

Carlo Mattogno

**Auschwitz:
The Case
For Sanity**

A Historical and Technical Study
of Jean-Claude Pressac's "Criminal Traces"
and Robert Jan van Pelt's "Convergence of Evidence"

Volume One of Two

THE BARNES REVIEW

P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003, USA

September 2010

HOLOCAUST Handbooks Series, vol. 22:

Carlo Mattogno:

Auschwitz: The Case For Sanity

A Historical and Technical Study of Jean-Claude Pressac's "Criminal Traces" and Robert Jan van Pelt's "Convergence of Evidence"

Washington, DC: THE BARNES REVIEW

P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003, USA

Volume One of Two

September 2010

Series editors: Germar Rudolf (up to 2005), Aaron Cohen (since 2006)

Translated from the Italian by Henry Gardner

ISBN: 978-0-9818085-6-7

ISSN: 1529-7748

Published by THE BARNES REVIEW

Manufactured in the United States of America

© by Carlo Mattogno 2010

Distribution USA/America: TBR Books, The Barnes Review

P.O. Box 15877

Washington, D.C. 20003, USA

1-877-773-9077

Distribution Europe/Africa: Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 243

Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

Distribution Australia/Asia: Peace Books, PO Box 3300

Norwood, 5067, Australia

Set in Times New Roman.

www.BarnesReview.com

www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

www.vho.org/GB/Books/atcfs

If these sites are inaccessible, try it with www.anonymizer.com

Cover illustrations, left to right: Deborah Lipstadt, David Irving and Robert van Pelt. Photo of Deborah Lipstadt by MARTYN HAYHOW/AFP/©Getty Images

Table of Contents

<u>Volume One</u>	page
Editors' Prologue	9
Measurement Conversions.....	20
Author's Preface	21
Part One: "Criminal Traces" Concerning Homicidal Gas Chambers	25
Introduction	25
1. "Criminal Traces".....	28
1.1. Historical Background	28
1.2. The Archive of the Auschwitz <i>Zentralbauleitung</i>	32
1.3. Methodical Premise	34
1.4. "39" Criminal Traces	37
1.5. Preliminary Considerations.....	39
1.6. Chronological Sequence of the "Traces" and Its Significance.....	42
1.7. Fundamental Contradictions	44
1.8. The Ventilation System of Crematoriums II and III.....	46
1.9. The Freight Elevators of Crematoria II and III	49
2. The "Criminal Traces" for Crematorium II.....	55
2.1. "Vergasungskeller" – Gassing Cellar.....	55
2.2. "Gasdichte Tür," "Gastür" – Gas-Tight Door	70
2.3. "Auskleideraum," "Auskleidekeller" and the Barrack in Front of Crematorium II.....	72
2.4. "Sonderkeller" – Special Cellar	80
2.5. "Drahtnetzeinschiebevorrichtung" and "Holzblenden"	83
2.6. "Gasprüfer" and "Anzeigergeräte für Blausäure-Reste"	93
2.7. "Warmluftzuführungsanlage"	114
2.8. "Holzgebläse" – Wooden Blower	124
2.9. Elimination of Corpse Slides	129
3. Secondary "Criminal Traces" Related to Crematorium II.....	136
3.1. Origin and Definition of the Secondary "Criminal Traces"	136
3.2. General Aspects	139
3.3. The Drainage System of the Crematorium.....	140
3.4. Opening an Access to <i>Leichenkeller 2</i>	142
3.5. Opening Direction of <i>Leichenkeller 1</i> Door.....	144
3.6. Substitution of Double- by Single-Leaf Door in <i>Leichenkeller 1</i>	145
3.7. Elimination of the Faucets in <i>Leichenkeller 1</i>	146
3.8. The Elimination of <i>Leichenkeller 3</i>	146
4. "Criminal Traces" for Crematorium III.....	148
4.1. Pressac's Interpretation.....	148
4.2. Historical Context	149
4.3. Wooden Plates of Alleged "Dummy Showers"	155

4.4. The “Gas-tight Door”	156
5. “Criminal Traces” Relative to Crematoria IV & V	158
5.1. Presentation of the Indications	158
5.2. Crematoria IV & V: Original Plan	158
5.3. Crematoria IV & V: First Operating Concept	162
5.4. Crematoria IV & V: Second Operating Concept	163
5.5. Crematoria IV & V: Third Operating Concept	166
5.6. The Gassing Technique	167
5.7. Introduction of Zyklon B	168
5.8. Van Pelt and the “12 pcs. Gas-tight Doors”	170
5.9. Natural Ventilation	171
5.10. Mechanical Ventilation	173
5.11. Analysis of Blueprint 2036 of January 1943	175
6. “Criminal Traces” of General Nature	181
6.1. “Normal Gas Chamber”	181
6.2. Why Not Use <i>Degesch</i> Gas Chambers for Homicides?	185
6.3. “Incineration with Simultaneous Special Treatment”	189
7. Alleged “Criminal Traces” for the “Bunkers” of Birkenau	200
7.1. Some Remarks Concerning the Title	200
7.2. “Special Treatment”	200
7.3. “Bath Facilities for Special Actions”	206
7.4. “ <i>Sperrgebiet</i> ” – Off-Limits Zone	212
7.5. Material for Special Treatment	214
7.6. “Materials for Resettlement of Jews” and the “Franke- Gricksch Report”	219
Part Two: The Crematory Ovens of Auschwitz-Birkenau	229
8. The First Scientific Treatment of Cremations at Auschwitz	229
8.1. Introduction	229
8.2. Structure of the Work	230
8.3. The Modern Cremation	235
8.4. The Topf Crematorium Ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau	251
8.5. Coke Consumption of the Topf Ovens at Auschwitz- Birkenau	268
8.6. Duration of Cremation Process in the Topf Ovens at Birkenau	272
8.7. Cremation Capacity of the Ovens at Auschwitz-Birkenau	282
8.8. Historiographic Implications	290
9. Pressac and the Cremation Ovens of Auschwitz-Birkenau	321
9.1. Pressac’s Technical Incompetence	321
9.2. Pressac’s Cremation Capacity	322
9.3. Loading of a Muffle	328
9.4. Coke Consumption	329
9.5. The Ratio of Muffles to Detainees	334
9.6. Pressac’s New Interpretations	337
9.7. The Ovens of Crematorium I	347

9.8. Ventilation of the Morgue in Crematorium I	354
9.9. The 8-Muffle Ovens.....	360
9.10. The Projects of Mass Cremations at Auschwitz-Birkenau in 1943	363

Volume Two

Part Three: The Witnesses Henryk Tauber and Rudolf Höss375

10. Critical Analysis of Henryk Tauber’s Testimonies	375
10.1. Introduction.....	375
10.2. Crematorium Ovens and Cremations	377
10.3. The Gassings.....	402
10.4. Strength and Events in Connection with the “Sonderkommando”.....	411
10.5. People Burned Alive: Black Propaganda	418
10.6. Conclusions.....	420
11. Critical Analysis of the Testimonies of Rudolf Höss	425
11.1. The “Non-Existent” Contradictions in Höss’s Declarations	425
11.2. Errors, Incongruities, and Deceptions by van Pelt	432
11.3. Höss was Tortured	436

Part Four: Van Pelt’s Technical and Historical Errors.....441

12. Van Pelt and the Crematorium Ovens of Auschwitz.....	441
12.1. Van Pelt’s Competence Regarding Cremations	441
12.2. Cremation Capacity of the Birkenau Crematoria	442
12.3. Kurt Prüfer’s Note of September 8, 1942	451
12.4. Coke Consumption for One Cremation.....	456
12.5. Number of Corpses Cremated with the Coke Delivered	457
12.6. Multiple Cremations	459
12.7. Crematoria and Morgues.....	468
12.8. “Excessive” Capacity of Crematorium Ovens	472
13. The Alleged Zyklon B Openings of Crematoria II And III.....	479
13.1. Van Pelt’s Conjectures.....	479
13.2. Daniel Keren, Jamie McCarthy, Harry W. Mazal.....	480
13.3. “Converging” Testimonies.....	486
14. Zyklon B.....	499
14.1. HCN Concentration in the Alleged Homicidal Gas Chambers.....	499
14.2. Zyklon B Deliveries to Auschwitz.....	503
14.3. Number of Potentially Gassed Victims.....	509
15. The Number of Victims.....	514
15.1. The Soviet Commission of Investigation.....	514
15.2. Nachman Blumental and Others	517
15.3. Revisions by Wellers and Piper	519
15.4. Piper’s Statistics.....	523

15.5. Significance and Value of Pressac's and F. Meyer's Revisions	535
15.6. The Four Million Propaganda Figure and the Reliability of Witnesses	538
Part Five: The Origin of the "Convergence of Independent Accounts"	541
16. Propaganda by Auschwitz Secret Resistance Movement	541
16.1. Forgotten Propaganda Stories	541
16.2. The Story of the Industrial Exploitation of Human Corpses	550
16.3. Birth of the Propaganda Story of Gas Chambers	552
16.4. Propaganda Takes Shape: Soviet, British, Polish Contributions	558
17. Genesis of "Knowledge" of the Auschwitz Gas Chambers	563
17.1. "War Refugee Board Report"	563
17.2. Justifications for Historical Falsifications	564
17.3. Origin of the Report and of the Drawing of Crematoria II and III	573
17.4. The Soviets and Majdanek: General Proof of Propaganda	577
17.5. Boris Polevoi's Article of February 2, 1945	581
17.6. The Polish Assessments and Investigations	583
17.7. The Witnesses Bendel, Nyiszli, Müller	593
17.8. The Lesser Witnesses	599
17.9. The Defendants of the Belsen Trial	607
18. Origin and Development of the Gas Chambers Story	613
18.1. Van Pelt's Historiographic Deficiencies	613
18.2. The Alleged "First Homicidal Gassing"	614
18.3. The Alleged Homicidal Gassings in Crematorium I	616
18.4. The Birkenau "Bunkers"	624
19. Van Pelt's Method	641
19.1. The Legend of the "Terrible Secret" of Auschwitz	641
19.2. Visits to Auschwitz by High-Ranking SS Officers	648
19.3. The Illusion of the "Convergence of Evidence"	658
Conclusion	669
Appendices	671
1. Glossary	671
2. Bureaucratic Structures	680
3. SS Ranks and U.S. Army Equivalentents	686
4. Documents	687
5. Abbreviations of Archives	734
6. Bibliography	735
7. Index of Names	750

Editors' Prologue

When faced with demands by Congressman Ron Paul to bring our (the U.S.'s) troops home from the various wars the United States are currently waging, Senator John McCain stated during a Republican Debate on CNN on Nov. 28, 2007:¹

"I just want to also say that Congressman Paul, I have heard him now in many debates talking about bringing our troops home and about the war in Iraq and how it's failed, and I want to tell you that that kind of isolationism, Sir, is what caused World War II. We allowed Hitler to come to power with that kind of attitude of isolationism and peace."

So what's the big deal, one might ask? Well, the real reasons for World War II can be found in the way the world ended World War I and how it treated democratic Germany between 1919 and 1933. The war was ended with the promise of free trade, ethnic self-determination, and disarmament for all – U.S. President Wilson's famous Fourteen Points.² Yet what followed was a 15 year lasting occupation, subjugation, plundering, humiliation, and forced one-sided disarmament of Germany and Austria only, whose people were denied any attempt at self-determination, frequently by use of force. What the world had been denying peaceful democratic Germany during all those years, it then conceded to National Socialism under Hitler, who had learned that the world would give Germany what was rightfully hers (and later more than that) only under the threat of violence.

That is not the point we want to make here, though. If we look into the war propaganda put forth by the U.S. before and during the wars against Serbia in 1999 and against Iraq in 1991 and 2003, plus when we look into how certain lobby groups have been pushing for a war against Iran over the past three years or so, we can see a pattern: Slobodan Milosevic, in 1999 leader of tiny Serbia, as well as Saddam Hussein and now Mahmoud Ahmadinejad are compared with – Adolf Hitler. Milosevic and Hussein were even accused of committing (or having committed) similar crimes of genocide – against the Kosovo Albanians here or the Kurds there. Hussein is even said to have used poison gas for that

¹ See www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Q9WzCrLuC4&feature=related

² See www.famousquotes.me.uk/speeches/Woodrow_Wilson/

purpose. These claims, among others, were used to justify the war. And there is no better justification for a war than to prevent a new Hitler – or a new threat to exterminate the Jewish people, an accusation currently leveled against Ahmadinejad.

We know today that the claims about weapons of mass destruction raised against Hussein were false. But they served their purpose well, because the world is so conditioned to react with automatic, Pavlovian style reflexes to such claims. One reason why these accusations work so well and why the world is so gullible to believe them, no matter how often they have been revealed to be wrong in the past, is because of that giant boogeyman called Hitler. Once his name is dropped and successfully put into the “right” context, there seems to be no stopping. War is the only solution to stop Hitler, Sloba-Hitler, Saddam-Hitler, Mahmoud-Hitler, or whatever their names may be.

Genocidal hysteria is today used to justify the wars of the U.S. and their allies, Israel being the most belligerent of them. Not that preventing genocide isn’t a worthwhile goal. It actually is, and in extreme cases maybe even by military intervention. But today genocide or the (real or fabricated) threat of it is attracting the U.S. government’s and military’s attention only if it is about either securing the almighty dollar, the free flow of goods (mostly oil), and – well, dare we say it? – the subjectively perceived security of Israel and its interests (which includes an aggressive expansionism into Palestinian lands). Genocide in Somalia, Congo or Darfur? Who cares...

It has come to the point where summoning the evil spirits of Adolf Hitler and “his” über-genocide – the holocaust – is the trump card needed to start just about any war the Powers That Be want to wage.

Wasn’t one of the primary lessons of the World Wars supposed to be that wars are evil? And wasn’t another lesson that governments use propaganda tricks to drive people into discriminating against minorities, into ethnic cleansing, into genocide, and into wars?

Presentations in today’s media frequently give the impression that World War II was fought to prevent or stop the holocaust, when in fact nothing could be further from the truth. In 1939 there was only one statesman who had proven to be a gargantuan mass murderer: Joseph Stalin. Yet instead of fighting him, the U.S. and Great Britain decided to gang up with Stalin in order to fight Hitler, who in 1939 may have caused the death of several hundred innocent people, but that was an

almost ridiculous amount, if compared to Stalin's peacetime(!) death toll of many millions of innocent souls.

Yet still, today's media, politicians, and even many scholars on the subject agree almost in unison that World War II really was a "good" war, where the good guys – the Allies – beat the bad guys – Hitler, plus the Japs as a collateral. But how can anyone seriously call the Allies "good guys," when Stalin was one of them, who, in addition to his pre-war massacres, was also responsible for innumerable atrocities during the war, for the ethnic cleansing of uncounted millions in Eastern Europe at war's end, and for the subjugating of some 20 nations afterwards?

Hence:

- World War II was NOT a good war!
- The good guys did NOT win that war, as there were no good guys!
- The holocaust was NOT the reason why it was fought.

And yet, after World War II the Powers That Be have been very successful in driving their people into one war after the other by referring to this "mother-of-all-wars." Pacifists are dumbfounded at how good those warmongers are in using the horrors of this greatest war ever to instigate even more wars. And so have some of us been for the past decade or so.

And then we eventually stumbled over holocaust revisionism or "holocaust denial," if you wish, and we suddenly knew why those warmongers are so good at it.

Mainstream media, politicians and academics depict holocaust revisionists as evil creatures trying to re-establish National Socialism, to prepare for another holocaust. As a consequence the world wages a constant war on holocaust revisionists, and this even includes the United Nations, which have passed a resolution against those wicked "deniers," urging all nations to take action against them.³ Those nations in turn pass laws to outlaw revisionist thoughts, to imprison the revisionists, to burn their books, and to ban their ideas from public fora. Every revisionist a little Hitler...

³ See United Nations, "Resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly on Holocaust denial," A/RES/61/255, 26 January 2007; www.un.org/holocaustremembrance/docs/res61.shtml; cf. United Nations, General Assembly, "General Assembly adopts resolution condemning any denial of holocaust," 26 January 2007; www.un.org/News/Press/docs//2007/ga10569.doc.htm; United Nations, "Ban calls on world to fight Holocaust denial, anti-Semitism and bigotry," 27 January 2009; www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=29679

But is that true?

As far as we have found out by now, it is not true. But do you know what? We don't care anymore.⁴ Because what we have come to understand is that the holocaust is the secret weapon of psychological warfare of the Powers That Be, which they use to expand and maintain their militaristic empire, to justify wars and subjugations, to foist their financial, economic and cultural system upon others against their will. Summon the evil ghosts of Hitler and the holocaust, and the world will blindly and defenselessly follow your war drums.

Against that, revisionism in general *is the key to peace*, where revisionism stands for: Be critical! Don't take for granted what those militant Powers want you to believe in justification of their deeds! Instead, look again (Latin: revidere) into their claims! Review their evidence! Revise your opinion, if needed. This definition of revisionism is the opposite of what those warmongers want you to believe, isn't it? And for a good reason: because they want to prevent with all means that we obtain and entertain a critical mind.

Holocaust revisionism is the most important one of those critical attitudes, as it is the key to understanding that governments have lied, are lying, and will always lie to us. And it is a key to understanding what modern "democratic" governments are willing to do in order to suppress ideas which threaten their nefarious ways.

The continual, annoying resorting to the holocaust theme as a means to justify war is the reason why we became skeptical and curious. And we have found out that we are not alone with that attitude. Famous British-Jewish musician and writer Gilad Atzmon, for instance, had a similar experience, as he has described on March 13, 2010, in an essay which wraps it all up nicely:⁵

"When I was young and naïve I regarded history as a serious academic matter. As I understood it, history had something to do with truth seeking, documents, chronology and facts. I was convinced that history aimed to convey a sensible account of the past

⁴ As far as we know, there are not much more active, publishing Holocaust revisionists in the world than there are fingers on one hand, with no money, no support, no media access. So what threat can they pose? What's the hubbub all about that even the U.N. feel urged to pass a resolution against them?

⁵ G. Atzmon, "Truth, History and Integrity," March 13, 2010; www.gilad.co.uk/writings/truth-history-and-integrity-by-gilad-atzmon.html; similar Daniel McGowan, <http://palestinethinktank.com/2009/09/25/daniel-mcgowan-what-does-holocaust-denial-really-mean/>

based on methodical research. [...] When I was young, I didn't think that history was a matter of political decisions or agreements between a rabid Zionist lobby and its favorite holocaust survivor. [...] When I was young and naive I was also somehow convinced that what they told us about our 'collective' Jewish past really happened. [...]

As it happened, it took me many years to understand that the holocaust, the core belief of the contemporary Jewish faith, was not at all an historical narrative, for historical narratives do not need the protection of the law and politicians. [...] It took me years to accept that the holocaust narrative, in its current form, doesn't make any historical sense. [...]

I think that 65 years after the liberation of Auschwitz, we must be entitled to start to ask the necessary questions. We should ask for some conclusive historical evidence and arguments rather than follow a religious narrative that is sustained by political pressure and laws. We should strip the holocaust of its Judeo-centric exceptional status and treat it as an historical chapter that belongs to a certain time and place.

[...] We should also ask, what purpose do the holocaust denial laws serve? What is the holocaust religion there to conceal? As long as we fail to ask questions, we will be subjected to Zionists and their Neocon agents' plots. We will continue killing in the name of Jewish suffering. We will maintain our complicity in Western imperialist crimes against humanity.

As devastating as it may be, at a certain moment in time, a horrible chapter was given an exceptionally meta-historical status. Its 'factuality' was sealed by draconian laws and its reasoning was secured by social and political settings. The holocaust became the new Western religion. Unfortunately, it is the most sinister religion known to man. It is a license to kill, to flatten, no nuke, to wipe, to rape, to loot and to ethnically cleanse. It made vengeance and revenge into a Western value. However, far more concerning is the fact that it robs humanity of its heritage, it is there to stop us from looking into our past with dignity. Holocaust religion robs humanity of its humanism. For the sake of peace and future generations, the holocaust must be stripped of its exceptional status immediately. It must be subjected to thorough historical scrutiny. Truth and truth seeking is an elementary human experience. It must prevail."

(In)famous political scientist Norman G. Finkelstein recently agreed to this when he stated in an interview to the 2009 documentary *Defamation* by Israeli documentary filmmaker Yoav Shamir.⁶

“The irony is that the Nazi holocaust has now become the main ideological weapon for launching wars of aggression. Every time you want to launch a war of aggression, drag in the Nazi holocaust.”

The most impressive thing about Shamir’s documentary, however, is that he lets his audience experience how young Jewish Israelis are being traumatized by holocaust “education,” which should better be called brainwashing, and how many Jews in the world, due to that kind of socialization, have become thoroughly paranoid about every single Gentile being a potential anti-Semite and about a new holocaust lurking behind every corner. This way many Jews have become prepared to do just about anything to protect themselves and their interests from both (rarely) real and (often) purely imaginary threats: ostracizing, stigmatizing, abusing, mistreating, harming, even killing Gentiles, if they stand in their way. What is all the suffering of gentiles compared to the holocaust anyway? Nothing. So why bother?

Although the holocaust – even the revisionist version of it, which is still filled with the horrors of persecution suffered by a religious minority – could be employed to worthwhile educational ends by teaching people to be tolerant toward individuals with other ethnic, cultural, religious, political, or philosophical backgrounds, it is actually misused to foster hatred and distrust among Jews against Gentiles in general and Germans (and in extension: Europeans and Christians) as well as Palestinians (and in extension: Arabs and Muslims) in particular. The “holocaust” of the current prevailing notion has created a paranoia among Jews and has thus become a mental ghetto of modern-day Jewry, forcefully separating it from the rest of the world. If Jewry wants to overcome this paranoia, it needs to break out of this ghetto.

Having had similar insights, we figured that the “holocaust” version forced down our throats for obvious political ends might not be kosher at all. Hence we started reading every scholarly book written about “holocaust deniers,” and written by them in order to make up our own minds.

⁶ See <http://wideeyecinema.com/?p=7208>, starting at 1 hr, 15 min., 46 seconds into the movie.

And now we have taken sides, because we think we've found the tools needed to blunt the war mongers' psychological wunder-weapon and to liberate Jewry from its modern ghetto: They are called Truth and Exactitude in writing history.

And we have found ample confirmation for what French mainstream historian Prof. Dr. Michel de Boüard stated in 1986 about the mainstream version of the holocaust (Lebailly 1988):

"The record is rotten to the core,"

which was confirmed fourteen years later by Jean-Claude Pressac, once the darling of the holocaust establishment:

"It is too late. [...] The current view of the world of the [National Socialist] camps, though triumphant, is doomed. What of it can be salvaged? Only little." (Igounet 2000, pp. 651f.)

Call us whatever you want – "anti-Semites," "neo-Nazis," or for some of us even "self-hating." Such hollow insults don't impress us anymore, after we have seen what revisionist scholars have to endure. Be that as it may. We will remain the pacifist that we have always been, and we will resist warmongers, be they imperialist, colonialist, nationalist, Zionist, Christian, Muslim, Jewish, anti-Revisionist, or what have you.

* * *

This is the second book of the *Holocaust Handbook Series* edited by us, after our predecessor Germar Rudolf was unlawfully arrested by the U.S. government in 2005 and deported to his native Germany, where he was subsequently put on trial and sentenced to a prison term for having edited this very series.⁷ What better proof do we need that this series must be important, as it is obviously considered dangerous by the Powers That Be?

This series can proudly claim to be the *only* one of its kind in the entire world which deserves the attributes "academic," "scholarly," and "scientific," because only such research can claim to be scientific which resists external pressures to come to certain conclusions. In that sense this series does a magnificent job indeed, as it is truly the only series of books on this topic that dares to withstand the massive pressures exerted by the Powers That Be.

Since the end-1990s, Prof. Dr. Robert Jan van Pelt has been the flagship of those Powers in defending the core of their myths, and hence in

⁷ Actually, the one volume summarizing the entire series: *Lectures on the Holocaust*.

justifying their imperialistic wars and shoring up their persecution of peaceful dissidents.

To underscore the statements made above, we will now quote Prof. van Pelt himself, the subject of this book. In 1999 van Pelt was preparing himself to confront British historian David Irving in court in an attempt to refute Irving's (partially) revisionist views. Irving himself got involved in revisionism after he had learned about the so-called *Leuchter Report*, which had been prepared in 1988 for a court case in Canada by Fred A. Leuchter Jr., then a specialist in the construction and maintenance of execution equipment. After Leuchter had inspected the respective facilities in Poland, he claimed in his report that the alleged homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz and Majdanek could not have functioned as such.⁸ Needless to say that this didn't exactly go down well with the Powers That Be.

To the rescue of the special interests of these Powers came brave Prof. van Pelt in the late 1990s, after other attempts at staving off revisionism had failed.⁹ When interviewed about revisionism in 1999, van Pelt stated the following:¹⁰

“Holocaust denial for me is so revolting, and the way for me not to immediately become sick with having to deal with Leuchter, was by saying, OK, I am going to map his journey.” [00:36:47-00:37:00]

This shows that van Pelt is obviously a person who is emotionally incapable of dealing objectively with dissenting opinions, as they make him physically sick. That alone is enough to render him unfit to act as an expert, though. But that wasn't all. Van Pelt continued:

“Auschwitz is like the holy of holies. I prepared years to go there and to have a fool [Leuchter] come in, come in completely unprepared, it's sacrilege. Somebody who walks into the holy of holies and doesn't give a damn.” [00:40:59-00:41:20]

For van Pelt and persons sharing his views, Auschwitz and the holocaust are thus not items of the real world, which can and ought to be scrutinized as every other item, but they have a religious, a sacred dimension and may therefore not be challenged. This, too, renders him inept to pose as an expert in the matters at hand. To this van Pelt added:

⁸ On the trial see Kulaszka; on Leuchter see Trombley; on his report see Leuchter et al.

⁹ Mainly those by J.-C. Pressac; re. his failure see Rudolf 2005.

¹⁰ Documentary video by Errol Morris, *Mr Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.*, Fourth Floor Productions, May 12, 1999; online i.a. at <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=654178281151939378#>; time given in [hr:min:sec]; for a transcript see www.errolmorris.com/film/mrd_transcript.html.

“Crematorium II is the most lethal building of Auschwitz. In the 2,500 square feet of this one room, more people lost their lives than any other place on this planet. 500,000 people were killed. If you would draw a map of human suffering, if you created a geography of atrocity, this would be the absolute center.” [00:55:44-00:56:15]

Hence, for van Pelt the holiest of places is at once the one representing the absolute center of evil. What kind of a religion is that which reveres symbols of absolute evil? Yet the pinnacle of van Pelt’s insight was yet to come:

“If the holocaust revisionists would be shown to be right, we would lose our sense about the Second World War, we would lose our sense about what democracy was. The Second World War was a moral war; it was a war between good and evil. And so if we take the core of this war, which is in fact Auschwitz, out of the picture, then everything else becomes unintelligible to us. We collectively end up in a madhouse.” [01:23:30 of original version¹¹]

Here you have it: World War II was a war of good against evil, a moral war; and the holocaust was at the core of that war.

As is intelligible to anyone only somewhat familiar with just a few basic facts about World War II, these statements are dead wrong. But people like van Pelt have made up their minds and their world view, and they even made their mental sanity depend on that myth. No wonder, then, that revisionism drives these people crazy.

How crazy it drives them can be seen from statements of some of the world’s leading holocaust peddlers. Haunted by the revisionist demands to show them or draw them a Nazi gas chamber, Elie Wiesel wrote in his memoirs (1994, p. 97):

“The gas chambers should better have stayed locked away from indiscreet gazes. And to the power of imagination.”

Claude Lanzmann, who is best known for his film *Shoah*, which is basically a concatenation of unscrutinized anecdotal statements,¹² expressed a similar irrational hostility toward more reliable kinds of evidence like documents or even material evidence:

“In Shoah there is no time spent on archival material because this is not the way I think and work, and besides, there isn’t any such material. [See! Told you!...] If I had found a film – a secret film, be-

¹¹ From Sundance version (Jan. 27, 1999); the revised VHS/DVD version has this passage excised.

¹² As book see Lanzmann 1985.

cause filming was forbidden – shot by the SS, in which it is shown how 3000 Jews – men, women, and children – die together, suffocated in the gas chamber of crematory 2 in Auschwitz, then not only would I not have shown it, I would have even destroyed it. I cannot say why. That happens on its own.” (*Le Monde*, March 3, 1994)

If you think that’s insane, then brace yourself for what is yet to come, because Prof. Dr. Robert Jan van Pelt has suggested during an interview with the Toronto newspaper *The Star*, published on Dec. 27, 2009,¹³ that the extant material traces of the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp, the site “where the murders happened,” should be left to be “reclaimed by nature.” Or in other words: he wants them to disappear. He stated that the material traces of the alleged crimes shouldn’t be preserved, because:

“To put the holocaust in some separate category and to demand that it be there – to demand that we have more material evidence – is actually us somehow giving in to the holocaust deniers by providing some sort of special evidence.”

As if the demand for material evidence for the alleged biggest slaughter in the history of mankind were anything special. Don’t we ask for material evidence for every single case of murder or manslaughter? Then why not here? And if the deliberate destruction (or should we say premeditated abandonment?) of evidence of an alleged crime is a crime in itself, then why not here?

But read this statement again, and then ask yourself: Do the revisionists demand *more* material evidence? More than *what*? In this same interview van Pelt himself had to admit the following:

“Ninety-nine percent of what we know we do not actually have the physical evidence to prove... it has become part of our inherited knowledge.”

Yet after having read the present book, it will be clear that the remaining one percent, which according to van Pelt is based on material evidence (including wartime documents), does not prove what van Pelt asserts. So it is more accurate to say: 100% of what is claimed about industrialized mass murder in gas chambers at Auschwitz is based on... “inherited knowledge,” or in plain English: nothing but hot air – which is, however, *contradicted* and thus *refuted* by all extant material and documentary evidence. Hence there is *no* physical or documentary evi-

¹³ www.thestar.com/news/insight/article/742965--a-case-for-letting-nature-take-back-auschwitz

dence at all for van Pelt's claims! There is therefore nothing special about asking for any kind of material evidence for an alleged crime, if nothing has been presented so far. *Not* demanding material evidence would put the holocaust into a "separate category" from all other historical or criminological claims. So the shoe is on the other foot.

However, revisionists are indeed perfectly happy with the existing material and documentary evidence, which points in but one direction, a different one than van Pelt wants it to, though. The revisionists don't need more evidence, and they don't ask for more. The case is clear for all open-minded persons to see. It is the exterminationists who need more, in fact *any* material and documentary evidence to support their case. It is *they* who ought to ask for more evidence.

* * *

Van Pelt has titled his anti-revisionist book *The Case for Auschwitz*. This implies that revisionists are making a case *against* Auschwitz, which is of course nonsense. But that kind of suggestive insinuation is typical for the obfuscatory, misleading attitude of the exterminationists. The revisionists, too, make a case *for* Auschwitz. It merely is a different Auschwitz than what van Pelt champions. It is an image of Auschwitz based on a consistent, conclusive, rational, judicious, sensible, and indeed sane analysis of the extant evidence. The revisionist case for Auschwitz is a case for sanity.

May this book be a beacon for sanity both in historiography and in society in general – by making the case against not just van Pelt's impending insanity, for we don't want him or anyone else to end up in a madhouse, do we?

May this book also contribute to the demise of the warmonger's pivotal myth, replacing it with *real history* instead.

Editorial Staff, Holocaust Handbook Series
May 17, 2010

Measurement Conversions

Since the author is European, he uses metric units throughout the book. Since some U.S. readers might find it difficult to imagine lengths, areas, volumes and weights given in metric units, a conversion list of the most common units is given below:

Mass

1 kg = 2.205 pounds

1 centner/Zentner = 50 kg = 110.25 pounds

1 ton = 1,000 kg = 2,205 pounds

Length

1 mm = 0.03937 inch

1 cm = 10 mm = 0.3937 inch

2.54 cm = 1 inch

30.48 cm = 1 ft

1 m = 100 cm = 1.094 yard

1 km = 1,000 m = 0.6214 miles

1.609 km = 1 mile

Area

1 m² = 10.76 sqft/ft²

Volume

1 cm³ = 1 ml(iter) = 0.001 liter = 0.03381 fl oz.

1 liter = 0.001 m³ = 1.057 quarts = 0.2642 gallons

1 m³ = 1.308 cyd/yd³ = 35.31 cft/ft³

Temperature

Increment: 1 °C = 1.8 °F

Conversion: °F = °C × 1.8 + 32

Pressure

10 mm of water column = 1 mbar = 0.0145 psi

For more detailed conversions please refer to Internet websites like convert-me.com

Author's Preface

Between January 11 and April 11, 2000, a lawsuit unfolded before the Royal Court of Justice in London as a result of David Irving having sued Deborah Lipstadt and the publishing house Penguin Books Ltd. for libel. It ended with the dismissal of the British historian's claims. Robert Jan van Pelt had been entrusted by the defense team with the preparation of an "expert opinion" which he presented in 1999. It became known as the "The Pelt Report."¹⁴ The author later rewrote it together with his affidavit for the appeal procedure,¹⁵ and in 2002 published it in the form of a book, *The Case for Auschwitz*, which became the new reference work of holocaust historiography in this field.

In doing so, van Pelt succeeded Jean-Claude Pressac who by that time had become an uncontrollable maverick dealing official historiography blow upon blow. Pressac was therefore sent into what might be labeled historiographic purgatory, half-way between the revisionists' hell and the paradise of the holocaust believers. This historiographic interdiction weighed upon him until he died on July 23, 2003, in the total silence of the media, which had previously praised him to the skies. The irony of fate would have it that on his death he was eulogized only by his erstwhile opponents.¹⁶

The post of the world-wide authority on Auschwitz had thus to be filled by a trustworthy person who would promote Pressac's purified theses without the latter's annoying spirit of criticism and bring about a new metaphysical vision of Auschwitz, immutable and definitive this time – van Pelt, in short.

"The Pelt Report" and the book which resulted from it constitute what is essentially a plundering of Pressac's work, but the man himself is never mentioned as the source of the arguments which van Pelt has usurped. The entire work rests upon two main pillars: the *corpus* of "criminal traces" assembled by Pressac and the testimonies of the witnesses, which center, in turn, on the declarations made by Henryk Tauber, a former detainee and member of the so-called *Sonderkommando* (see chapter 10). Van Pelt regards them as having "the highest evidentiary value" and makes Pressac's analysis of these declarations his own.

¹⁴ The report is available at: www.holocaustdenialontrial.org/en/trial/defense/van

¹⁵ The affidavit is available at: www.holocaust-history.org/irving-david/vanpelt/

¹⁶ Graf 2003, pp. 406-411; Mattogno 2003d, pp. 412-415, Countess, p. 413.

Van Pelt, however, has honed Tauber's significance, making him the mainstay of his argumentation, the measure of all sources to the point where he even uses his own documents to bolster the "plausibility" of Tauber's declarations. This is true as well for the other testimonies which gravitate around Tauber's statements for the sole purpose of "confirming" them.

It is easy to see why van Pelt does this. Tauber's testimonies have constituted the seemingly unassailable basis of holocaust historiography as far as cremations and homicidal gassings at Auschwitz are concerned – from 1945 to 1993, from Jan Sehn to Pressac. Pressac's own "criminal traces" rely tacitly or explicitly on Tauber's assertions and merely constitute, as it were, their (fictitious) documentary rendition.

Van Pelt's choice has another, more important motive: he had to deal with technical problems in the field of cremation and crematorium ovens with which he was entirely unfamiliar, and so he blindly followed Tauber's statements. By accepting the absurdities uttered by this witness, however, and by making them the basis of his own reasoning, van Pelt has engendered a chain reaction which leads to the self-destruction of his book.

The radical refutation of van Pelt's argumentation therefore requires three specific approaches: one concerning the "criminal traces," another concerning the cremations and crematorium ovens, and a third concerning Tauber's testimony. They will constitute the first, second, and third part of the present work, respectively.

Compared to Pressac, van Pelt has introduced a new method or rather a new designation for a method, the "convergence of evidence" – a method which Pressac had already utilized without giving it a specific name. It consists in the confrontation of allegedly independent documents and testimonies in an effort to show that everything "converges" on the thesis of an extermination. Part Four examines the practical application of this method by van Pelt and lays bare the serious technical and historical mistakes that flow from it. Part Five finally analyzes in detail the origins of the alleged convergence of testimonies.

In the section "Preface and Acknowledgment" of his book, thanking his supporters, van Pelt says (pp. XIII-XIV):

"Writing my rebuttal to Rudolf's affidavit, I was fortunate to have Green, Mazal, Keren, and McCarthy as partners in a daily conversation that quickly also included John Zimmerman, Kern Stern, Peter Maguire, and Stephen Prothero."

The present study will deal with a number of examples concerning the competence and intellectual honesty of some of these persons. Van Pelt also speaks with much self-assurance of the task he had in the Irving-Lipstadt trial (p. IX):

“It was my task, therefore, to help the defense barristers Richard Rampton, Heather Rogers, and Anthony Julius convince the judge that no serious historian who had considered the evidence would have serious cause to doubt that there were gas chambers at Auschwitz.”

This arrogant statement was refuted by Justice Gray himself in his sentence of April 11, 2000. On this subject, he writes in section 13.71:¹⁷

“I have to confess that, in common I suspect with most other people, I had supposed that the evidence of mass extermination of Jews in the gas chambers at Auschwitz was compelling. I have, however, set aside this preconception when assessing the evidence adduced by the parties in these proceedings.”

Unbelievably, this point of view was shared by van Pelt (p. 100):

“My first problem was rather straightforward: the evidence for Auschwitz was undoubtedly problematic.”

In section 13.73 he adds:¹⁷

“I recognise the force of many of Irving’s comments upon some of those categories. He is right to point out that the contemporaneous documents, such as drawings, plans, correspondence with contractors and the like, yield little clear evidence of the existence of gas chambers designed to kill humans. Such isolated references to the use of gas as are to be found amongst these documents can be explained by the need to fumigate clothes so as to reduce the incidence of diseases such as typhus. The quantities of Zyklon B delivered to the camp may arguably be explained by the need to fumigate clothes and other objects. It is also correct that one of the most compromising documents, namely Muller’s [recte: Bischoff’s] letter of 28 June 1943 setting out the number of cadavers capable of being burnt in the incinerators, has a number of curious features which raise the possibility that it is not authentic. In addition, the photographic evidence for the existence of chimneys protruding through the roof of morgue 1 at crematorium 2 is, I accept, hard to interpret.”

¹⁷ www.holocaustdenialontrial.org/ieindex.html sub “The Judgement,” § XIII.

In section 13.74, Gray accepts furthermore the value of several of Irving's arguments:¹⁷

“Similarly Irving had some valid comments to make about the various accounts given by survivors of the camp and by camp officials. Some of those accounts were given in evidence at the post-war trials. The possibility exists that some of these witnesses invented some or even all of the experiences which they describe. Irving suggested the possibility of cross-pollination, by which he meant the possibility that witnesses may have repeated and even embellished the (invented) accounts of other witnesses with the consequence that a corpus of false testimony is built up. Irving pointed out that parts of some of the accounts of some of the witnesses are obviously wrong or (like some of Olère's drawings) clearly exaggerated. He suggested various motives why witnesses might have given false accounts, such as greed and resentment (in the case of survivors) and fear and the wish to ingratiate themselves with their captors (in the case of camp officials). Van Pelt accepted that these possibilities exist. I agree.”

The justice's conviction with respect to the reality of the homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz derived solely from the presumed “convergence of evidence,” as he stated in section 13.78:¹⁷

“My conclusion is that the various categories of evidence do ‘converge’ in the manner suggested by the Defendants.”

This book constitutes the first complete and radical dismantling of the intrinsically false argumentative structure and of the spearhead of mainstream holocaust historiography about Auschwitz by demonstrating, on the one hand, that Pressac's “criminal traces” have no value as evidence and, on the other, by documenting the fact that van Pelt's “convergence of proof” is purely fictitious.

As against this, the present work furnishes a coherent and *actually* converging set of evidentiary elements which show that the holocaust thesis regarding the existence of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz is historically, documentarily and technically unfounded.