Tomasz: 24, 26
 Kratz, Männe: 129, 191, 192
 Kues, Thomas: 71, 95, 170
 Kühnemann, Heinz: 99, 100,
 133
 Kula, Michał: 160

— L —

Lamock, Henri Joseph: 127
 Lasik, Aleksander: 59
 Lenz, Otto: 164
 Lenzer, Wilhelm: 183
 Levin, military judge: 180
 Liebehenschel, Arthur: 53,
 133
 Lipstadt, Deborah: 163
 Longerich, Peter: 168
 Lubitz, Heinz: 52

— M —

Maier, SS-Oberscharführer:
 47
 Maliszewski, Stefan: 50, 160
 Mandelbaum, Henryk: 88
 Marczevska, Krystyna: 61,
 70, 156, 157, 161
 Martyniak, Łukasz: 41, 223,
 243
 Mattogno, Carlo: 8, 9, 13, 16,
 20, 22, 24-26, 45, 46, 49,

52, 60, 63, 64, 65, 70, 71,
 74, 75, 76, 77, 81, 83, 84,
 89, 91, 95, 97, 99, 114,
 119-122, 131, 134, 139,
 142, 143, 151, 157, 158,
 159, 164, 170, 177, 184,
 194

McCalden, David: 28
 Messing, Heinrich: 107, 110
 Meyer, Fritjof: 80
 Mieczysław, Stecisko: 160
 Milch, Erhard: 124
 Mildner, Rudolf: 159, 160
 Möckel, Karl E.: 111, 112
 Morgiel, inmate: 50
 Morris, Errol: 27, 28
 Mrugowski, Joachim: 198
 Mulka, Robert: 189
 Müller, Filip: 73, 121
 Müller, Heinrich: 147

— N —

Nosal, Eugeniusz: 131
 Nowak, Hans Jürgen: 35
 Nyiszli, Miklos: 121

— P —

Paisikovic, Dov: 121
 Parcer, Jan: 184
 Paskuly, Steven: 167, 168,
 177, 181, 196
 Pelt, Robert Jan van: 27, 28,
 41, 71, 163, 166
 Perz, Bertrand: 72, 99
 Petzold, Walter: 164
 Pezola, Wachtmeister: 103,
 104
 Phillips, Raymond: 111
 Pietrzykowski, Tadeusz: 166
 Piper, Franciszek: 15, 16, 41,
 56, 59, 60, 64, 79, 90, 100,
 121, 137, 151, 181, 193,
 194
 Plagge, Ludwig: 62, 179
 Pohl, Oswald: 53, 72, 95, 122,
 154
 Pollock, Josef: 138, 143, 174
 Pressac, Jean-Claude: 16, 17,
 41, 42, 51, 57, 66, 78, 88,
 105-108, 120, 121, 126,
 136, 137, 140, 144, 150,
 153, 182, 184, 196
 Prüfer, Kurt: 65, 69-71, 110,
 135, 164-166, 178, 183

— R —

Rademacher, Franz: 176
 Rademacher, Werner: 35
 Rögner, Adolf: 100
 Rosin, Arnošt: 58, 62, 63,
 178, 179, 186
 Rudolf, Germar: 8, 10, 20, 35

— S —

Sackar, Josef: 88
 Sander, Fritz: 165
 Sandkühler, Thomas: 72, 99
 Scheide, Rudolf: 146
 Schellekes, Maurice: 180
 Schüle, Annegret: 165
 Schultze, Karl: 165
 Schulz, Heinz: 59
 Schumann, Horst: 156
 Schwarz, Heinrich: 162
 Schwarz, SS-
 Hauptsturmführer: 146
 Sehn, Jan: 31, 74, 107, 128,
 129, 130, 137, 138, 174,
 186, 187, 191
 Seidler, Fritz August: 45
 Setkiewicz, Piotr: 17, 41, 57,
 58, 64, 69-71, 110, 128,
 180, 194, 223, 243
 Siebert, Barbara: 151
 Stark, Hans: 32, 161, 162
 Strzelecki, Andrzej: 100
 Swischczowski, Stefan: 51
 Szablewski, Stanisław: 160
 Sztternfinkiel, Natan Elias: 175

— T —

Tauber, Henryk: 59, 87, 105,
 107, 111
 Timföld, Alfred: 102
 Tintner, Eduard: 102

— U —

Urbanczyk, Walter: 166

— V —

Venezia, Shlomo: 121

— W —

Wagner, SS-Oberscharführer:
 227
 Wallwey, Willy: 35
 Ważniewski, Władysław: 61,
 70, 156, 157, 161

Wirths, Eduard: 105, 111,
122, 135, 149, 198
Wisnińska, Józefa: 77

Wohlfahrt, Wilhelm: 152
Wolken, Otto: 102

— **Z** —

Zalewski, Józef Piotr: 50
Żłobnicki, Adam: 17, 18


HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS

This ambitious, growing series addresses various aspects of the “Holocaust” of the WWII era. Most of them are based on decades of research from archives all over the world. They are heavily referenced. In contrast to most other works on this issue, the tomes of this series approach its topic with profound academic scrutiny and a critical attitude. Any Holocaust researcher ignoring this series will remain oblivious to some of the most important research in the field. These books are designed to both convince the common reader as well as academics. The following books have appeared so far, or are about to be released.

SECTION ONE:

General Overviews of the Holocaust


The First Holocaust. The Surprising Origin of the Six-Million Figure. By Don Heddesheimer. This compact but substantive study documents



propaganda spread prior to, during and after the FIRST World War that claimed East European Jewry was on the brink of annihilation. The magic number of suffering and dying Jews was 6 million back then as well. The book details how these Jewish fundraising operations in America raised vast sums in the name of feeding suffering Polish and Russian Jews but actually fun-

neled much of the money to Zionist and Communist groups. 5th ed., 200 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#6)

Lectures on the Holocaust. Controversial Issues Cross Examined. By Germar Rudolf. This book first explains why “the Holocaust” is an important topic, and that it is essential to keep an open mind about it. It then tells how



many mainstream scholars expressed doubts and subsequently fell from grace. Next, the physical traces and documents about the various claimed crime scenes and murder weapons are discussed. After that, the reliability of witness testimony is examined. Finally, the author argues for a free

exchange of ideas on this topic. This book gives the most-comprehensive and up-to-date overview of the critical research into the Holocaust. With its dialogue style, it is easy to read, and it can even be used as an encyclopedic compendium. 4th ed., 597 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#15)


Breaking the Spell. The Holocaust, Myth & Reality. By Nicholas Kollerstrom. In 1941, British Intelligence analysts cracked the German “Enigma” code. Hence, in 1942 and 1943, encrypted radio communications between German concentration camps and the Berlin headquarters were decrypted. The intercepted data



Pictured above are the first 50 volumes of scientific studies that comprise the series *Holocaust Handbooks*. More volumes and new editions are constantly in the works. Check www.HolocaustHandbooks.com for updates.


refutes the orthodox “Holocaust” narrative. It reveals that the Germans were desperate to reduce the death rate in their labor camps, which was caused by catastrophic typhus epidemics.







Dr. Kollerstrom, a science historian, has taken these intercepts and a wide array of mostly unchallenged corroborating evidence to show that “witness statements” supporting the human gas chamber narrative clearly clash with the available scientific data. Kollerstrom concludes that the history of the Nazi “Holocaust” has been written by the victors with ulterior motives. It is distorted, exaggerated and largely wrong. With a foreword by Prof. Dr. James Fetzner. 6th ed., 285 pages, b&w ill., bibl., index. (#31)



Debating the Holocaust. A New Look at Both Sides. By Thomas Dalton. Mainstream historians insist that there cannot be, any debate about the Holocaust. But ignoring it

does not make this controversy go away. Traditional scholars admit that there was neither a budget, a plan, nor an order for the Holocaust; that the key camps have all but vanished, and so have any human remains; that material and unequivocal documentary evidence is absent; and that there are serious problems with survivor testimonies. Dalton juxtaposes the traditional Holocaust narrative with revisionist challenges and then analyzes the mainstream’s responses to them. He reveals the weaknesses of both sides, while declaring revisionism the winner of the current state of the debate.





4th ed., 342 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#32)

The Hoax of the Twentieth Century. The Case against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry. By Arthur R. Butz. The first writer to analyze the entire Holocaust complex in a precise scientific manner. This book exhibits the overwhelming force of arguments accumulated by the mid-1970s. Butz's two main arguments are: 1. All major entities hostile to Germany must have known what was happening to the Jews under German authority. They acted during the war as if no mass slaughter was occurring. 2. All the evidence adduced to prove any mass slaughter has a dual interpretation, while only the innocuous one can be proven to be correct. This book continues to be a major historical reference work, frequently cited by prominent personalities. This edition has numerous supplements with new information gathered over the last 35 years. 4th ed., 524 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#7)

Dissecting the Holocaust. The Growing Critique of 'Truth' and 'Memory.' Edited by Germar Rudolf. *Dissecting the Holocaust* applies state-of-the-art scientific techniques and classic methods of detection to investigate the alleged murder of millions of Jews by Germans during World War II. In 22 contributions—each of some 30 pages—the 17 authors dissect generally accepted paradigms of the “Holocaust.” It reads as excitingly as a crime novel: so many lies, forgeries and deceptions by politicians, historians and scientists are proven. This is the intellectual adventure of the 21st Century. Be part of it! 3rd ed., 635 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#1)

The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry. By Walter N. Sanning. Six Million Jews died in the Holocaust. Sanning did not take that number at face value, but thoroughly explored European population developments and shifts mainly caused by emigration as well as deportations and evacuations conducted by both Nazis and the Soviets, among other things. The book is based mainly on Jewish, Zionist and mainstream sources. It concludes that a sizeable share of the Jews found missing during local censuses after the Second World War, which were so far counted as “Holocaust victims,” had either emigrated (mainly to Israel or the U.S.) or had been deported by Stalin to Siberian labor camps. 3rd ed., foreword by A.R. Butz, epilogue by Germar Rudolf, and an update by the author containing new insights; 264

pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography (#29).

Air-Photo Evidence: World-War-Two Photos of Alleged Mass-Murder Sites Analyzed. By Germar Rudolf (editor). During World War Two both German and Allied reconnaissance aircraft took countless air photos of places of tactical and strategic interest in Europe. These photos are prime evidence for the investigation of the Holocaust. Air photos of locations like Auschwitz, Majdanek, Treblinka, Babi Yar etc. permit an insight into what did or did not happen there. The author has unearthed many pertinent photos and has thoroughly analyzed them. This book is full of air-photo reproductions and schematic drawings explaining them. According to the author, these images refute many of the atrocity claims made by witnesses in connection with events in the German sphere of influence. 6th edition; with a contribution by Carlo Mattogno. 167 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index (#27).

The Leuchter Reports: Critical Edition. By Fred Leuchter, Robert Faurisson and Germar Rudolf. Between 1988 and 1991, U.S. expert on execution technologies Fred Leuchter wrote four reports on whether the Third Reich operated homicidal gas chambers. The first on Auschwitz and Majdanek became world-famous. Based on various arguments, Leuchter concluded that the locations investigated could never have been “utilized or seriously considered to function as execution gas chambers.” The second report deals with gas-chamber claims for the camps Dachau, Mauthausen and Hartheim, while the third reviews design criteria and operation procedures of execution gas chambers in the U.S. The fourth report reviews Pressac's 1989 tome about Auschwitz. 4th ed., 252 pages, b&w illustrations. (#16)

Bungled: “The Destruction of the European Jews”. Raul Hilberg's Failure to Prove National-Socialist “Killing Centers.” By Carlo Mattogno. Raul Hilberg's magnum opus *The Destruction of the European Jews* is an orthodox standard work on the Holocaust. But how does Hilberg support his thesis that Jews were murdered *en masse*? He rips documents out of their context, distorts their content, misinterprets their meaning, and ignores entire archives. He only refers to “useful” witnesses, quotes fragments out of context, and conceals the fact that his witnesses are lying through their teeth. Lies and deceptions permeate Hil-

berg's book, 302 pages, bibliography, index. (#3)

Jewish Emigration from the Third Reich. By Ingrid Weckert. Current historical writings about the Third Reich claim state it was difficult for Jews to flee from Nazi persecution. The truth is that Jewish emigration was welcomed by the German authorities. Emigration was not some kind of wild flight, but rather a lawfully determined and regulated matter. Weckert's booklet elucidates the emigration process in law and policy. She shows that German and Jewish authorities worked closely together. Jews interested in emigrating received detailed advice and offers of help from both sides. 2nd ed., 130 pages, index. (#12)

Inside the Gas Chambers: The Extermination of Mainstream Holocaust Historiography. By Carlo Mattogno. Neither increased media propaganda or political pressure nor judicial persecution can stifle revisionism. Hence, in early 2011, the Holocaust Orthodoxy published a 400-page book (in German) claiming to refute "revisionist propaganda," trying again to prove "once and for all" that there were homicidal gas chambers at the camps of Dachau, Natzweiler, Sachsenhausen, Mauthausen, Ravensbrück, Neuengamme, Stutthof... you name them. Mattogno shows with his detailed analysis of this work of propaganda that mainstream Holocaust hagiography is beating around the bush rather than addressing revisionist research results. He exposes their myths, distortions and lies. 2nd ed., 280 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#25)







SECTION TWO: Specific non-Auschwitz Studies







The Dachau Gas Chamber. By Carlo Mattogno. This study investigates whether the alleged homicidal gas chamber at the infamous Dachau Camp could have been operational. Could these gas chambers have fulfilled their alleged function to kill people as assumed by mainstream historians? Or does the evidence point to an entirely different purpose? This study reviews witness reports and finds that many claims are nonsense or technically impossible. As many layers of confounding misunderstandings and misrepresentations are peeled away, we discover the core of what the truth was concerning the existence of these gas chambers. 154 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#49)

Treblinka: Extermination Camp or Transit Camp? By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. It is alleged that at Treblinka in East Poland between 700,000 and 3,000,000 persons were murdered in 1942 and 1943. The weapons used were said to have been stationary and/or mobile gas chambers, fast-acting or slow-acting poison gas, unslaked lime, superheated steam, electricity, Diesel-exhaust fumes etc. Holocaust historians alleged that bodies were piled as high as multi-storied buildings and burned without a trace, using little or no fuel at all. Graf and Mattogno have now analyzed the origins, logic and technical feasibility of the official version of Treblinka. On the basis of numerous documents they reveal Treblinka's true identity as a mere transit camp. 3rd ed., 384 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#8)

Belzec: Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research and History. By Carlo Mattogno. Witnesses report that between 600,000 and 3 million Jews were murdered in the Belzec Camp, located in Poland. Various murder weapons are claimed to have been used: Diesel-exhaust gas; unslaked lime in trains; high voltage; vacuum chambers; etc. The corpses were incinerated on huge pyres without leaving a trace. For those who know the stories about Treblinka this sounds familiar. Thus, the author has restricted this study to the aspects which are new compared to Treblinka. In contrast to Treblinka, forensic drillings and excavations were performed at Belzec, the results of which are critically reviewed. 142 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#9)

Sobibor: Holocaust Propaganda and Reality. By Jürgen Graf, Thomas Kues and Carlo Mattogno. Between 25,000 and 2 million Jews are said to have been killed in gas chambers in the Sobibór camp in Poland. The corpses were allegedly buried in mass graves and later incinerated on pyres. This book investigates these claims and shows that they are based on the selective use of contradictory eyewitness testimony. Archeological surveys of the camp are analyzed that started in 2000-2001 and carried on until 2018. The book also documents the general National-Socialist policy toward Jews, which never included a genocidal "final solution." In conclusion, Sobibór emerges not as a "pure extermination camp", but as a transit camp from where Jews were deported to the occupied eastern territories. 2nd ed., 456 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#19)





The "Operation Reinhardt" Camps Treblinka, Sobibór, Belzec. By Carlo Mattogno. This study has its first focus on witness testimonies recorded during World War II and the immediate post-war era, many of them discussed here for the first time, thus demonstrating how the myth of the "extermination camps" was created. The second part of this book brings us up to speed with the various archaeological efforts made by mainstream scholars in their attempt to prove that the myth is true. The third part compares the findings of the second part with what we ought to expect, and reveals the chasm between facts and myth. 402 pages, illustrations, bibliography, index. (#28)

Chelmno: A Camp in History & Propaganda. By Carlo Mattogno. At Chelmno, huge masses of Jewish prisoners are said to have been gassed in "gas vans" or shot (claims vary from 10,000 to 1.3 million victims). This study covers the subject from every angle, undermining the orthodox claims about the camp with an overwhelmingly effective body of evidence. Eyewitness statements, gas wagons as extermination weapons, forensics reports and excavations, German documents – all come under Mattogno's scrutiny. Here are the uncensored facts about Chelmno, not the propaganda. This is a complementary volume to the book on *The Gas Vans* (#26). 2nd ed., 188 pages, indexed, illustrated, bibliography. (#23)

The Gas Vans: A Critical Investigation. By Santiago Alvarez and Pierre Marais. Did the Nazis use mobile gas chambers to exterminate 700,000 people? Are witness statements believable? Are documents genuine? Where are the murder weapons? Could they have operated as claimed? Where are the corpses? In order to get to the truth of the matter, Alvarez has scrutinized all known wartime documents and photos about this topic; he has analyzed a huge amount of witness statements as published in the literature and as presented in more than 30 trials held over the decades in Germany, Poland and Israel; and he has examined the claims made in the pertinent mainstream literature. The result of his research is mind-boggling. Note: This book and Mattogno's book on Chelmno were edited in parallel to make sure they are consistent and not repetitive. 2nd ed., 412 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#26)

The Einsatzgruppen in the Occupied Eastern Territories: Genesis, Missions and Actions. By C. Mattogno. Before invading the Soviet Union, the German authorities set up special units meant to secure the area behind the German front. Orthodox historians claim that these units called *Einsatzgruppen* primarily engaged in rounding up and mass-murdering Jews. This study sheds a critical light onto this topic by reviewing all the pertinent sources as well as material traces. It reveals on the one hand that original war-time documents do not fully support the orthodox genocidal narrative, and on the other that most post-"liberation" sources such as testimonies and forensic reports are steeped in Soviet atrocity propaganda and are thus utterly unreliable. In addition, material traces of the claimed massacres are rare due to an attitude of collusion by governments and Jewish lobby groups. 2nd ed., 2 vols., 864 pp., b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#39)

Concentration Camp Majdanek. A Historical and Technical Study. By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. At war's end, the Soviets claimed that up to two million Jews were murdered at the Majdanek Camp in seven gas chambers. Over the decades, however, the Majdanek Museum reduced the death toll three times to currently 78,000, and admitted that there were "only" two gas chambers. By exhaustively researching primary sources, the authors expertly dissect and repudiate the myth of homicidal gas chambers at that camp. They also critically investigated the legend of mass executions of Jews in tank trenches and prove it groundless. Again they have produced a standard work of methodical investigation which authentic historiography cannot ignore. 3rd ed., 358 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#5)

The Neuengamme and Sachsenhausen Gas Chambers. By Carlo Mattogno. The Neuengamme Camp near Hamburg, and the Sachsenhausen Camp north of Berlin allegedly had homicidal gas chambers for the mass gassing of inmates. The evaluation of many postwar interrogation protocols on this topic exposes inconsistencies, discrepancies and contradictions. British interrogating techniques are revealed as manipulative, threatening and mendacious. Finally, technical absurdities of gas-chambers and mass-gassing claims unmask these tales as a mere regurgitation of hearsay stories from other camps, among

them foremost Auschwitz. 178 pages, b&w ill., bibliography, index. (#50)

Concentration Camp Stutthof and Its Function in National Socialist Jewish Policy. By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. Orthodox historians claim that the Stutthof Camp near Danzig, East Prussia, served as a “makeshift” extermination camp in 1944, where inmates were killed in a gas chamber. Based mainly on archival resources, this study thoroughly debunks this view and shows that Stutthof was in fact a center for the organization of German forced labor toward the end of World War II. The claimed gas chamber was a mere delousing facility. 4th ed., 170 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#4)

SECTION THREE: Auschwitz Studies

The Making of the Auschwitz Myth: Auschwitz in British Intercepts, Polish Underground Reports and Post-war Testimonies (1941-1947). By Carlo Mattogno. Using messages sent by the Polish underground to London, SS radio messages sent to and from Auschwitz that were intercepted and decrypted by the British, and a plethora of witness statements made during the war and in the immediate postwar period, the author shows how exactly the myth of mass murder in Auschwitz gas chambers was created, and how it was turned subsequently into “history” by intellectually corrupt scholars who cherry-picked claims that fit into their agenda and ignored or actively covered up literally thousands of lies of “witnesses” to make their narrative look credible. 2nd edition, 514 pp., b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#41)






The Real Case of Auschwitz: Robert van Pelt's Evidence from the Irving Trial Critically Reviewed. By Carlo Mattogno. Prof. Robert van Pelt, a mainstream expert on Auschwitz, became famous when appearing as an expert during the London libel trial of David Irving against Deborah Lipstadt. From it resulted a book titled *The Case for Auschwitz*, in which van Pelt laid out his case for the existence of homicidal gas chambers at that camp. This book is a scholarly response to Prof. van Pelt—and Jean-Claude Pressac, upon whose books van Pelt's study is largely based. Mattogno lists all the evidence van Pelt adduces, and shows one by one that van Pelt misrepresented and misinterpreted every single one of them. This is a book of prime political and







scholarly importance to those looking for the truth about Auschwitz. 3rd ed., 692 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary, bibliography, index. (#22)

Auschwitz: Plain Facts: A Response to Jean-Claude Pressac. Edited by Germar Rudolf, with contributions by Serge Thion, Robert Faurisson and Carlo Mattogno. French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac tried to refute revisionist findings with the “technical” method. For this he was praised by the mainstream, and they proclaimed victory over the “revisionists.” In his book, Pressac's works and claims are shown to be unscientific in nature, as he never substantiates what he claims, and historically false, because he systematically misrepresents, misinterprets and misunderstands German wartime documents. 2nd ed., 226 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary bibliography, index. (#14)

Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers: An Introduction and Update. By Germar Rudolf. Pressac's 1989 oversize book of the same title was a trail blazer. Its many document reprints are valuable, but Pressac's annotations are now outdated. This book summarizes the most pertinent research results on Auschwitz gained during the past 30 years. With many references to Pressac's epic tome, it serves as an update and correction to it, whether you own an original hard copy of it, read it online, borrow it from a library, purchase a reprint, or are just interested in such a summary in general. 144 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography. (#42)

The Chemistry of Auschwitz: The Technology and Toxicology of Zyklon B and the Gas Chambers – A Crime-Scene Investigation. By Germar Rudolf. This study documents forensic research on Auschwitz, where material traces reign supreme. Most of the claimed crime scenes – the claimed homicidal gas chambers – are still accessible to forensic examination to some degree. This book addresses questions such as: How were these gas chambers configured? How did they operate? In addition, the infamous Zyklon B is examined in detail. What exactly was it? How did it kill? Did it leave traces in masonry that can be found still today? Indeed, it should have, the author concludes, but several sets of analyses show no trace of it. The author also discusses in depth similar forensic research conducted by other scholars. 4th ed., 454 pages, more than 120 color and over 100 b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#2)





Auschwitz Lies: Legends, Lies and Prejudices on the Holocaust. By Carlo Mattogno and Germar Rudolf. The fallacious research and alleged “refutation” of revisionist scholars by French biochemist G. Wellers (attacking Leuchter’s famous report, #16), Polish chemist Dr. J. Markiewicz and U.S. chemist Dr. Richard Green (taking on Rudolf’s chemical research), Dr. John Zimmerman (tackling Mattogno on cremation issues), Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman (trying to prove it all), as well as researchers Keren, McCarthy and Mazal (who turned cracks into architectural features), are exposed for what they are: blatant and easily exposed political lies created to ostracize dissident historians. 4th ed., 420 pages, b&w illustrations, index. (#18)

Auschwitz: The Central Construction Office. By Carlo Mattogno. When Russian authorities granted access to their archives in the early 1990s, the files of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office, stored in Moscow, attracted the attention of scholars researching the history of this camp. This important office was responsible for the planning and construction of the Auschwitz camp complex, including the crematories which are said to have contained the “gas chambers.” This study sheds light into this hitherto hidden aspect of this camp’s history, but also provides a deep understanding of the organization, tasks, and procedures of this office. 2nd ed., 188 pages, b&w illustrations, glossary, index. (#13)

Garrison and Headquarters Orders of the Auschwitz Camp. By Germar Rudolf and Ernst Böhm. A large number of the orders issued by the various commanders of the Auschwitz Camp have been preserved. They reveal the true nature of the camp with all its daily events. There is not a trace in them pointing at anything sinister going on. Quite to the contrary, many orders are in insurmountable contradiction to claims that prisoners were mass murdered, such as the children of SS men playing with inmates, SS men taking friends for a sight-seeing tour through the camp, or having a romantic stroll with their lovers around the camp grounds. This is a selection of the most pertinent of these orders together with comments putting them into their proper historical context. 185 pages, b&w ill., bibl., index (#34)

Special Treatment in Auschwitz: Origin and Meaning of a Term. By Carlo Mattogno. When appearing in German wartime documents, terms like

“special treatment,” “special action,” and others have been interpreted as code words for mass murder. But that is not always true. This study focuses on documents about Auschwitz, showing that, while “special” had many different meanings, not a single one meant “execution.” Hence the practice of deciphering an alleged “code language” by assigning homicidal meaning to harmless documents – a key component of mainstream historiography – is untenable. 2nd ed., 166 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#10)

Healthcare at Auschwitz. By Carlo Mattogno. In extension of the above study on *Special Treatment in Auschwitz*, this study proves the extent to which the German authorities at Auschwitz tried to provide health care for the inmates. Part 1 of this book analyzes the inmates’ living conditions and the various sanitary and medical measures implemented. It documents the vast construction efforts to build a huge inmate hospital inside the Auschwitz-Birkenau Camp. Part 2 explores what happened to registered inmates who were “selected” or subject to “special treatment” while disabled or sick. This study shows that a lot was tried to cure these inmates, especially under the aegis of Garrison Physician Dr. Wirths. Part 3 is dedicated to this very Dr. Wirths. The reality of this caring philanthropist refutes the current stereotype of SS officers. 398 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#33)

Debunking the Bunkers of Auschwitz: Black Propaganda vs. History. By Carlo Mattogno. The “bunkers” at Auschwitz-Birkenau, two former farmhouses just outside the camp’s perimeter, are claimed to have been the first homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz specifically equipped for this purpose. They supposedly went into operation during the first half of 1942, with thousands of Jews sent straight from deportation trains to these “gas chambers.” However, documents clearly show that all inmates sent to Auschwitz during that time were properly admitted to the camp. No mass murder on arrival can have happened. With the help of other wartime files as well as air photos taken by Allied reconnaissance aircraft in 1944, this study shows that these homicidal “bunkers” never existed, how the rumors about them evolved as black propaganda created by resistance groups in the camp, and how this propaganda was transformed into a false reality by “historians.” 2nd ed.,

292 pages, b&w ill., bibliography, index. (#11)

Auschwitz: The First Gassing. Rumor and Reality. By Carlo Mattogno. The first gassing in Auschwitz is claimed to have occurred on Sept. 3, 1941 in a basement. The accounts reporting it are the archetypes for all later gassing accounts. This study analyzes all available sources about this alleged event. It shows that these sources contradict each other about the event's location, date, the kind of victims and their number, and many more aspects, which makes it impossible to extract a consistent story. Original wartime documents inflict a final blow to this legend and prove without a shadow of a doubt that this legendary event never happened. 4th ed., 262 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#20)

Auschwitz: Crematorium I and the Alleged Homicidal Gassings. By Carlo Mattogno. The morgue of Crematorium I in Auschwitz is said to be the first homicidal gas chamber there. This study analyzes witness statements and hundreds of wartime documents to accurately write a history of that building. Where witnesses speak of gassings, they are either very vague or, if specific, contradict one another and are refuted by documented and material facts. The author also exposes the fraudulent attempts of mainstream historians to convert the witnesses' black propaganda into "truth" by means of selective quotes, omissions, and distortions. Mattogno proves that this building's morgue was never a homicidal gas chamber, nor could it have worked as such. 2nd ed., 152 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#21)





Auschwitz: Open-Air Incinerations. By Carlo Mattogno. In 1944, 400,000 Hungarian Jews were deported to Auschwitz and allegedly murdered in gas chambers. The camp crematoria were unable to cope with so many corpses. Therefore, every single day thousands of corpses are claimed to have been incinerated on huge pyres lit in trenches. The sky was filled with thick smoke, if we believe witnesses. This book examines many testimonies regarding these incinerations and establishes whether these claims were even possible. Using air photos, physical evidence and wartime documents, the author shows that these claims are fiction. A new Appendix contains 3 papers on groundwater levels and cattle mass burnings. 2nd ed., 202 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#17)




The Cremation Furnaces of Auschwitz. By Carlo Mattogno & Franco Deana. An exhaustive study of the early history and technology of cremation in general and of the cremation furnaces of Auschwitz in particular. On a vast base of technical literature, extant wartime documents and material traces, the authors establish the nature and capacity of these cremation furnaces, showing that these devices were inferior makeshift versions, and that their capacity was lower than normal. The Auschwitz crematoria were not facilities of mass destruction, but installations barely managing to handle the victims among the inmates who died of various epidemics. 2nd ed., 3 vols., 1201 pages, b&w and color illustrations (vols 2 & 3), bibliography, index, glossary. (#24)

Curated Lies: The Auschwitz Museum's Misrepresentations, Distortions and Deceptions. By Carlo Mattogno. Revisionist research results have put the Polish Auschwitz Museum under enormous pressure to answer this challenge. They've answered. This book analyzes their answer. It first exposes the many tricks and lies used by the museum to bamboozle millions of visitors every year regarding its most valued asset, the "gas chamber" in the Main Camp. Next, it reveals how the museum's historians mislead and lie through their teeth about documents in their archives. A long string of completely innocuous documents is mistranslated and misrepresented to make it look like they prove the existence of homicidal gas chambers. 2nd ed., 259 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#38)

Deliveries of Coke, Wood and Zyklon B to Auschwitz: Neither Proof Nor Trace for the Holocaust. By Carlo Mattogno. Researchers from the Auschwitz Museum tried to prove the reality of mass extermination by pointing to documents about deliveries of wood and coke as well as Zyklon B to the Auschwitz Camp. If put into the actual historical and technical context, however, as is done by this study, these documents prove the exact opposite of what those orthodox researchers claim. This study exposes the mendacious tricks with which these museum officials once more deceive the trusting public. 184 pages, b&w illust., bibl., index. (#40)

Mis-Chronicling Auschwitz. Danuta Czech's Flawed Methods, Lies and Deceptions in Her "Auschwitz Chronicle". By Carlo Mattogno. The *Auschwitz Chronicle* is a reference book for the history of the Auschwitz





Camp. It was published in 1990 by Danuta Czech, one of the Auschwitz Museum's most prolific and impactful historians. Analyzing this almost 1,000-page long tome one entry at a time, Mattogno has compiled a long list of misrepresentations, outright lies and deceptions contained in it. They all aim at creating the otherwise unsubstantiated claim that homicidal gas chambers and lethal injections were used at Auschwitz for mass-murdering inmates. This literary mega-fraud needs to be retired from the ranks of Auschwitz sources. 324 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#47)

The Real Auschwitz Chronicle. By Carlo Mattogno. Nagging is easy. We actually did a better job! That which is missing in Czech's *Chronicle* is included here: day after day of the camp's history, documents are presented showing that it could not have been an extermination camp: tens of thousands of sick and injured inmates were cared for medically with huge efforts, and the camp authorities tried hard to improve the initially catastrophic hygienic conditions. Part Two contains data on transports, camp occupancy and mortality figures. For the first time, we find out what this camp's real death toll was. 2 vols., 906 pp., b&w illustrations (Vol. 2), bibliography, index. (#48)

Politics of Slave Labor: The Fate of the Jews Deported from Hungary and the Lodz Ghetto in 1944. By Carlo Mattogno. The deportation of the Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz in May-July 1944 is said to have been the pinnacle of this camp's extermination frenzy, topped off in August of that year by the extermination of Jews deported from the Lodz Ghetto. This book gathers and explains all the evidence available on both events. In painstaking research, the author proves almost on a person-by-person level what the fate was of many of the Jews deported from Hungary or the Lodz Ghetto. He demonstrates that these Jews were deported to serve as slave laborers in the Third Reich's collapsing war economy. There is no trace of any extermination of any of these Jews. 338 pp., b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#51)

SECTION FOUR: Witness Critique

Elie Wiesel, Saint of the Holocaust: A Critical Biography. By Warren B. Rudolph. This book analyzes several of Wiesel's texts, foremost his

camp autobiography *Night*. The author proves that much of what Wiesel claims can never have happened. It shows how Zionist control has allowed Wiesel and his fellow extremists to force leaders of many nations, the U.N. and even popes to genuflect before Wiesel as symbolic acts of subordination to World Jewry, while at the same time forcing school children to submit to Holocaust brainwashing. This study also shows how parallel to this abuse of power, critical reactions to it also increased: Holocaust revisionism. While Catholics jumped on the Holocaust band wagon, the number of Jews rejecting certain aspect of the Holocaust narrative and its abuse grew as well. This first unauthorized biography of Wiesel exposes both his personal deceits and the whole myth of "the six million." 3rd ed., 458 pages, b&w illustration, bibliography, index. (#30)

Auschwitz: Eyewitness Reports and Perpetrator Confessions. By Jürgen Graf. The traditional narrative of what transpired at the infamous Auschwitz camp during WWII rests almost exclusively on witness testimony from former inmates as well as erstwhile camp officials. This study critically scrutinizes the 30 most important of these witness statements by checking them for internal coherence, and by comparing them with one another as well as with other evidence such as wartime documents, air photos, forensic research results, and material traces. The result is devastating for the traditional narrative. 372 pages, b&w illust., bibl., index. (#36)

Commandant of Auschwitz: Rudolf Höss, His Torture and His Forced Confessions. By Carlo Mattogno & Rudolf Höss. From 1940 to 1943, Rudolf Höss was the commandant of the infamous Auschwitz Camp. After the war, he was captured by the British. In the following 13 months until his execution, he made 85 depositions of various kinds in which he confessed his involvement in the "Holocaust." This study first reveals how the British tortured him to extract various "confessions." Next, all of Höss's depositions are analyzed by checking his claims for internal consistency and comparing them with established historical facts. The results are eye-opening... 2nd ed., 411 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#35)

An Auschwitz Doctor's Eyewitness Account: The Tall Tales of Dr. Mengele's Assistant Analyzed. By Miklos Nyiszli & Carlo Mattogno.

Nyiszli, a Hungarian physician, ended up at Auschwitz in 1944 as Dr. Mengele's assistant. After the war he wrote a book and several other writings describing what he claimed to have experienced. To this day some traditional historians take his accounts seriously, while others reject them as grotesque lies and exaggerations. This study presents and analyzes Nyiszli's writings and skillfully separates truth from fabulous fabrication. 2nd ed., 484 pages, b&w illustrations, bibliography, index. (#37)


Rudolf Reder versus Kurt Gerstein: Two False Testimonies on the Belzec Camp Analyzed. By Carlo Mattogno. Only two witnesses have ever testified substantially about the alleged Belzec Extermination Camp: The survivor Rudolf Reder and the SS officer Kurt Gerstein. Gerstein's testimonies have been a hotspot of revisionist critique for decades. It is now discredited even among orthodox historians. They use Reder's testimony to fill the void, yet his testimonies are just as absurd. This study thoroughly scrutinizes Reder's various statements, critically revisits Gerstein's various depositions, and then compares these two testimonies which are at once similar in some respects, but incompatible in others. 216 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#43)

Sonderkommando Auschwitz I: Nine Eyewitness Testimonies Analyzed. By Carlo Mattogno. The 1979 book *Auschwitz Inferno* by alleged former Auschwitz "Sonderkommando" member Filip Müller has a great influence on the perception of Auschwitz by the public and by historians. This book critically analyzes Müller's various post-war statements, which are full of exaggerations, falsehoods and plagiarized text passages. Also scrutinized are the testimonies of eight other claimed former *Sonderkommando* members: D. Paisikovic, S. Jankowski, H. Mandelbaum, L. Nagraba, J. Rosenblum, A. Pilo, D. Fliamenbaum and S. Karolinskij. 304 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#44)

Sonderkommando Auschwitz II: The False Testimonies by Henryk Tauber and Szlama Dragon. By Carlo Mattogno. Auschwitz survivor and former member of the so-called "Sonderkommando" Henryk Tauber is one of the most important witnesses about the alleged gas chambers inside the crematoria at Auschwitz, because right at the war's end, he made several extremely detailed depositions about it. The same is true for Szlama Dragon, only he claims to have worked at the so-called "bunkers" of Birkenau, two makeshift gas chambers just outside the camp perimeter. This study thoroughly scrutinizes these two key testimonies. 254 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#45)

Sonderkommando Auschwitz III: They Wept Crocodile Tears. A Critical Analysis of Late Witness Testimonies. By Carlo Mattogno. This book focuses on the critical analysis of witness testimonies on the alleged Auschwitz gas chambers recorded or published in the 1990s and early 2000s, such as J. Sackar, A. Dragon, J. Gabai, S. Chasan, L. Cohen and S. Venezia, among others. 232 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#46)

Auschwitz Engineers in Moscow: The Soviet Postwar Interrogations of the Auschwitz Cremation-Furnace Engineers. By Carlo Mattogno and Jürgen Graf. After the war, the Soviets arrested four leading engineers of the Topf Company. Among other things, they had planned and supervised the construction of the Auschwitz cremation furnaces and the ventilation systems of the rooms said to have served as homicidal gas chambers. Between 1946 and 1948, Soviet officials conducted numerous interrogations with them. This work analyzes them by putting them into the context of the vast documentation on these and related facilities. The appendix contains all translated interrogation protocols. 254 pages, b&w illust., bibliography, index. (#52)




For current prices and availability, and to learn more, go to www.HolocaustHandbooks.com – for example by simply scanning the QR code on the right.



Three decades of unflagging archival and forensic research by the world's most knowledgeable, courageous and prodigious Holocaust scholars have finally coalesced into a reference book that makes all this knowledge readily accessible to everyone:

HOLOCAUST ENCYCLOPEDIA **uncensored and unconstrained**

Available as paperback (b&w) or hardcover (color), 634 pages, 8.5"×11"; as eBook (ePub or PDF) and eBook + audio (ePub + mp3); more than 350 illustrations in 579 entries; introduction, bibliography, index. Online at www.NukeBook.org



We all know the basics of “The Holocaust.” But what about the details? Websites and printed encyclopedias can help us there. Take the 4-volume encyclopedia by Israel’s Yad Vashem Center: *The Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* (1990). For every significant crime scene, it presents a condensed narrative of Israel’s finest Holocaust scholars. However, it contains not one entry about witnesses and their stories, even though they are the foundation of our knowledge. When a murder is committed, the murder weapon and the crime’s traces are of crucial importance. Yet Yad Vashem’s encyclopedia has no entries explaining scientific findings on these matters – not one.

This is where the present encyclopedia steps in. It not only summarizes and explains the many pieces that make up the larger Holocaust picture. It also reveals the evidence that confirms or contradicts certain notions. Nearly 300 entries present the essence of important witness accounts, and they are subjected to source criticism. This enables us to decide which witness claims are credible.

For all major crime scenes, the sometimes-conflicting claims are presented. We learn how our knowledge has changed over time, and what evidence shores up the currently valid

narrative of places such as Auschwitz, Belzec, Sobibór, Treblinka, Dachau and Bergen-Belsen and many more.

Other entries discuss tools and mechanisms allegedly used for the mass murders, and how the crimes’ traces were erased, if at all. A few entries discuss toxicological issues surrounding the various lethal gases claimed to have been used.

This encyclopedia has multiple entries on some common claims about aspects of the Holocaust, including a list of “Who said it?” This way we can quickly find proof for these claims.

Finally, several entries address factors that have influenced the creation of the Holocaust narrative, and how we perceive it today. This includes entries on psychological warfare and wartime propaganda; on conditions prevailing during investigations and trials of alleged Holocaust perpetrators; on censorship against historical dissidents; on the religious dimension of the Holocaust narrative; and on motives of all sides involved in creating and spreading their diverse Holocaust narratives.

In this important volume, now with 579 entries, you will discover many astounding aspects of the Holocaust narrative that you did not even know exist.

BOOKS ON THE HOLOCAUST AND FREE SPEECH

On the next six pages, we list some of the books available from ARMREG that are not part of the series *Holocaust Handbooks*. For our current range of products, visit our web store at www.ARMREG.co.uk.

The Holocaust: An Introduction. By Thomas Dalton. The Holocaust was perhaps the greatest crime of the 20th Century. Six million Jews, we are told, died by gassing, shooting, and deprivation. But: Where did the six-million figure come from? How, exactly, did the gas chambers work? Why do we have so little physical evidence from major death camps? Why haven't we found even a fraction of the six million bodies, or their ashes? Why has there been so much media suppression and governmental censorship on this topic? In a sense, the Holocaust is the greatest murder mystery in history. It is a topic of greatest importance for the present day. Let's explore the evidence, and see where it leads. 128 pp. pb, 6"x9", ill., bibl., index.






Auschwitz: A Three-Quarter Century of Propaganda: Origins, Development and Decline of the "Gas Chamber" Propaganda Lie. By Carlo Mattogno. Wild rumors were circulating about Auschwitz during WWII: Germans testing war gases; mass murder in electrocution chambers, with gas showers or pneumatic hammers; living people sent on conveyor belts into furnaces; grease and soap made of the victims. Nothing of it was true. When the Soviets captured Auschwitz in early 1945, they reported that 4 million inmates were killed on electrocution conveyor belts discharging their load directly into furnaces. That wasn't true either. After the war, "witnesses" and "experts" added more claims: mass murder with gas bombs, gas chambers made of canvas; crematoria burning 400 million victims... Again, none of it was true. This book gives an overview of the many rumors and lies about Auschwitz today rejected as untrue, and exposes the ridiculous methods that turned some claims into "history," although they are just as untrue. 125 pp. pb, 6"x9", ill., bibl., index, b&w ill.

Auschwitz: A Judge Looks at the Evidence. By Wilhelm Stäglich. Auschwitz is the epicenter of the Holocaust, where more people are said to have been murdered than anywhere else.

The most important evidence for this claim was presented during two trials: the International Military Tribunal of 1945/46, and the German Auschwitz Trial of 1963-1965. In this book, Wilhelm Stäglich, a former German judge, reveals the incredibly scandalous way in which Allied victors and German courts bent and broke the law in order to come to politically foregone conclusions. Stäglich also exposes the superficial way in which historians are dealing with the many incongruities and discrepancies of the historical record. 3rd edition 2015, 422 pp. pb, 6"x9", b&w ill.

Hilberg's Giant with Feet of Clay. By Jürgen Graf. Raul Hilberg's major work *The Destruction of the European Jews* is generally considered the standard work on the Holocaust. The critical reader might ask: what evidence does Hilberg provide to back his thesis that there was a German plan to exterminate Jews, to be carried out in the legendary gas chambers? And what evidence supports his estimate of 5.1 million Jewish victims? Jürgen Graf applies the methods of critical analysis to Hilberg's evidence, and examines the results in the light of revisionist historiography. The results of Graf's critical analysis are devastating for Hilberg. Graf's analysis is the first comprehensive and systematic examination of the leading spokesperson for the orthodox version of the Jewish fate during the Third Reich. 3rd edition 2022, 182 pp. pb, 6"x9", b&w ill.

Exactitude: Festschrift for Prof. Dr. Robert Faurisson. By R.H. Countess, C. Lindtner, G. Rudolf (eds.) Faurisson probably deserves the title of the most-courageous intellectual of the 20th and the early 21st Century. With bravery and steadfastness, he challenged the dark forces of historical and political fraud with his unrelenting exposure of their lies and hoaxes surrounding the orthodox Holocaust narrative. This book describes and celebrates the man and his work dedicated to accuracy and marked by in-submission. 146 pp. pb, 6"x9", b&w ill.



Auschwitz – Forensically Examined.

By Cyrus Cox. Modern forensic crime-scene investigations can reveal a lot about the Holocaust. There are many big tomes about this. But if you want it all in a nutshell, read this booklet. It condenses the most-important findings of Auschwitz forensics into a quick and easy read. In the first section, the forensic investigations conducted so far are reviewed. In the second section, the most-important results of these studies are summarized. The main arguments focus on two topics. The first centers around the poison allegedly used at Auschwitz for mass murder: Zyklon B. Did it leave any traces in masonry where it was used? Can it be detected to this day? The second topic deals with mass cremations. Did the crematoria of Auschwitz have the claimed huge capacity? Do air photos taken during the war confirm witness statements on huge smoking pyres? This book gives the answers, together with many references to source material and further reading. The third section reports on how the establishment has reacted to these research results. 2nd ed., 128 pp. pb., b&w ill., bibl., index.






Ulysses's Lie. By Paul Rassinier. Holocaust revisionism began with this book: Frenchman Rassinier, a pacifist and socialist, was sent first to Buchenwald Camp in 1944, then to Dora-Mittelbau. Here he reports from his own experience how the prisoners turned each other's imprisonment into hell without being forced to do so. In the second part, Rassinier analyzes the books of former fellow prisoners, and shows how they lied and distorted in order to hide their complicity. First complete English edition, including Rassinier's prologue, Albert Paraz's preface, and press reviews. 270 pp. 6"x9" pb, bibl, index.

The Second Babylonian Captivity: The Fate of the Jews in Eastern Europe since 1941. By Steffen Werner. "But if they were not murdered, where did the six million deported Jews end up?" This objection demands a well-founded response. While researching an entirely different topic, Werner stumbled upon peculiar demographic data of Belorussia. Years of research subsequently revealed more evidence which eventually allowed him to

propose: The Third Reich did indeed deport many of the Jews of Europe to Eastern Europe in order to settle them there "in the swamp." This book shows what really happened to the Jews deported to the East by the National Socialists, how they have fared since. It provides context for hitherto-obscure historical events and obviates extreme claims such as genocide and gas chambers. With a preface by Germar Rudolf. 190 pp. pb, 6"x9", b&w ill., bibl., index

Holocaust Skepticism: 20 Questions and Answers about Holocaust Revisionism. By Germar Rudolf. This 15-page brochure introduces the novice to the concept of Holocaust revisionism, and answers 20 tough questions, among them: What does Holocaust revisionism claim? Why should I take Holocaust revisionism more seriously than the claim that the earth is flat? How about the testimonies by survivors and confessions by perpetrators? What about the pictures of corpse piles in the camps? Why does it matter how many Jews were killed by the Nazis, since even 1,000 would have been too many? ... Glossy full-color brochure. PDF file free of charge available at www.HolocaustHandbooks.com, Option "Promotion". This item is *not* copyright-protected. Hence, you can do with it whatever you want: download, post, email, print, multiply, hand out, sell... 20 pp., stapled, 8.5"x11", full-color throughout.

Bungled: "Denying the Holocaust" How Deborah Lipstadt Botched Her Attempt to Demonstrate the Growing Assault on Truth and Memory. By Germar Rudolf. With her book *Denying the Holocaust*, Deborah Lipstadt tried to show the flawed methods and extremist motives of "Holocaust deniers." This book demonstrates that Dr. Lipstadt clearly has neither understood the principles of science and scholarship, nor has she any clue about the historical topics she is writing about. She misquotes, mistranslates, misrepresents, misinterprets, and makes a plethora of wild claims without backing them up with anything. Rather than dealing thoroughly with factual arguments, Lipstadt's book is full of *ad hominem* attacks on her opponents. It is an exercise in anti-intellectual pseudo-scientific






arguments, an exhibition of ideological radicalism that rejects anything which contradicts its preset conclusions. **F for FAIL.** 2nd ed., 224 pp. pb, 6"×9", bibl., index, b&w ill.

Bungled: "Denying History". How Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman Botched Their Attempt to Refute Those Who Say the Holocaust Never Happened. By Carolus Magnus (C. Mattogno). *Skeptic Magazine* editor Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman from the Simon Wiesenthal Center wrote a book claiming to be "a thorough and thoughtful answer to all the claims of the Holocaust deniers." As this book shows, however, Shermer and Grobman completely ignored almost all the "claims" made in the more than 10,000 pages of more-recent cutting-edge revisionist archival and forensic research. Furthermore, they piled up a heap of falsifications, contortions, omissions and fallacious interpretations of the evidence. Finally, what the authors claim to have demolished is not revisionism but a ridiculous parody of it. They ignored the known unreliability of their cherry-picked selection of evidence, utilized unverified and incestuous sources, and obscured the massive body of research and all the evidence that dooms their project to failure. 162 pp. pb, 6"×9", bibl., index, b&w ill.

Bungled: "Debunking Holocaust Denial Theories". How James and Lance Morcan Botched Their Attempt to Affirm the Historicity of the Nazi Genocide. By Carolus Magnus. The novelists and movie-makers James and Lance Morcan have produced a book "to end [Holocaust] denial once and for all" by disproving "the various arguments Holocaust deniers use to try to discredit wartime records." It's a lie. First, the Morcans completely ignored the vast amount of recent scholarly studies published by revisionists; they don't even mention them. Instead, they engage in shadowboxing, creating some imaginary, bogus "revisionist" scarecrow which they then tear to pieces. In addition, their knowledge even of their own side's source material is dismal, and the way they back up their misleading or false claims is pitifully inadequate. 144 pp. pb, 6"×9", bibl., index, b&w ill.

Stalin's War of Extermination 1941-1945. By Joachim Hoffmann. A German government historian documents Stalin's murderous war against the German army and the German people. Based on the author's lifelong study of German and Russian military records, this book reveals the Red Army's grisly record of atrocities against soldiers and civilians, as ordered by Stalin. Since the 1920s, Stalin planned to invade Western Europe to initiate the "World Revolution." He prepared an attack which was unparalleled in history. The Germans noticed Stalin's aggressive intentions, but they underestimated the strength of the Red Army. What unfolded was the cruelest war in history. This book shows how Stalin and his Bolshevik henchman used unimaginable violence and atrocities to break any resistance in the Red Army and to force their unwilling soldiers to fight against the Germans. The book explains how Soviet propagandists incited their soldiers to unlimited hatred against everything German, and he gives the reader a short but extremely unpleasant glimpse into what happened when these Soviet soldiers finally reached German soil in 1945: A gigantic wave of looting, arson, rape, torture, and mass murder... **428 pp. pb, 6"×9", bibl., index, b&w ill.**

Who Started World War II: Truth for a War-Torn World. By Udo Walendy. For seven decades, mainstream historians have insisted that Germany was the main, if not the sole culprit for unleashing World War II in Europe. In the present book this myth is refuted. There is available to the public today a great number of documents on the foreign policies of the Great Powers before September 1939 as well as a wealth of literature in the form of memoirs of the persons directly involved in the decisions that led to the outbreak of World War II. Together, they made possible Walendy's present mosaic-like reconstruction of the events before the outbreak of the war in 1939. This book has been published only after an intensive study of sources, taking the greatest care to minimize speculation and inference. The present edition has been translated completely anew from the German original and has been slightly revised. **500 pp. pb, 6"×9", index, bibl., b&w ill.**



The Day Amazon Murdered Free Speech. By Germar Rudolf. Amazon is the world's biggest book retailer. They dominate the U.S. and several foreign markets. Pursuant to the 1998 declaration of Amazon's founder Jeff Bezos to offer "the good, the bad and the ugly," customers once could buy every title that was in print and was legal to sell. However, in early 2017, a series of anonymous bomb threats against Jewish community centers occurred in the U.S., fueling a campaign by Jewish groups to coax Amazon into banning revisionist writings. On March 6, 2017, Amazon caved in and banned more than 100 books with dissenting viewpoints on the Holocaust. In April 2017, an Israeli Jew was arrested for having placed the fake bomb threats. But Amazon kept its new censorship policy: They next culled any literature critical of Jews or Judaism; then they enforced these bans at all its subsidiaries, such as AbeBooks and The Book Depository; then they banned books other pressure groups don't like; finally, they bullied Ingram, who has a book-distribution monopoly in the US, to enforce the same rules by banning from the entire world-wide book market all books Amazon doesn't like... 3rd ed., 158 pp. pb, 6"x9", bibl., color illustrations throughout.

The First Zündel Trial: The Transcript. In the early 1980s, Ernst Zündel, a German living in Toronto, was indicted for allegedly spreading "false news" by selling copies of Harwood's brochure *Did Six Million Really Die?*, which challenged the accuracy of the orthodox Holocaust narrative. When the case went to court in 1985, so-called Holocaust experts and "eyewitnesses" of the alleged homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz were cross-examined for the first time in history by a competent and skeptical legal team. The results were absolutely devastating for the Holocaust orthodoxy. For decades, these mind-boggling trial transcripts were hidden from public view. Now, for the first time, they have been published in print in this new book – unabridged and unedited. 820 pp. pb, 8.5"x11"





The Holocaust on Trial: The Second Trial against Ernst Zündel 1988. By Ernst Zündel. In 1988, the appeal trial of Ernst Zündel for "knowingly

spreading false news about the Holocaust" took place in Toronto. This book is introduced by a brief autobiographic summary of Zündel's early life, and an overview of the evidence introduced during the First Zündel Trial. This is followed by a detailed summary of the testimonies of all the witnesses who testified during the Second Zündel Trial. This was the most-comprehensive and -competent argument ever fought in a court of law over the Holocaust. The arguments presented have fueled revisionism like no other event before, in particular Fred Leuchter's expert report on the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Majdanek, and the testimony of British historian David Irving. Critically annotated edition with a foreword by Germar Rudolf. 410 pp. pb, 6"x9", index.

The Second Zündel Trial: Excerpts from the Transcript. By Barbara Kulaszka (ed.). In contrast to Ernst Zündel's book *The Holocaust on Trial* (see earlier description), this book focuses entirely on the Second Zündel Trial by exclusively quoting, paraphrasing and summarizing the entire trial transcript... 498 pp. pb, 8.5"x11", bibl., index, b&w ill.

Resistance Is Obligatory! By Germar Rudolf. In 2005, Rudolf, dissident publisher of revisionist literature, was kidnapped by the U.S. government and deported to Germany. There a show trial was staged. Rudolf was not permitted to defend his historical opinions. Yet he defended himself anyway: Rudolf gave a 7-day speech-proving that only the revisionists are scholarly in their approach, whereas the Holocaust orthodoxy is merely pseudo-scientific. He then explained why it is everyone's obligation to resist, without violence, a government which throws peaceful dissidents into dungeons. When Rudolf tried to publish his defence speech as a book, the public prosecutor initiated a new criminal investigation against him. After his probation time ended in 2011, he dared publish this speech anyway... 2nd ed. 2016, 378 pp. pb, 6"x9", b&w ill.

Hunting Germar Rudolf: Essays on a Modern-Day Witch Hunt. By Germar Rudolf. German-born revisionist activist, author and publisher Germar Rudolf describes which events made



him convert from a Holocaust believer to a Holocaust skeptic, quickly rising to a leading personality within the revisionist movement. This in turn unleashed a tsunami of persecution against him: lost his job, denied his PhD exam, destruction of his family, driven into exile, slandered by the mass media, literally hunted, caught, put on a show trial where filing motions to introduce evidence is illegal under the threat of further prosecution, and finally locked up in prison for years for nothing else than his peaceful yet controversial scholarly writings. In several essays, Rudolf takes the reader on a journey through an absurd world of government and societal persecution which most of us could never even fathom actually exists in a “Western democracy”... 304 pp. pb, 6”x9”, bibl., index, b&w ill.

Love: The Pursuit of Happiness. By Germar Rudolf. Rudolf’s autobiography on the sensual and emotional aspects of his life: love, affection, romance and erotica, as well as the lack of it. It tells about his human relationships with parents, siblings, friends and girlfriends, wives and children – and with a little puppy called Daisy; about his trials and tribulations as a lover and husband, and most importantly as a father of five children. This book might assist many readers to understand themselves and to help resolve or avoid relationship conflicts. It is an account filled with both humility and humor. Ca. 230 pp. pb, 6”x9” (to appear in late 2024)




The Book of the Shulchan Aruch. By Erich Bischoff. Most people have heard of the Talmud-that compendium of Jewish laws. The Talmud, however, is vast and largely inscrutable. Fortunately, back in the mid-1500s, a Jewish rabbi created a condensed version of it: the Shulchan Aruch. A fair number of passages in it discuss non-Jews. The laws of Judaism hold Gentiles in very low regard; they can be cheated, lied to, abused, even killed, if it serves Jewish interests. Bischoff, an expert in Jewish religious law, wrote a summary and analysis of this book. He shows us many dark corners of the Jewish religion. 152 pp. pb, 6”x9”.

Hitler’s Revolution: Ideology, Social Programs, Foreign Affairs. By Richard Tedor. Defying all boycotts, Adolf

Hitler transformed Germany from a bankrupt state to the powerhouse of Europe within just four years, thus becoming Germany’s most popular leader ever. How was this possible? This study tears apart the dense web of calumny surrounding this controversial figure. It draws on nearly 200 published German sources, many from the Nazi era, as well as documents from British, U.S., and Soviet archives that describe not only what Hitler did but, more importantly, why he did it. These sources also reveal the true war objectives of the democracies – a taboo subject for orthodox historians – and the resulting world war against Germany. This book is aimed at anyone who feels that something is missing from conventional accounts. 2nd ed., 309 pp. pb, 6”x9”, index, bibl.

Hitler on the Jews. By Thomas Dalton. That Adolf Hitler spoke out against the Jews is beyond obvious. But of the thousands of books and articles written on Hitler, virtually none quotes Hitler’s exact words on the Jews. The reason for this is clear: Those in positions of influence have incentives to present a simplistic picture of Hitler as a blood-thirsty tyrant. However, Hitler’s take on the Jews is far more complex and sophisticated. In this book, for the first time, you can make up your own mind by reading nearly every idea that Hitler put forth about the Jews, in considerable detail and in full context. This is the first book ever to compile his remarks on the Jews. As you will discover, Hitler’s analysis of the Jews, though hostile, is erudite, detailed, and – surprise, surprise – largely aligns with events of recent decades. There are many lessons here for the modern-day world to learn. 200 pp. pb, 6”x9”, index, bibl.

Goebbels on the Jews. By Thomas Dalton. From the age of 26 until his death in 1945, Joseph Goebbels kept a near-daily diary. It gives us a detailed look at the attitudes of one of the highest-ranking men in Nazi Germany. Goebbels shared Hitler’s dislike of the Jews, and likewise wanted them removed from the Reich. Ultimately, Goebbels and others sought to remove the Jews completely from Europe—perhaps to the island of Madagascar. This would be the “final solution” to the Jewish Question. Nowhere in the





diary does Goebbels discuss any Hitler order to kill the Jews, nor is there any reference to extermination camps, gas chambers, or any methods of systematic mass-murder. Goebbels acknowledges that Jews did indeed die by the thousands; but the range and scope of killings evidently fall far short of the claimed figure of 6 million. This book contains, for the first time, every significant diary entry relating to the Jews or Jewish policy. Also included are partial or full transcripts of 10 major essays by Goebbels on the Jews. 274 pp. pb, 6"x9", index, bibl.

The Jewish Hand in the World Wars. By Thomas Dalton. For many centuries, Jews have had a negative reputation in many countries. The reasons given are plentiful, but less-well-known is their involvement in war. When we examine the causal factors for wars, and look at their primary beneficiaries, we repeatedly find a Jewish presence. Throughout history, Jews have played an exceptionally active role in promoting and inciting wars. With their long-notorious influence in government, we find recurrent instances of Jews promoting hard-line stances, being uncompromising, and actively inciting people to hatred. Jewish misanthropy, rooted in Old Testament mandates, and combined with a ruthless materialism, has led them, time and again, to instigate warfare if it served their larger interests. This fact explains much about the present-day world. In this book, Thomas Dalton examines in detail the Jewish hand in the two world wars. Along the way, he dissects Jewish motives and Jewish strategies for maximizing gain amidst warfare, reaching back centuries. 2nd ed., 231 pp. pb, 6"x9", index, bibl.

Eternal Strangers: Critical Views of Jews and Judaism through the Ages. By Thomas Dalton. It is common

knowledge that Jews have been disliked for centuries. But why? Our best hope for understanding this recurrent 'anti-Semitism' is to study the history: to look at the actual words written by prominent critics of the Jews, in context, and with an eye to any common patterns that might emerge. Such a study reveals strikingly consistent observations: Jews are seen in very negative, yet always similar terms. The persistence of such comments is remarkable and strongly suggests that the cause for such animosity resides in the Jews themselves—in their attitudes, their values, their ethnic traits and their beliefs.. This book addresses the modern-day "Jewish problem" in all its depth—something which is arguably at the root of many of the world's social, political and economic problems. 186 pp. pb, 6"x9", index, bibl.

Streicher, Rosenberg, and the Jews: The Nuremberg Transcripts. By Thomas Dalton. Who, apart from Hitler, contrived the Nazi view on the Jews? And what were these master ideologues thinking? During the post-war International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, the most-interesting men on trial regarding this question were two with a special connection to the "Jewish Question": Alfred Rosenberg and Julius Streicher. The cases against them, and their personal testimonies, examined for the first time nearly all major aspects of the Holocaust story: the "extermination" thesis, the gas chambers, the gas vans, the shootings in the East, and the "6 million." The truth of the Holocaust has been badly distorted for decades by the powers that be. Here we have the rare opportunity to hear firsthand from two prominent figures in Nazi Germany. Their voices, and their verbatim transcripts from the IMT, lend some much-needed clarity to the situation. 330 pp. pb, 6"x9", index, bibl.



For current prices and availability visit www.ARMREG.co.uk

Academic Research Media Review Education Group Ltd (ARMREG)
86-90 Paul Street, London, EC2A 4NE, UK