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Introduction

It is well known that the official historiography on Auschwitz hinges on an order to exterminate the European Jews – supposedly given by Hitler to Himmler and then transmitted to Rudolf Höß – which took on concrete shape when the Auschwitz extermination camp was built.

According to the interpretation that has now become dogma, this order was carried out in four successive stages:

1. In September 1941, the first experimental homicidal gassing by means of Zyklon B was performed at Auschwitz; this represented the ‘discovery’ of the instrument of extermination.
2. In early 1942, the homicidal gassing activity was moved to the mortuary of the Auschwitz crematorium.
3. In the succeeding months two farmhouses located outside the perimeter of the Birkenau camp were transformed into gas chambers (the so-called ‘Bunkers’), and the mass extermination of Jews and sick inmates began.
4. Finally, from March 1943 onwards, the extermination activity was transferred to the four Birkenau crematoria, which all had their homicidal gas chambers.

The starting point for this assumed sequence of events is thus the first homicidal gassing in the basement of Block 11 at Auschwitz between September 3 and 5, 1941, during which (according to the version invented by Danuta Czech) 250 sick detainees and 600 Soviet prisoners of war were murdered. This alleged event is very important for the official historiography on Auschwitz, because it is said to have been the birth of the homicidal gas chambers.

In 1992, I dedicated a fairly extensive study, still the only one of its kind, to this alleged event, in which I demonstrated that this event has no historical foundation whatsoever.

---

1 In the section entitled “La metodologia storiografica di Danuta Czech” of my book Auschwitz: la prima gasazione. Edizioni di Ar, Padova, 1992, pp. 140-144, I have shown that the Polish researcher has artificially constructed the official version as published in the Auschwitz Kalenderium by fusing individual elements taken from completely contradictory testimonies. Updated English edition: Auschwitz: The First Gassing, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, in preparation.
2 Even today, there is no other book dealing with this topic. In the five-volume collective work Auschwitz 1940-1945. Węzłowe zagadnienia z dziejów obozu (Fundamental problems of the camp history, by Danuta Czech, Tadeusz Iwaszko, Stanisław Kłodziński, et al.), Wydawnictwo Państwowego Muzeum Oświęcim-Brzezinka, 1995, which represents the historiographical peak of the Auschwitz Museum, scarcely more than four pages are dedicated to the question of the first gassing in the section by Franciszek Piper “Komory Gazowe i Krematoria” (Gas chambers and crematoria), Vol. III, pp. 97-102 (pages 97 and 102 contain in total 5 lines concerning this topic).
3 Carlo Mattogno, Auschwitz: la prima gasazione, op. cit. (note 1).
My book managed to shake even the confidence of Jean-Claude Pressac. In 1989, he still followed the official interpretation of the *Auschwitz Chronicle* to the letter; in 1993 he still accepted the reality of Czech’s account of the first gassing, but he moved it to December 1941 on account of a polemical cue I had given him; in 2000 he came to doubt its historical reality. In an interview, which he gave in 1995 but which was clearly updated in 2000, Pressac referred to my study (of which a French translation had appeared in 1999) stating:

“If that first gassing did occur, it happened in December of 1941, or perhaps in January of 1942, and it has no link at all with the massacre of the Jews.” (emphasis added)

In the same way as does this elusive ‘first gassing,’ the alleged extermination activity of the Birkenau ‘Bunkers’ relies exclusively on testimonies.

As I have emphasized in a previous work, the archives of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office, which were preserved in Moscow, allow us to re-establish a complete account of the buildings that were erected in Auschwitz during the first half of 1942. Yet neither Pressac nor Robert Jan van Pelt, the new official ‘expert’ on Auschwitz, has searched those archives for documentary proof of the homicidal Birkenau ‘Bunkers,’ or, shall we say, none of them has found any evidence of their existence. But if those installations actually existed, there will be documentary proof of their existence.

The present study, which relies for the most part on unpublished documents, fills this embarrassing gap in the official historiography and supplies us with a solid answer to the question of the alleged homicidal ‘Bunkers’ of Birkenau. This question has, of late, become particularly pressing. In a recent article entitled “Die Zahl der Opfer von Auschwitz. Neue Erkenntnisse durch neue William Archivfund,” Fritjof Meyer, senior editor of the German news magazine *Der Spiegel* (Hamburg), has advanced the thesis that the alleged mass gassings at Birkenau were conducted essentially in the so-called ‘Bunkers’ rather than in the alleged gas chambers of the crematoria. That, in turn, has given rise within the official historiography to an internal dispute, which

---

6 Cf. in this respect my study *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, CA, 1994, pp. 37f.
intensified in November 2003 with the involvement of Franciszek Piper, director of the history department at the Auschwitz Museum.\textsuperscript{11}

According to the Auschwitz Museum, the SS called these two presumed gassing ins “little red house” (in Polish: \textit{czerwony domek}) and the “little white house” (in Polish: \textit{bialy domek}) by the inmates. Although these designations – as I shall show in the Part Two – were invented after the liberation of Auschwitz, I will continue in this study to use the accepted term ‘Bunker,’ but only for reasons of clarity.

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. in this respect my article “\textit{On the Piper-Meyer-Controversy: Soviet Propaganda vs. Pseudo-Revisionism},” \textit{The Revisionist}. 2(2) (2004), pp. 131-139.