



Leaflets

These bite-size files are distillations of Institute for Historical Review positions on the topics they cover. Don't let their size fool you: there is a lot of food for thought here. (If you are not familiar with the Institute, or desire more information, check out "[A Few Facts About the IHR.](#)")

- [A Few Facts About the IHR](#)
- [A Look at The 'Powerful Jewish Lobby'](#) *New!*
- [Liberating America from Israel](#) *New!*
- [The 'Problem of the Gas Chambers'](#)
- [Auschwitz: Myths and Facts](#)
- [The Holocaust: Let's Hear Both sides](#)
- [The Liberation of the Camps](#)
- [What is 'Holocaust Denial'?](#)
- [Inside the Auschwitz 'Gas Chambers'](#)
- [The 'Jewish soap' myth](#)
- [The US Holocaust Memorial Museum](#)
- [Simon Wiesenthal: Bogus Nazi Hunter](#)
- [A Prominent False Witness: Elie Wiesel](#)



Institute for Historical Review

Leaflets

A Few Facts About the

Institute for Historical Review

P. O. Box 2739 -- Newport Beach, CA 92659 -- U.S.A.

<http://www.ihr.org>

Founded in 1978, the Institute for Historical Review is a public interest research, educational and publishing center dedicated to promoting greater public awareness of key chapters of history, especially twentieth century history, that have social-political relevance today. The IHR is non-ideological, non-political, and non-sectarian. It is recognized by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) not-for-profit, tax exempt educational and publishing enterprise.

The Institute's offices are located in Orange County, southern California. Mark Weber has been the IHR director since 1995. Its work is funded through sales of books and cassette tapes, subscriptions to its Journal of Historical Review, and donations from supporters around the world. In its day-to-day operations, the IHR employs its modest financial resources very cost-effectively. For every dollar it spends, the IHR's adversaries spend a hundred.

The IHR is at the center of a worldwide network of scholars and activists who are working -- sometimes at great personal sacrifice -- to separate historical fact from propaganda fiction.

Legally, the Institute operates as an entity of the "Legion for the Survival of Freedom" (LSF), a non-profit corporation founded in 1952 and controlled by a board of directors.

Devoted to truth and accuracy in history, the IHR continues the tradition of historical revisionism pioneered by distinguished historians such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, Charles Tansill, Paul Rassinier and William H. Chamberlin. The Institute's purpose is, in the words of Barnes, to "bring history into accord with the facts."

With growing support from across the United States and many foreign countries, the IHR works to bring sanity to America's foreign policy, to liberate people from pseudo-religious intimidation, and to uphold the First Amendment right of free speech. The IHR also works to tear down barriers to international peace and understanding by encouraging greater awareness of the root causes, nature and consequences of war. Nowhere is this work more important than here in the United States, where untold billions of dollars have been squandered in preparation for pointless wars and conflicts.

Growing Impact

Defying powerful adversaries, the Institute's impact continues to grow. While media coverage of the IHR is often hostile, the Institute and its work steadily receive ever more widespread and respectful attention. The Institute is now accepted, however grudgingly, as an established part of the American social-cultural landscape.

The IHR has been cited in every major American newspaper and magazine, and in many periodicals in Europe and the Middle East. Institute spokesmen have made numerous radio and television appearances, both in the US and abroad.

Millions of Americans were introduced to the IHR through a broadcast of CBS's "60 Minutes," one of the country's most widely viewed television shows. The front cover of an issue of the IHR Journal was also shown on screen.

Moreover, steadily growing numbers of scholars and educated lay persons -- across the United States and around the world -- rely on and support the IHR and its work.

The Holocaust Issue

Even though IHR books and IHR Journal articles have consistently dealt with a broad range of historical topics, certainly the best-known and most controversial aspect of the Institute's work has been its treatment of the Holocaust issue. For example, the Los Angeles Times (May 15, 1994) has described the IHR as a "revisionist think tank that critics call the 'spine of the international Holocaust denial movement'."

Although the Institute does not "deny the Holocaust," over the years it has published detailed books and numerous probing essays that call into question aspects of the orthodox Holocaust extermination story. IHR publications have devoted considerable attention to this issue because it plays such an enormously significant role in the cultural and political life of America and much of the world.

Opponents of the IHR, in their efforts to discredit and marginalize us, routinely mischaracterize the Institute as a "Holocaust denial" organization. This smear is completely at variance with the facts.

Around the world awareness is growing that the "Holocaust" campaign is a major weapon in the Jewish-Zionist arsenal, that it is used to justify otherwise unjustifiable Israeli policies, and serves as a powerful tool for blackmailing enormous sums of money from Americans and Europeans. Even a few courageous Jewish writers have spoken out against what they call the "Holocaust cult," the Holocaust "racket," "Holocaustomania," and the "Holocaust industry."

If the revisionist view of the Holocaust were really as simplistic and indefensible as some insist, it would not have gained the support of university professors such as Arthur Butz and Robert Faurisson, historians such as David Irving and Harry Elmer Barnes, former concentration camp inmates such as Paul Rassinier, and American gas chamber specialist Fred Leuchter. These individuals did not decide publicly to reject the orthodox Holocaust story -- thereby risking public censure, and worse -- because they are fools, or because their motives are evil, but rather on the basis of a sincere and thoughtful evaluation of the evidence.

Bigoted Attacks

Occasionally the Institute is denounced as a racist or fascist "hate group." This too is a baseless smear. Since its founding the IHR has steadfastly opposed bigotry of all kinds in its efforts to promote greater public understanding of history. It does not seek to whitewash any past regime or rehabilitate any ideology. The IHR is proud of the backing it has earned from people of the most diverse political views and racial and ethnic backgrounds.

At the 13th IHR Conference (May 2000), a featured speaker was John Sack, who is Jewish. A report by this veteran American journalist and author based on his participation in the three-day meeting appeared in the February 2001 issue of Esquire magazine. Rejecting the often-repeated lie that the IHR and the revisionists are "haters" or bigots, Sack described those who spoke at and attended the IHR conference as "affable, open-minded, intelligent [and] intellectual." He also affirmed that numerous revisionist arguments and findings are, indeed, true.

Far from being a fomentor of hate, the Institute has been a target of hate groups. During the 1980s, the Jewish Defense League -- identified by the FBI in 1985 as the second most active terrorist group in the United States -- repeatedly assaulted Institute offices and staff members. Following numerous death threats by telephone and mail, extensive property damage, five relatively minor fire bombings, one drive-by shooting and two physical assaults, the Institute's office-warehouse was destroyed in an arson attack on July 4, 1984. Estimated property loss was more than \$400,000, including tens of thousands of books, rare documents, irreplaceable files and expensive office equipment.

In addition, well-financed special interest groups seeking to curtail open discussion of vital historical issues have for years targeted the Institute, grossly misrepresenting its work and purpose. Prominent among these are the Simon Wiesenthal Center (Los Angeles) and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (New York) -- stridently partisan organizations with well documented records as staunch apologists for narrow Zionist-Jewish interests.

The Journal of Historical Review

The Institute's Journal of Historical Review -- the leading periodical of its kind in the world -- appears six times yearly in an attractive illustrated magazine format. More than 60 issues have appeared since it first began publication in 1980.

The IHR Journal, says best-selling British historian David Irving, "has an astounding record of fearlessly shattering the icons of those vested interests who hate and fear the truth. That is why I strongly endorse it, and suggest that every intelligent man and woman in America, Britain and the dominions subscribe."

In addition to individual scholars and discerning lay readers, leading university libraries and academic centers around the world subscribe.

More than 20 distinguished historians, educators and other scholars are members of the Journal's Editorial Advisory Committee. Journal contributors have included respected scholars from around the world.

Journal articles (along with IHR leaflets and other IHR materials) are frequently disseminated globally through the Internet, and are often reprinted, translated and circulated worldwide. Hundreds of Journal items can easily be downloaded from the IHR's well-organized web site.

Conferences

Since 1979, the IHR has held 13 conferences, presenting speakers from Europe, Asia, and Australia, as well as the United States. IHR speakers have included:

- John Toland, Pulitzer prize-winning American historian, and author of several best-selling works of history.
- John Sack, veteran journalist, war correspondent, historian and novelist. This Jewish-American writer is the author of nine non-fiction books.
- Dr. James J. Martin, an American historian with a 25-year career as an educator. Author of several meticulously researched historical studies. Contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Paul "Pete" McCloskey, former US Congressman (Rep.-Calf.). This US Marine Corps veteran braved enemy fire in Korea, opposed Richard Nixon on Capitol Hill, and spoke out against Israel's violations of US law and the deceit of the Israel-first Anti-Defamation League.
- David Irving, British historian and author of numerous bestselling works.
- Hideo Miki, retired professor at Japan's National Defense Academy and retired Lieutenant General of Japan's Self-Defense Forces.
- John Bennett, noted Australian civil liberties attorney and activist, and president of the Australian Civil Liberties Union.
- Fred Leuchter, America's foremost expert on execution hardware. Author of a widely discussed forensic report on the alleged extermination "gas chambers" at Auschwitz.

IHR Conference addresses are available on audio and video cassette.

Publishing and Outreach

A major task of the Institute is the publication of solid works of history. It brings long-neglected revisionist classics back

into print, and breaks fresh ground with professionally edited and attractively designed first editions of important new works.

Most IHR books can be found in major libraries around the world. One title alone has sold more than 50,000 copies. Several IHR titles have been published in foreign-language editions. In addition to its own titles, the IHR distributes scores of worthwhile books issued by other publishers. More than a hundred solidly researched books and dozens of compelling audio and video tapes are listed in our catalog.

Hundreds of thousands of leaflets from our popular introductory series have been sold and distributed. IHR speakers are available for meetings and radio and television appearances. Depending on availability of financial resources, the IHR also helps fund primary scholarly research of critical historical issues.

For Peace And Understanding

Bitter experience has taught us just how little we can trust politicians and governments, especially during wartime when official and semi-official propagandists are most busy deceiving the public. As American historian Harry Elmer Barnes put it: "Truth is always the first war casualty. The emotional disturbances and distortions in historical writing are greatest in wartime."

Powerful interests -- including politicians and the major media -- distort the historical record for self-serving reasons. Textbooks, motion pictures and television routinely present history in a slanted and partisan way. As George Orwell aptly noted in his classic *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past."

Americans have been misled into one costly, devastating, and needless war after another. During the Vietnam and 1991 Gulf Wars, for example, government officials and much of the media lied to and deceived the American people to justify needless slaughter and devastation.

As shrewd observers have long understood, history is written by the victors. This is particularly true with regard to the history of the Second World War. Routinely the origins and nature of that catastrophic conflict are deceitfully portrayed as a simplistic struggle between good and evil.

In seeking to replace ideologically-driven and emotion-charged portrayals with truth and fact, the Institute promotes historical awareness, understanding and mutual respect among nations. Artificially maintaining the hatreds and passions of the past prevents genuine reconciliation and lasting peace. As Barnes emphasized, historical revisionism is the key to just and lasting peace.

An awareness of real history provides understanding about the great issues of the present and the future. The work of the IHR in "blasting the historical blackout" (Barnes) is all the more relevant in this first decade of the 21st century.

In a world often saturated with historical lies and self-serving propaganda, the Institute for Historical Review stands as a precious bulwark and beacon.

Last updated: 11/2001



A Look at The 'Powerful Jewish Lobby'

by [Mark Weber](#)

For decades Israel has violated well established precepts of international law and defied numerous United Nations resolutions in its occupation of conquered lands, in extra-judicial killings, and in its repeated acts of military aggression.

Most of the world regards Israel's policies, and especially its oppression of Palestinians, as outrageous and criminal. This international consensus is reflected, for example, in numerous UN resolutions condemning Israel, which have been approved with overwhelming majorities.

"The whole world," United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan recently said, "is demanding that Israel withdraw [from occupied Palestinian territories]. I don't think the whole world ... can be wrong."[\[note 1\]](#)

Only in the United States do politicians and the media still fervently support Israel and its policies. For decades the US has provided Israel with crucial military, diplomatic and financial backing, including more than \$3 billion each year in aid.

Why is the U.S. the only remaining bastion of support for Israel?

Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa, who was awarded the 1984 Nobel Peace Prize, has candidly identified the reason: "The Israeli government is placed on a pedestal [in the US], and to criticize it is to be immediately dubbed anti-Semitic," he said. "People are scared in this country, to say wrong is wrong because the Jewish lobby is powerful -- very powerful."[\[note 2\]](#)

Bishop Tutu spoke the truth. Although Jews make up only about three percent of the US population, they wield immense power and influence -- vastly more than any other ethnic or religious group.

As Jewish author and political science professor Benjamin Ginsberg has pointed out:[\[note 3\]](#)

Since the 1960s, Jews have come to wield considerable influence in American economic, cultural, intellectual and political life. Jews played a central role in American finance during the 1980s, and they were among the chief beneficiaries of that decade's corporate mergers and reorganizations. Today, though barely two percent of the nation's population is Jewish, close to half its billionaires are Jews. The chief executive officers of the three major television networks and the four largest film studios are Jews, as are the owners of the nation's largest newspaper chain and the most influential single newspaper, the New York Times ... The role and influence of Jews in American politics is equally marked ...

Jews are only three percent of the nation's population and comprise eleven percent of what this study defines as the nation's elite. However, Jews constitute more than 25 percent of the elite journalists and publishers, more than 17 percent of the leaders of important voluntary and public interest organizations, and more than 15 percent of the top ranking civil servants.

Stephen Steinlight, former Director of National Affairs of the American Jewish Committee, similarly notes the "disproportionate political power" of Jews, which is "pound for pound the greatest of any ethnic/cultural group in America." He goes on to explain that "Jewish economic influence and power are disproportionately concentrated in Hollywood, television, and in the news industry."[\[note 4\]](#)

Two well-known Jewish writers, Seymour Lipset and Earl Raab, pointed out in their 1995 book, *Jews and the New American Scene*:[\[note 5\]](#)

During the last three decades Jews [in the United States] have made up 50 percent of the top two hundred intellectuals ... 20 percent of professors at the leading universities ... 40 percent of partners in the leading law firms in New York and Washington ... 59 percent of the directors, writers, and producers of the 50 top-grossing motion pictures from 1965 to 1982, and 58 percent of directors, writers, and producers in two or more primetime television series.

The influence of American Jewry in Washington, notes the Israeli daily *Jerusalem Post*, is "far disproportionate to the size of the community, Jewish leaders and U.S. officials acknowledge. But so is the amount of money they contribute to [election] campaigns." One member of the influential Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations "estimated Jews alone had contributed 50 percent of the funds for [President Bill] Clinton's 1996 re-election campaign."[\[note 6\]](#)

"It makes no sense at all to try to deny the reality of Jewish power and prominence in popular culture," acknowledges Michael Medved, a well-known Jewish author and film critic. "Any list of the most influential production executives at each of the major movie studios will produce a heavy majority of recognizably Jewish names."[\[note 7\]](#)

One person who has carefully studied this subject is Jonathan J. Goldberg, now editor of the influential Jewish community weekly *Forward*. In his 1996 book, *Jewish Power*, he wrote:[\[note 8\]](#)

In a few key sectors of the media, notably among Hollywood studio executives, Jews are so numerically dominant that calling these businesses Jewish-controlled is little more than a statistical observation ...

Hollywood at the end of the twentieth century is still an industry with a pronounced ethnic tinge. Virtually all the senior executives at the major studios are Jews. Writers, producers, and to a lesser degree directors are disproportionately Jewish -- one recent study showed the figure as high as 59 percent among top-grossing films.

The combined weight of so many Jews in one of America's most lucrative and important industries gives the Jews of Hollywood a great deal of political power. They are a major source of money for Democratic candidates.

Reflecting their role in the American media, Jews are routinely portrayed as high-minded, altruistic, trustworthy, compassionate, and deserving of sympathy and support. While millions of Americans readily accept such stereotyped imagery, not everyone is impressed. "I am very angry with some of the Jews," complained actor Marlon Brando during a 1996 interview. "They know perfectly well what their responsibilities are ... Hollywood is run by Jews. It's owned by Jews, and they should have a greater sensitivity about the issue of people who are suffering."[\[note 9\]](#)

A Well-Entrenched Factor

The intimidating power of the "Jewish lobby" is not a new phenomenon, but has long been an important factor in American life.

In 1941 Charles Lindbergh spoke about the danger of Jewish power in the media and government. The shy 39-year-old -- known around the world for his epic 1927 New York to Paris flight, the first solo trans-Atlantic crossing -- was addressing

7,000 people in Des Moines, Iowa, on September 11, 1941, about the dangers of US involvement in the war then raging in Europe. The three most important groups pressing America into war, he explained, were the British, the Jews, and the Roosevelt administration.

Of the Jews, he said: "Their greatest danger to this country lies in their large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio, and our government." Lindbergh went on:

... For reasons which are understandable from their viewpoint as they are inadvisable from ours, for reasons which are not American, [they] wish to involve us in the war. We cannot blame them for looking out for what they believe to be their own interests, but we must also look out for ours. We cannot allow the natural passions and prejudices of other peoples to lead our country to destruction.

In 1978, Jewish American scholar Alfred M. Lilienthal wrote in his detailed study, *The Zionist Connection*:[\[note 10\]](#)

How has the Zionist will been imposed on the American people?... It is the Jewish connection, the tribal solidarity among themselves and the amazing pull on non-Jews, that has molded this unprecedented power ... In the larger metropolitan areas, the Jewish-Zionist connection thoroughly pervades affluent financial, commercial, social, entertainment, and art circles.

As a result of the Jewish grip on the media, wrote Lilienthal, news coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict in American television, newspapers and magazines is relentlessly sympathetic to Israel. This is manifest, for example, in the misleading portrayal of Palestinian "terrorism." As Lilienthal put it: "One-sided reportage on terrorism, in which cause is never related to effect, was assured because the most effective component of the Jewish connection is probably that of media control."

One-Sided 'Holocaust' History

The Jewish hold on cultural and academic life has had a profound impact on how Americans look at the past. Nowhere is the well entrenched Judeocentric view of history more obvious than in the "Holocaust" media campaign, which focuses on the fate of Jews in Europe during World War II.

Israeli Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer, a professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, has remarked:[\[note 11\]](#)

Whether presented authentically or inauthentically, in accordance with the historical facts or in contradiction to them, with empathy and understanding or as monumental kitsch, the Holocaust has become a ruling symbol of our culture ... Hardly a month goes by without a new TV production, a new film, a new drama, new books, prose or poetry, dealing with the subject, and the flood is increasing rather than abating.

Non-Jewish suffering simply does not merit comparable attention. Overshadowed in the focus on Jewish victimization are, for example, the tens of millions of victims of America's World War II ally, Stalinist Russia, along with the tens of millions of victims of China's Maoist regime, as well as the 12 to 14 million Germans, victims of the flight and expulsion of 1944-1949, of whom some two million lost their lives.

The well-financed Holocaust media and "educational" campaign is crucially important to the interests of Israel. Paula Hyman, a professor of modern Jewish history at Yale University, has observed: "With regard to Israel, the Holocaust may be used to forestall political criticism and suppress debate; it reinforces the sense of Jews as an eternally beleaguered people who can rely for their defense only upon themselves. The invocation of the suffering endured by the Jews under the Nazis often takes the place of rational argument, and is expected to convince doubters of the legitimacy of current Israeli government policy."[\[note 12\]](#)

Norman Finkelstein, a Jewish scholar who has taught political science at City University of New York (Hunter College), says in his book, *The Holocaust Industry*, that "invoking The Holocaust" is "a ploy to delegitimize all criticism of

Jews."[\[note 13\]](#) "By conferring total blamelessness on Jews, the Holocaust dogma immunizes Israel and American Jewry from legitimate censure ... Organized Jewry has exploited the Nazi holocaust to deflect criticism of Israel's and its own morally indefensible policies." He writes of the brazen "shakedown" of Germany, Switzerland and other countries by Israel and organized Jewry "to extort billions of dollars." "The Holocaust," Finkelstein predicts, "may yet turn out to be the 'greatest robbery in the history of mankind'."

Jews in Israel feel free to act brutally against Arabs, writes Israeli journalist Ari Shavit, "believing with absolute certitude that now, with the White House, the Senate and much of the American media in our hands, the lives of others do not count as much as our own."[\[note 14\]](#)

Admiral Thomas Moorer, former Chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, has spoken with blunt exasperation about the Jewish-Israeli hold on the United States:[\[note 15\]](#)

I've never seen a President -- I don't care who he is -- stand up to them [the Israelis]. It just boggles the mind. They always get what they want. The Israelis know what is going on all the time. I got to the point where I wasn't writing anything down. If the American people understood what a grip those people have got on our government, they would rise up in arms. Our citizens certainly don't have any idea what goes on.

Today the danger is greater than ever. Israel and Jewish organizations, in collaboration with this country's pro-Zionist "amen corner," are prodding the United States -- the world's foremost military and economic power -- into new wars against Israel's enemies. As the French ambassador in London recently acknowledged, Israel -- which he called "that shitty little country" -- is a threat to world peace. "Why should the world be in danger of World War III because of those people?," he said.[\[note 16\]](#)

To sum up: Jews wield immense power and influence in the United States. The "Jewish lobby" is a decisive factor in US support for Israel. Jewish-Zionist interests are not identical to American interests. In fact, they often conflict.

As long as the "very powerful" Jewish lobby remains entrenched, there will be no end to the systematic Jewish distortion of current affairs and history, the Jewish-Zionist domination of the U.S. political system, Zionist oppression of Palestinians, the bloody conflict between Jews and non-Jews in the Middle East, and the Israeli threat to peace.

Notes

- [1.](#) Quoted in *Forward* (New York City), April 19, 2002, p. 11.
- [2.](#) D. Tutu, "Apartheid in the Holy Land," *The Guardian* (Britain), April 29, 2002.
- [3.](#) Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State* (University of Chicago, 1993), pp. 1, 103.
- [4.](#) S. Steinlight, "The Jewish Stake in America's Changing Demography: Reconsidering a Misguided Immigration Policy," *Center for Immigration Studies*, Nov. 2001. <http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back1301.html>
- [5.](#) Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, *Jews and the New American Scene* (Harvard Univ. Press, 1995), pp. 26-27.
- [6.](#) Janine Zacharia, "The Unofficial Ambassadors of the Jewish State," *The Jerusalem Post* (Israel), April 2, 2000. Reprinted in "Other Voices," June 2000, p. OV-4, a supplement to *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*.
- [7.](#) M. Medved, "Is Hollywood Too Jewish?," *Moment*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (1996), p. 37.
- [8.](#) Jonathan Jeremy Goldberg, *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment* (Addison-Wesley, 1996), pp. 280, 287-288. See also pp. 39-40, 290-291.
- [9.](#) Interview with Larry King, CNN network, April 5, 1996. "Brando Remarks," *Los Angeles Times*, April 8, 1996, p. F4 (OC). A short time later, Brando was obliged to apologize for his remarks.
- [10.](#) A. Lilienthal, *The Zionist Connection* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1978), pp. 206, 218, 219, 229.

11. From a 1992 lecture, published in: David Cesarani, ed., *The Final Solution: Origins and Implementation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 305, 306.
12. Paula E. Hyman, "New Debate on the Holocaust," *The New York Times Magazine*, Sept. 14, 1980, p. 79.
13. Norman G. Finkelstein, *The Holocaust Industry* (London, New York: Verso, 2000), pp. 130, 138, 139, 149.
14. *The New York Times*, May 27, 1996. Shavit is identified as a columnist for *Ha'aretz*, a Hebrew-language Israeli daily newspaper, "from which this article is adapted."
15. Interview with Moorer, Aug. 24, 1983. Quoted in: Paul Findley, *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby* (Lawrence Hill, 1984 and 1985), p. 161.
16. D. Davis, "French Envoy to UK: Israel Threatens World Peace," *Jerusalem Post*, Dec. 20, 2001. The French ambassador is Daniel Bernard.

6/02

About the author

Mark Weber is director of the Institute for Historical Review. He studied history at the University of Illinois (Chicago), the University of Munich, Portland State University and Indiana University (M.A., 1977). For nine years he served as editor of the IHR's *Journal of Historical Review*.

Send \$2 for a packet of literature and full listing of books. Or, order more copies of this leaflet, postpaid, at the following prices:

10 copies: \$2.00 — 50 copies: \$7.50
100 copies, or more: 10 cents each

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
Post Office Box 2739 · Newport Beach, California 92659

<http://www.ihr.org>

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



Liberating America From Israel

by [Paul Findley](#)

Nine-eleven would not have occurred if the U.S. government had refused to help Israel humiliate and destroy Palestinian society. Few express this conclusion publicly, but many believe it is the truth. I believe the catastrophe could have been prevented if any U.S. president during the past 35 years had had the courage and wisdom to suspend all U.S. aid until Israel withdrew from the Arab land seized in the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

The U.S. lobby for Israel is powerful and intimidating, but any determined president — even President Bush this very day — could prevail and win overwhelming public support for the suspension of aid by laying these facts before the American people:

Israel's present government, like its predecessors, is determined to annex the West Bank — biblical Judea and Samaria — so Israel will become Greater Israel. Ultra-Orthodox Jews, who maintain a powerful role in Israeli politics, believe the Jewish Messiah will not come until Greater Israel is a reality. Although a minority in Israel, they are committed, aggressive, and influential. Because of deep religious conviction, they are determined to prevent Palestinians from gaining statehood on any part of the West Bank.

In its violent assaults on Palestinians, Israel uses the pretext of eradicating terrorism, but its forces are actually engaged advancing the territorial expansion just cited. Under the guise of anti-terrorism, Israeli forces treat Palestinians worse than cattle. With due process nowhere to be found, hundreds are detained for long periods and most are tortured. Some are assassinated. Homes, orchards, and business places are destroyed. Entire cities are kept under intermittent curfew, some confinements lasting for weeks. Injured or ill Palestinians needing emergency medical care are routinely held at checkpoints for an hour or more. Many children are undernourished. The West Bank and Gaza have become giant concentration camps. None of this could have occurred without U.S. support. Perhaps Israeli officials believe life will become so unbearable that most Palestinians will eventually leave their ancestral homes.

Once beloved worldwide, the U.S. government finds itself reviled in most countries because it provides unconditional support of Israeli violations of the United Nations Charter, international law, and the precepts of all major religious faiths.

How did the American people get into this fix?

Nine-eleven had its principal origin 35 years ago when Israel's U.S. lobby began its unbroken success in stifling debate about the proper U.S. role in the Arab-Israeli conflict and effectively concealed from public awareness the fact that the U.S. government gives massive uncritical support to Israel.

Thanks to the suffocating influence of Israel's U.S. lobby, open discussion of the Arab-Israeli conflict has been non-existent in our government all these years. I have firsthand knowledge, because I was a member of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee in June 1967 when Israeli military forces took control of the Golan Heights, a part of Syria, as well as the Palestinian West Bank and Gaza. I continued as a member for 16 years, and to this day maintain a close watch on Congress.

For 35 years, not a word has been expressed in that committee or in either chamber of Congress that deserves to be called

debate on Middle East policy. No restrictive or limiting amendments on aid to Israel have been offered for 20 years, and none of the few offered in previous years received more than a handful of votes. On Capitol Hill, criticism of Israel, even in private conversation, is all but forbidden, treated as downright unpatriotic, if not anti-Semitic. The continued absence of free speech was assured when those few who spoke out — Senators Adlai Stevenson and Charles Percy, and Reps. Paul “Pete” McCloskey, Cynthia McKinney, Earl Hilliard, and myself — were defeated at the polls by candidates heavily financed by pro-Israel forces.

As a result, legislation dealing with the Middle East has been heavily biased in favor of Israel and against Palestinians and other Arabs year after year. Home constituencies, misled by news coverage equally lop-sided in Israel’s favor, remain largely unaware that Congress behaves as if it were a subcommittee of the Israeli parliament.

However, the bias is widely noted beyond America, where most news media candidly cover Israel’s conquest and generally excoriate America’s complicity and complacency. When President Bush welcomed Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, sometimes called the Butcher of Beirut, as “my dear friend” and “a man of peace” after Israeli forces, using U.S.-donated arms, completed their devastation of the West Bank last spring, worldwide anger against American policy reached the boiling point.

The fury should surprise no one who reads foreign newspapers or listens to BBC. In several televised statements long before 9/11, Osama bin Laden, believed by U.S. authorities to have masterminded 9/11, cited U.S. complicity in Israel’s destruction of Palestinian society as a principal complaint. Prominent foreigners, in and out of government, express their opposition to U.S. policies with unprecedented frequency and severity, especially since Bush announced his determination to make war against Iraq.

The lobby’s intimidation remains pervasive. It seems to reach every government center, and even houses of worship and revered institutions of higher learning. It is highly effective in silencing the many U.S. Jews who object to the lobby’s tactics and Israel’s brutality.

Nothing can justify 9/11. Those guilty deserve maximum punishment, but it makes sense for America to examine motivations promptly and as carefully as possible. Terrorism almost always arises from deeply-felt grievances. If they can be eradicated or eased, terrorist passions are certain to subside.

Today, a year after 9/11, President Bush has made no attempt to redress grievances, or even to identify them. In fact, he has made the scene far worse by supporting Israel’s religious war against Palestinians, an alliance that has intensified anti-American anger. He seems oblivious to the fact that nearly two billion people worldwide regard the plight of Palestinians as today’s most important foreign-policy challenge.

No one in authority will admit a calamitous reality that is skillfully shielded from the American people but clearly recognized by most of the world: America suffered 9/11 and its aftermath and may soon be at war with Iraq, mainly because U.S. policy in the Middle East is made in Israel, not in Washington.

Israel is a scofflaw nation and should be treated as such. Instead of helping Sharon intensify Palestinian misery, our president should suspend all aid until Israel ends its occupation of Arab land Israel seized in 1967. The suspension would force Sharon’s compliance or lead to his removal from office, as the Israeli electorate will not tolerate a prime minister who is at odds with the White House.

If Bush needs an additional reason for doing the right thing, he can justify the suspension as a matter of military necessity, an essential step in winning international support for his war on terrorism. He can cite a worthy precedent. When President Abraham Lincoln issued the proclamation that freed only the slaves in states that were then in rebellion, he made the restriction because of “military necessity.” If Bush suspends U.S. aid, he will liberate all Americans from long years of bondage to Israel’s misdeeds.

This essay is distributed as a public service by the Institute for Historical Review. Founded in 1978, the IHR is recognized by the US Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)(3) tax exempt, not-for-profit, educational and publishing enterprise. Donations to the IHR are tax deductible.

#2017 1/03

About the author

Paul Findley, a U.S. Congressional Representative from Illinois 1961-83, is the author of three books related to the Middle East, including *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby* (1985) and, most recently, *Silent No More: Confronting America's False Images of Islam*. He resides in Jacksonville, Illinois. This essay was issued on Sept. 12, 2002.

Send \$2 for a packet of literature and full listing of books. Order more copies of this leaflet, postpaid, at the following prices:

10 copies: \$2.00 — 50 copies: \$7.50
100 copies, or more: 10 cents each

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
Post Office Box 2739 · Newport Beach, California 92659

<http://www.ihr.org>

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



The 'Problem of the Gas Chambers'

by [Robert Faurisson](#)

The Tribunal shall not be bound by technical rules of evidence.

Article 19 of the Statutes of the International Military Tribunal
(in reality: the Inter-allied Military Tribunal) at Nuremberg

The Tribunal shall not require proof of facts of common knowledge, but shall take judicial notice thereof.

Article 21 of the Statutes

No one, not even those individuals who regard the Third Reich with nostalgia, denies the existence of concentration camps under Hitler. Everyone also recognizes that certain camps were equipped with crematory ovens: instead of being buried, the corpses were reduced to ashes. The repeated occurrence of epidemics made cremation necessary, especially for those who had died of typhus (see the photos of mass graves at Belsen et cetera). What is disputed by numerous French, British, American, and German authors is the existence of "extermination camps." This expression is used by historiographers to refer to those camps that were supposed to have been equipped with "gas chambers." Allegedly, these "gas chambers" were different from American gas chambers in that they were used to kill hundreds of men, women, and children at a time. Because the victims were chosen because of their race or religion, this is referred to as "genocide." The poison employed in this "genocide" is said to have been Zyklon B (a pesticide based upon prussic or hydrocyanic acid).

Those who contest the "genocide" claim and the existence of the "gas chambers" are called Revisionists. Their argument runs approximately as follows:

It suffices for both of these problems ("genocide" and "gas chambers") to apply the customary methods of historical criticism, to see that one is confronted here by two myths that are inseparable. The criminal intentions that are attributed to Hitler have never been proven. As far as the weapon for this crime is concerned, no one has actually seen it. Here one is confronted by an extraordinarily successful war and hate propaganda campaign. History is full of frauds of this kind, beginning with their religious fables of sorcery and witchcraft. What distinguishes our times from earlier epochs is the frightening power of the media and the propaganda ad nauseam which is made for what must be called "the hoax of the twentieth century." Let him beware who, after 30 years, gets the idea to expose this hoax. He will learn depending upon the situation through imprisonment, fines, assaults and insults. His career can be shattered or endangered. He will be denounced as a Nazi. Either his thesis will be ignored, or else it will be distorted. No country will be more unrelentingly ruthless toward him than Germany. 1

Today however, the silence is about to be broken about those men who have dared to write responsibly that Hitler's "gas chambers" (including those of Auschwitz and Majdanek) are only a historical lie. That is a great advance.

But what insults and distortions an Exterminationist historian such as Georges Wellers allowed himself when, more than ten years after Paul Rassinier's death, he decided to expose the minutest part of the arguments of this ex-inmate of a concentration camp who had had the courage to reveal the lie of the "gas chambers" in his writings!

The best way in which a historian may inform himself regarding the actual claims of the disciples of Paul Rassinier is to refer to the work of American professor Dr. Arthur R. Butz entitled *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. 2

For my part, I take the liberty of making only a few observations specifically for serious research-oriented historians.

I call their attention to a paradox. Although the "gas chambers" are, in the view of the official historians, absolutely central to a picture of the Nazi concentration camp system (and furthermore, as proof for the totally perverse and devilish character of the German concentration camps in comparison to all previous and more recent concentration camps it ought to be meticulously shown how the Nazis proceeded to invent, construct, and operate these fearsome human slaughterhouses), one must be thoroughly astonished that in the impressive bibliography of the concentration camp literature there is not a single book, not a single brochure, not a single article, on the "gas chambers" themselves. One must not be misled by some very promising titles; rather one must ascertain the contents of these writings for oneself. I regard as "official historical writing" those publications which are written about the concentration camps by institutions or foundations that are partly or wholly financed from public funds, such as, for example, in France, the Comité d'Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale (Committee for the History of the Second World War) and the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine (Jewish Contemporary Documentation Center), and in Germany (Munich), the Institut für Zeitgeschichte (Institute for Contemporary History).

One must wait until page 541 of the thesis by Olga Wormser-Migot on the system of Nazi concentration camps, before one finds a passage about the "gas chambers." However, for the reader there are still three other surprises:

1. The passage in question covers only three pages.
2. It carries the title: "The Problem of the Gas Chambers."
3. The "problem" consists of trying to determine whether the "gas chambers" at Ravensbrück (Germany) and Mauthausen (Austria) really existed; the author comes to the conclusion that they did not exist; however she does not examine here the "problem" of the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz or any of the other camps, probably because in her mind they do not present a "problem." [on page 157 of her book she says that Auschwitz I had no gas chamber.]

At this point, the reader probably wants to know why an analysis that concludes that "gas chambers" did not exist in certain camps is suddenly discontinued as soon as, for example, Auschwitz is discussed. Why, on one hand, is the critical spirit awakened, and then, on the other hand, is it allowed to collapse into lethargy? After all, as far as the "gas chamber" of Ravensbrück is concerned, we have many points of "evidence" and "undeniable eyewitness accounts," beginning with repeated and extensive eyewitness accounts by Marie-Claude Vaillant-Couturier or Germaine Tillion.

It gets even better. Several years after the war, before both British and French tribunals, the camp officials of Ravensbrück (Suhren, Schwarzhuber and Treite) repeatedly confessed to the existence of a "gas chamber" in their camp. They even vaguely described its operation. Eventually, those who did not commit suicide were executed because of this alleged "gas chamber." The same "confessions" were given prior to their deaths by Ziereis for Mauthausen (Austria) and by Kramer for Struthof-Natzweiler (Alsace).

Today, one can see the alleged "gas chamber" of Struthof-Natzweiler and in the same place one can also read the unbelievable "confession" of Kramer. This "gas chamber," which is designated as an "historical monument," is a complete fraud. The slightest amount of critical spirit will be sufficient to convince oneself that a gassing in this small room, without any sealing whatsoever, would have been a catastrophe for the executioner as well as for the people in the vicinity. In order to make this "gas chamber" (which is guaranteed to be "in its original condition") believable, someone has gone so far as to clumsily knock a hole into the thin wall with a chisel, and thereby break four tiles. The hole was so arranged that Josef Kramer would have dumped through it the mysterious "salts" (about which he could give no further details and which, when mixed with a little water, killed within one minute!). How could salts and water make such a gas? How could Kramer have prevented the gas from coming back out the hole? How could he see his victims from a hole which would have let him see

no more than half the room? How did he ventilate the room before opening the rudimentary door, made from rough-cut lumber? Perhaps one must ask the civil engineering firm in Saint-Michel sur-Meurthe (Vosges), which after the war altered the place which today is presented to visitors "in its original condition"?

Even long after the war, prelates, university professors, and some ordinary citizens gave eyewitness descriptions regarding the terrible reality of the "gas chambers" of Buchenwald and Dachau. With regard to Buchenwald, the "gas chamber" gradually disappeared from the minds of the people who had previously maintained that there was one in this camp.

Dachau

With regard to Dachau, the situation is different. After it had been firmly established for example by His Eminence Bishop Piguët, the bishop of Clermont-Ferrand that the "gas chamber" had been especially useful in gassing Polish priests,³ eventually the following official explanation came to pass:

This gas chamber, whose construction had been started in 1942, was still not completed in 1945 when the camp was liberated. No one could have been gassed in it.

The little room, which visitors are told is a "gas chamber," is in reality completely harmless and, while all sorts of construction plans are available for "Baracke X" (the crematorium and vicinity), one cannot determine upon what basis or technical explanation one can claim that this structure is an "unfinished gas chamber."

Broszat

No official historical institute has done more than the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich to make the myth of the "gas chambers" believable. Since 1972 its director has been Dr. Martin Broszat. As a member of this Institute since 1955, Dr. Broszat became famous as a result of his (partial!) publication in 1958 of the confessions that Rudolf Höss (former Commandant of Auschwitz) is supposed to have written in a communist prison before he was hanged. However, on 19 August 1960, this historian had to tell his amazed countrymen that there had never been mass gassings in the entire Old Reich (Germany's 1937 frontiers), but rather, only in a small number of selected places, especially in occupied Poland, including Auschwitz and Birkenau but not Majdanek. This startling news was given in a simple letter to the editor which was published in the weekly magazine *Die Zeit* (19 August 1960, page 16). The title was quite misleading and restrictive: Keine Vergasung in Dachau (No Gassing at Dachau) instead of Keine Massenvergasung im Altreich (No Mass Gassing in the Old Reich).⁴ In order to support this contention, Dr. Broszat provided not the slightest piece of evidence. Today [1978], eighteen years after his letter, neither he nor any of his colleagues has provided the slightest explanation for this affirmation. It would be highly interesting to learn:

1. How does Dr. Broszat know that "gas chambers" in the Old Reich were frauds?
2. How does he know that the "gas chambers" in Poland are genuine?
3. Why do the "proofs," the "certainties," and the "eyewitness accounts" concerning the concentration camps in the west suddenly have no value, while the "proofs," "certainties," and "eyewitness accounts" concerning the camps in Poland Communist territory still remain true?

As if by some tacit agreement, not a single recognized historian has raised these questions. How often in the "history of history" has one relied upon the claims of a single historian? ⁵

German Camps in Occupied Poland

Let us now examine the "gas chambers" in Poland.

For proof that the "gas chambers" in Belzec or Treblinka really existed, one is asked to rely essentially upon the statement of Kurt Gerstein. This document from a member of the SS, who allegedly committed suicide in 1945 in the prison of Cherche-

Midi in Paris, abounds with so many absurdities that in the eyes of historians it has for a long time already been thoroughly discredited.⁶ Furthermore, this statement has never been made public, not even in the documents of the Nuremberg tribunal, except in an unusable form (with truncations, falsifications, and rewritings). The actual document has never been available with its absurd appendices (French "draft" or the "supplements" in German).

Regarding Majdanek, a visit to the actual site is absolutely necessary. It is even more convincing than a visit to Struthof-Natzweiler, if that is possible. Over this question I will publish additional information.

With regard to Auschwitz and Birkenau, one must rely essentially on the "Memoirs" ⁷ of Rudolf Höss, which were prepared under the supervision of his Polish captors. At the actual site, one can only find a "reconstructed" room (Auschwitz I) and ruins (Auschwitz II or Birkenau).

An execution with gas has nothing to do with a suicidal or accidental suffocation. In the case of an execution, the executioner and his team must not be exposed to the slightest danger. For their executions, the Americans employ hydrocyanic acid in a sophisticated way, and that only in a small, hermetically-sealed chamber. Afterwards, the gas is exhausted from the chamber and neutralized.

For this reason, one must ask how, for example in the case of Auschwitz II or Birkenau, one could bring 2,000 people into a room measuring 210 square meters in area, and then in this highly crowded situation throw in the very strong pesticide Zyklon B, and then immediately after the deaths of the victims let a work crew without any gas masks enter the room in order to take out the bodies which had been thoroughly saturated with cyanide.

Two documents⁸ from the German industrial archives which were registered by the Americans at Nuremberg tell us that the Zyklon B had a strong tendency to adhere to surfaces and could not be removed from an ordinary room with a strong ventilator, but only by natural aeration for almost 24 hours. Additional documents may be found only at the site in the Auschwitz Museum archives, which were never described elsewhere, but which show that this room of 210 square meters, which is today in a dilapidated condition, was only a very simple mortuary, which (in order to protect it against heat) had been located underground, and which was provided with only a single door which served as both an entrance and an exit. ⁹

Concerning the crematoria of Auschwitz, there is just as there is generally for the entire camp an overabundance of documents and invoices down to the last penny. However, concerning the "gas chambers" there is nothing: no contract for construction, not even a study, nor an order for materials, nor a plan, nor an invoice, nor even a photograph. In a hundred war crimes trials, nothing of the sort was ever produced.

Christophersen

"I was in Auschwitz and I can assure you that there was no 'gas chamber' there." Only seldom does one hear defense witnesses with enough courage to pronounce this statement. They are persecuted in the courts. ¹⁰ Still today, everyone in Germany takes the risk that, if they give an eyewitness account in favor of Thies Christophersen (who wrote *The Auschwitz Lie*), they will be punished for "'defaming the memory of the deceased.'" ¹¹

Immediately after the war, the Germans, the International Red Cross and the Vatican (which was otherwise so expert as to whatever happened in Poland), as well as many others, declared in an embarrassed tone: "The 'gas chambers' we knew nothing about them!" Yes but I would put the question this way: "Can one know about things which did not even happen?"

There was not a single "gas chamber" in even one of the German concentration camps; that is the truth. The nonexistence of "gas chambers" should be regarded as welcome news; to hide this news in the future would be an injustice. Just as there is no attack upon a religion if one portrays "Fatima" as a fraud, the announcement that the "gas chambers" are an historical lie is no attack upon concentration camp survivors. One is merely doing one's duty being truthful.

Conclusions

After 30 years of research, revisionist authors have reached the following conclusions:

1. The Hitler "gas chambers" never existed.
2. The "genocide" (or "attempted genocide") of the Jews never took place. In other words: Hitler never gave an order nor permission that anyone should be killed because of his race or religion.
3. The alleged "gas chambers" and the alleged "genocide" are one and the same lie.
4. This lie, which is largely of Zionist origin, has made an enormous political and financial fraud possible, whose principal beneficiary is the state of Israel.
5. The principal victims of this fraud are the German people (but not the German rulers) and the entire Palestinian people.
6. The enormous power of the official information services has, thus far, had the effect of ensuring the success of the lie and of censoring the freedom of expression of those who have denounced the lie.
7. The participants in this lie know that its days are numbered. They distort the purpose and nature of the Revisionist research. They label as "resurgence of Nazism" or as "falsification of history" what is only a thoughtful and justified concern for historical truth.

Supplement

Two publications and an official intervention by the author:

1. A letter to *Historama*, Paris, November 1975, page 10, on the expression "N.N." Originally, these initials never meant *Nacht und Nebel* (Night and Fog), but *Nomen nescio* (Anonymous). In practice it meant that certain inmates would not be permitted to receive or send mail.
2. Segments of a letter to *Historia*, Paris, August 1977, page 132: "The Imposture of Genocide."
3. On 29 January 1978 at the *Colloque National de Lyon sur Eglises et Chrétiens de France dans la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale* (National Convention in Lyon on Churches and Christians of France during the Second World War) an intervention concerning the imposture of the "gas chambers" (see *Rivarol*, Paris, 16 February 1978, page 5).

Notes

1. Regarding the great number of vicious and insulting articles, there is a study by Hermann Langbein which appeared in *Le Monde Juif* (The Jewish World), April/June 1975. The title is "Coup d'oeil sur la littérature néo-nazie," ("A Glimpse at Neo-Nazi Literature"), pages 8-20. Hermann Langbein was an inmate in Auschwitz. He testified at countless trials. He holds an important position in the circles of former concentration camp inmates. One of his most recent works is entitled: *Hommes et Femmes à Auschwitz* (Men and Women of Auschwitz), Paris, Fayard, 1975, VIII-529 pages (Translated from *Menschen in Auschwitz*, Vienna, 1974.) Not one of the 30 chapters, not one of the 268 sections of this book is devoted to the "gas chambers"! Rather, one constantly sees expressions such as "selection for the gas chambers" etc. There is also a study by Georges Wellers which appeared in *Le Monde Juif* (op. cit.) April/June 1977. The title is "La 'Solution finale', de la question juive et la mythomanie néo-nazie" ("The 'Final Solution' and Neo-Nazi Mythomania,"), pages 41-84. There is also a study by Ino Arndt and Wolfgang Scheffler in *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte* (Quarterly Review for Contemporary History), which is a publication of the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich. The Institute's director is currently Dr. Martin Broszat. This study was published in the issue of April 1976. The title is: "Organisierter Massenmord an Juden in NS-Vernichtungslagern" (Organized Mass-Murder of Jews in Nazi Extermination Camps), pages 105-135.
2. *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Newport Beach, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1979.
3. *Prison et Déportation* (Prison and Deportation). Paris: Spes; 1947; page 77.
4. Broszat's letter is reproduced in facsimile (with its English translation) in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May/June 1993, page 12.
5. The famed Simon Wiesenthal has also admitted that "there were no extermination camps on German soil" in a letter to the editor of *Books and Bookmen*, page 5, April 1975. Although he later wrote in a letter dated 12 May 1986 to Professor John George of Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma, that he "could never have said such a thing," Wiesenthal reconfirmed his earlier statement in a letter to the editor published on page 14 of the *European editor of Stars and Stripes* dated 24 January 1993. This letter is reproduced in facsimile in *The Journal for Historical*

Review, May/June 1993, page 10.

6. See the opinion expressed by the forensic pathologist as it is reported by the Exterminationist Pierre Joffroy in his book about Kurt Gerstein: *L'Espion de Dieu/La Passion de Kurt Gerstein* (The Spy of God/The Passion of Kurt Gerstein), Paris, Grasset, 1969, page 262.
7. *Kommandant in Auschwitz/Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen* (Commandant of Auschwitz/Autobiographical Memoirs) by Rudolf Höss, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1958, 184p; introduction and commentary by Dr. Martin Broszat. Concerning "gassing," see pages 126 and 166. The entry of the work crew into the "gas chamber" is supposed to happen "sofort" ("immediately") as it is written on page 166.
8. These two extensive documents which are of great importance were apparently not used at the trials of Gerhard Peters, former director of Degesch. They were registered as documents NI-9098 and NI-9912. They irrevocably reduce to nothing the "eyewitness testimony" of Höss regarding the "gas chambers."
9. Photographs Neg. 6228 and following.
10. Case of Wilhelm Stäglich, for example. See Stäglich in the Index Nominum of Butz's book (op. cit.).
11. *Die Auschwitz-Lüge* (The Auschwitz Lie), #23 of *Kritik* (2341 Kälberhagen, Post Mohrkirch, West Germany), 1974. This booklet was followed by *Der Auschwitz-Betrug/Das Echo auf die Auschwitz-Lüge* (The Auschwitz Fraud/The Echo of the Auschwitz Lie.).

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



Auschwitz: Myths and facts

by [Mark Weber](#)

Nearly everyone has heard of Auschwitz, the German wartime concentration camp where many prisoners -- most of them Jewish -- were reportedly exterminated, especially in gas chambers. Auschwitz is widely regarded as the most terrible Nazi extermination center. The camp's horrific reputation cannot, however, be reconciled with the facts.

Scholars challenge Holocaust story

Astonishing as it may seem, more and more historians and engineers have been challenging the widely accepted Auschwitz story. These "revisionist" scholars do not dispute the fact that large numbers of Jews were deported to the camp, or that many died there, particularly of typhus and other diseases. But the compelling evidence they present shows that Auschwitz was not an extermination center and that the story of mass killings in "gas chambers" is a myth.

The Auschwitz camps

The Auschwitz camp complex was set up in 1940 in what is now south-central Poland. Large numbers of Jews were deported there between 1942 and mid-1944.

The main camp was known as Auschwitz I. Birkenau, or Auschwitz II, was supposedly the main extermination center, and Monowitz, or Auschwitz III, was a large industrial center where gasoline was produced from coal. In addition there were dozens of smaller satellite camps devoted to the war economy.

Four million victims?

At the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal, the Allies charged that the Germans exterminated four million people at Auschwitz. This figure, which was invented by the Soviets, was uncritically accepted for many years. It often appeared in major American newspapers and magazines, for example. (note 1)

Today no reputable historian, not even those who generally accept the extermination story, believes this figure. Israeli Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer said in 1989 that it is time to finally acknowledge the familiar four million figure is a deliberate myth. In July 1990 the Auschwitz State Museum in Poland, along with Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust Center, suddenly announced that altogether perhaps one million people (both Jews and non-Jews) died there. Neither institution would say how many of these people were killed, nor were any estimates given of the numbers of those supposedly gassed. (note 2) One prominent Holocaust historian, Gerald Reitlinger, has estimated that perhaps 700,000 or so Jews perished at Auschwitz. More recently, Holocaust historian Jean-Claude Pressac has estimated that about 800,000 persons -- of whom 630,000 were Jewish -- perished at Auschwitz. While even such lower figures are incorrect, they show how the Auschwitz story has changed drastically over the years. (note 3)

Bizarre tales

At one time it was seriously claimed that Jews were systematically electrocuted at Auschwitz. American newspapers, citing a Soviet eyewitness report from liberated Auschwitz, told readers in February 1945 that the methodical Germans had killed Jews there using an "electric conveyor belt on which hundreds of persons could be electrocuted simultaneously [and] then moved on into furnaces. They were burned almost instantly, producing fertilizer for nearby cabbage fields." (note 4)

And at the Nuremberg Tribunal, chief U.S. prosecutor Robert Jackson charged that the Germans used a "newly invented" device to instantaneously "vaporize" 20,000 Jews near Auschwitz "in such a way that there was no trace left of them." (note 5) No reputable historian now accepts either of these fanciful tales.

The Höss 'confession'

A key Holocaust document is the "confession" of former Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss of April 5, 1946, which was submitted by the U.S. prosecution at the main Nuremberg trial. (note 6)

Although it is still widely cited as solid proof for the Auschwitz extermination story, it is actually a false statement that was obtained by torture.

Many years after the war, British military intelligence sergeant Bernard Clarke described how he and five other British soldiers tortured the former commandant to obtain his "confession." Höss himself privately explained his ordeal in these words: "Certainly, I signed a statement that I killed two and half million Jews. I could just as well have said that it was five million Jews. There are certain methods by which any confession can be obtained, whether it is true or not." (note 7)

Even historians who generally accept the Holocaust extermination story now acknowledge that many of the specific statements made in the Höss "affidavit" are simply not true. For one thing, no serious scholar now claims that anything like two and a half or three million people perished in Auschwitz.

The Höss "affidavit" further alleges that Jews were already being exterminated by gas in the summer of 1941 at three other camps: Belzec, Treblinka and Wolzek. The "Wolzek" camp mentioned by Höss is a total invention. No such camp existed, and the name is no longer mentioned in Holocaust literature. Moreover, the story these days by those who believe in the Holocaust legend is that gassings of Jews did not begin at Auschwitz, Treblinka, or Belzec until sometime in 1942.

No documentary evidence

Many thousands of secret German documents dealing with Auschwitz were confiscated after the war by the Allies. Not a single one refers to a policy or program of extermination. In fact, the extermination story cannot be reconciled with the documentary evidence.

Many Jewish inmates unable to work

For example, it is often claimed that all Jews at Auschwitz who were unable to work were immediately killed. Jews who were too old, young, sick, or weak were supposedly gassed on arrival, and only those who could be worked to death were temporarily kept alive.

But the evidence shows that, in fact, a very high percentage of the Jewish inmates were not able to work, and were nevertheless not killed. For example, an internal German telex message dated Sept. 4, 1943, from the chief of the Labor Allocation department of the SS Economic and Administrative Main Office (WVHA), reported that of 25,000 Jewish inmates in Auschwitz, only 3,581 were able to work, and that all of the remaining Jewish inmates -- some 21,500, or about 86 percent -- were unable to work. (note 8)

This is also confirmed in a secret report dated April 5, 1944, on "security measures in Auschwitz" by Oswald Pohl, head of the SS concentration camp system, to SS chief Heinrich Himmler. Pohl reported that there was a total of 67,000 inmates in

the entire Auschwitz camp complex, of whom 18,000 were hospitalized or disabled. In the Auschwitz II camp (Birkenau), supposedly the main extermination center, there were 36,000 inmates, mostly female, of whom "approximately 15,000 are unable to work." (note 9)

These two documents simply cannot be reconciled with the Auschwitz extermination story.

The evidence shows that Auschwitz-Birkenau was established primarily as a camp for Jews who were not able to work, including the sick and elderly, as well as for those who were temporarily awaiting assignment to other camps. That's the considered view of Dr. Arthur Butz of Northwestern University, who also says that this was the reason for the unusually high death rate there. (note 10)

Princeton University history professor Arno Mayer, who is Jewish, acknowledges in a recent book about the "final solution" that more Jews perished at Auschwitz as a result of typhus and other "natural" causes than were executed. (note 11)

Anne Frank

Perhaps the best known Auschwitz inmate was Anne Frank, who is known around the world for her famous diary. But few people know that thousands of Jews, including Anne and her father, Otto Frank, "survived" Auschwitz.

The 15-year-old girl and her father were deported from the Netherlands to Auschwitz in September 1944. Several weeks later, in the face of the advancing Soviet army, Anne was evacuated along with many other Jews to the Bergen-Belsen camp, where she died of typhus in March 1945.

Her father came down with typhus in Auschwitz and was sent to the camp hospital to recover. He was one of thousands of sick and feeble Jews who were left behind when the Germans abandoned the camp in January 1945, shortly before it was overrun by the Soviets. He died in Switzerland in 1980.

If the German policy had been to kill Anne Frank and her father, they would not have survived Auschwitz. Their fate, tragic though it was, cannot be reconciled with the extermination story.

Allied propaganda

The Auschwitz gassing story is based in large part on the hearsay statements of former Jewish inmates who did not personally see any evidence of extermination. Their beliefs are understandable, because rumors about gasings at Auschwitz were widespread.

Allied planes dropped large numbers of leaflets, written in Polish and German, on Auschwitz and the surrounding areas which claimed that people were being gassed in the camp. The Auschwitz gassing story, which was an important part of the Allied wartime propaganda effort, was also broadcast to Europe by Allied radio stations. (note 12)

Survivor testimony

Former inmates have confirmed that they saw no evidence of extermination at Auschwitz.

An Austrian woman, Maria Vanherwaarden, testified about her camp experiences in a Toronto District Court in March 1988. She was interned in Auschwitz-Birkenau in 1942 for having sexual relations with a Polish forced laborer. On the train trip to the camp, a Gypsy woman told her and the others that they would all be gassed at Auschwitz.

Upon arrival, Maria and the other women were ordered to undress and go into a large concrete room without windows to take a shower. The terrified women were sure that they were about to die. But then, instead of gas, water came out of the

shower heads.

Auschwitz was no vacation center, Maria confirmed. She witnessed the death of many fellow inmates by disease, particularly typhus, and quite a few committed suicide. But she saw no evidence at all of mass killings, gassings, or of any extermination program. (note 13)

A Jewish woman named Marika Frank arrived at Auschwitz-Birkenau from Hungary in July 1944, when 25,000 Jews were supposedly gassed and cremated daily. She likewise testified after the war that she heard and saw nothing of "gas chambers" during the time she was interned there. She heard the gassing stories only later. (note 14)

Inmates released

Auschwitz internees who had served their sentences were released and returned to their home countries. If Auschwitz had actually been a top secret extermination center, the Germans would certainly not have released inmates who "knew" what was happening in the camp. (note 15)

Himmler orders death rate reduced

In response to the deaths of many inmates due to disease, especially typhus, the German authorities responsible for the camps ordered firm counter-measures.

The head of the SS camp administration office sent a directive dated Dec. 28, 1942, to Auschwitz and the other concentration camps. It sharply criticized the high death rate of inmates due to disease, and ordered that "camp physicians must use all means at their disposal to significantly reduce the death rate in the various camps." Furthermore, it ordered:

The camp doctors must supervise more often than in the past the nutrition of the prisoners and, in cooperation with the administration, submit improvement recommendations to the camp commandants ... The camp doctors are to see to it that the working conditions at the various labor places are improved as much as possible.

Finally, the directive stressed that "the Reichsführer SS [Heinrich Himmler] has ordered that the death rate absolutely must be reduced." (note 16)

German camp regulations

Official German camp regulations make clear that Auschwitz was not an extermination center. They ordered: (note 17)

New arrivals in the camp are to be given a thorough medical examination, and if there is any doubt [about their health], they must be sent to quarantine for observation.

Prisoners who report sick must be examined that same day by the camp physician. If necessary, the physician must transfer the prisoners to a hospital for professional treatment.

The camp physician must regularly inspect the kitchen regarding the preparation of the food and the quality of the food supply. Any deficiencies that may arise must be reported to the camp commandant.

Special care should be given in the treatment of accidents, in order not to impair the full productivity of the prisoners.

Prisoners who are to be released or transferred must first be brought before the camp physician for medical

examination.

Telltale aerial photos

Detailed aerial reconnaissance photographs taken of Auschwitz-Birkenau on several random days in 1944 (during the height of the alleged extermination period there) were made public by the CIA in 1979. These photos show no trace of piles of corpses, smoking crematory chimneys or masses of Jews awaiting death, things that have been repeatedly alleged, and all of which would have been clearly visible if Auschwitz had been the extermination center it is said to have been. (note 18)

Absurd cremation claims

Cremation specialists have confirmed that thousands of corpses could not possibly have been cremated every day throughout the spring and summer of 1944 at Auschwitz, as commonly alleged.

For example, Mr. Ivan Lagace, manager of a large crematory in Calgary, Canada, testified in court in April 1988 that the Auschwitz cremation story is technically impossible. The allegation that 10,000 or even 20,000 corpses were burned every day at Auschwitz in the summer of 1944 in crematories and open pits is simply "preposterous" and "beyond the realm of reality," he declared under oath. (note 19)

Gassing expert refutes extermination story

America's leading gas chamber expert, Boston engineer Fred A. Leuchter, carefully examined the supposed "gas chambers" in Poland and concluded that the Auschwitz gassing story is absurd and technically impossible.

Leuchter is the foremost specialist on the design and installation of gas chambers used in the United States to execute convicted criminals. For example, he designed a gas chamber facility for the Missouri state penitentiary.

In February 1988 he carried out a detailed onsite examination of the "gas chambers" at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek in Poland, which are either still standing or only partially in ruins. In sworn testimony to a Toronto court and in a technical report, Leuchter described every aspect of his investigation.

He concluded by emphatically declaring that the alleged gassing facilities could not possibly have been used to kill people. Among other things, he pointed out that the so-called "gas chambers" were not properly sealed or vented to kill human beings without also killing German camp personnel. (note 20)

Dr. William B. Lindsey, a research chemist employed for 33 years by the Dupont Corporation, likewise testified in a 1985 court case that the Auschwitz gassing story is technically impossible. Based on a careful on-site examination of the "gas chambers" at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, and on his years of experience, he declared: "I have come to the conclusion that no one was willfully or purposefully killed with Zyklon B [hydrocyanic acid gas] in this manner. I consider it absolutely impossible." (note 21)

Notes

1. Nuremberg document 008-USSR. IMT blue series, Vol. 39, pp. 241, 261.; NC and A red series, vol. 1, p. 35.; C.L. Sulzberger, "Oswiecim Killings Placed at 4,000,000," *New York Times*, May 8, 1945, and, *New York Times*, Jan. 31, 1986, p. A4.
2. Y. Bauer, "Fighting the Distortions," *Jerusalem Post* (Israel), Sept. 22, 1989; "Auschwitz Deaths Reduced to a Million," *Daily Telegraph* (London), July 17, 1990; "Poland Reduces Auschwitz Death Toll Estimate to 1 Million," *The Washington Times*, July 17, 1990.
3. G. Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (1971); J.-C. Pressac, *Le Crématoires d'Auschwitz: La Machinerie du meurtre de*

- mass* (Paris: CNRS, 1993). On Pressac's estimates, see: *L'Express* (France), Sept. 30, 1993, p. 33.
4. *Washington (DC) Daily News*, Feb. 2, 1945, pp. 2, 35. (United Press dispatch from Moscow).
 5. IMT blue series, Vol. 16, p. 529-530. (June 21, 1946).
 6. Nuremberg document 3868-PS (USA-819). IMT blue series, Vol. 33, pp. 275-279.
 7. Rupert Butler, *Legions of Death* (England: 1983), pp. 235; R. Faurisson, *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-87, pp. 389-403.
 8. Archives of the Jewish Historical Institute of Warsaw, German document No. 128, in: H. Eschwege, ed., *Kennzeichen J* (East Berlin: 1966), p. 264.
 9. Nuremberg document NO-021. NMT green series, Vol. 5. pp. 384-385.
 10. Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Costa Mesa, Calif.), p. 124.
 11. Arno Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The 'Final Solution' in History* (Pantheon, 1989), p. 365.
 12. Nuremberg document NI-11696. NMT green series, Vol. 8, p. 606.
 13. Testimony in Toronto District Court, March 28, 1988. *Toronto Star*, March 29, 1988, p. A2.
 14. Sylvia Rothchild, ed., *Voices from the Holocaust* (New York: 1981), pp. 188-191.
 15. Walter Laqueur, *The Terrible Secret* (Boston: 1981), p. 169.
 16. Nuremberg document PS-2171, Annex 2. NC&A red series, Vol. 4, pp. 833-834.
 17. "Rules and Regulations for the Concentration Camps." Anthology, *Inhuman Medicine*, Vol. 1, Part 1 (Warsaw: International Auschwitz Committee, 1970), pp. 149-151.; S. Paskuly, ed., *Death Dealer: the Memoirs of the SS Kommandant at Auschwitz* (Buffalo: 1992), pp. 216-217.
 18. Dino A. Brugioni and Robert C. Poirier, *The Holocaust Revisited* (Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 1979).
 19. *Canadian Jewish News* (Toronto), April 14, 1988, p. 6.
 20. *The Leuchter Report: An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek* (Toronto: 1988). Available for \$17.00, postpaid, from the IHR.
 21. *The Globe and Mail* (Toronto), Feb. 12, 1985, p. M3

Summary

The Auschwitz extermination story originated as wartime propaganda. Now, more than 40 years after the end of the Second World War, it is time to take another, more objective look at this highly polemicized chapter of history. The Auschwitz legend is the core of the Holocaust story. If hundreds of thousands of Jews were not systematically killed there, as alleged, one of the great myths of our time collapses.

Artificially maintaining the hatreds and passions of the past prevents genuine reconciliation and lasting peace. Revisionism promotes historical awareness and international understanding. That is why the work of the Institute for Historical Review is so important and deserves your support.

About the author:

Mark Weber is editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*, published six times yearly by the Institute for Historical Review. He studied history at the University of Illinois (Chicago), the University of Munich, Portland State University, and Indiana University (M.A., 1977). For five days in March 1988, he testified as a recognized expert witness on the "final solution" and the Holocaust issue in a Toronto District Court case. He is the author of many published articles, reviews and essays on various aspects of modern European history. Weber has appeared as a guest on numerous radio talk shows, and on the nationally-syndicated "Montel Williams" television show.

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



The Holocaust: Let's hear both sides

by [Mark Weber](#)

Nearly everyone has heard that the Germans killed some six million Jews in Europe during the Second World War. American television, motion pictures, newspapers and magazines hammer away on this theme. In Washington, DC, an enormous official Holocaust Museum has been built.

Scholars Challenge Holocaust Story

During the past decade, though, more and more "revisionist" historians, including respected scholars such as Dr. Arthur Butz of Northwestern University, Prof. Robert Faurisson of the University of Lyon in France and best-selling British historian David Irving, have been challenging the widely-accepted extermination story.

They do not dispute the fact that large numbers of Jews were deported to concentration camps and ghettos, or that many Jews died or were killed during the Second World War. Revisionist scholars have, however, presented considerable evidence to show that there was no German program to exterminate Europe's Jews, that numerous claims of mass killings in "gas chambers" are false, and that the estimate of six million Jewish wartime dead is an irresponsible exaggeration.

Many Holocaust Claims Abandoned

Revisionists point out that the Holocaust story has changed quite a lot over the years. Many extermination claims that were once widely accepted have been quietly dropped in recent years.

At one time it was alleged that the Germans gassed Jews at Dachau, Buchenwald and other concentration camps in Germany proper. That part of the extermination story proved so untenable that it was abandoned more than 20 years ago.

No serious historian now supports the once supposedly proven story of "extermination camps" in the territory of the old German Reich. Even famed "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal has acknowledged that "there were no extermination camps on German soil." (note 1)

Prominent Holocaust historians now claim that masses of Jews were gassed at just six camps in what is now Poland: Auschwitz, Majdanek, Treblinka, Sobibor, Chelmno and Belzec. However, the "evidence" presented for "gassings" at these six camps is not qualitatively different than the "evidence" for alleged "gassings" at the camps in Germany proper.

At the great Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946 and during the decades following the end of the Second World War, Auschwitz (especially Auschwitz-Birkenau) and Majdanek (Lublin) were generally regarded as the most important "death camps." For example, the Allies alleged at Nuremberg that the Germans killed four million at Auschwitz and another 1.5 million at Majdanek. Today, no reputable historian accepts these fantastic figures.

In addition, more and more striking evidence has been presented in recent years that simply cannot be reconciled with the allegations of mass exterminations at these camps. For example, detailed aerial reconnaissance photographs taken of

Auschwitz-Birkenau on several random days in 1944 (during the height of the alleged extermination period there) were made public by the CIA in 1979. They show no trace of the piles of corpses, smoking chimneys and masses of Jews awaiting death, all of which have been alleged and would have been clearly visible if Auschwitz had indeed been an extermination center.

We now also know that the postwar "confession" of Auschwitz commandant Rudolf Höss, which is a crucial part of the Holocaust extermination story, is a false statement that was obtained by torture. (note 2)

Other Absurd Holocaust Claims

At one time it was also seriously claimed that the Germans exterminated Jews with electricity and steam, and that they manufactured soap from Jewish corpses. For example, at Nuremberg the United States charged that the Germans killed Jews at Treblinka, not in gas chambers, as is now claimed, but by steaming them to death in "steam chambers." (note 3)

Such bizarre stories have also been quietly abandoned in recent years.

Disease Claimed Many Inmates

The Holocaust extermination story is superficially plausible. Everyone has seen the horrific photos of dead and dying inmates taken at Bergen-Belsen, Nordhausen and other concentration camps when they were liberated by British and American forces in the final weeks of the war in Europe. These unfortunate people were victims, not of an extermination program, but of disease and malnutrition brought on by the complete collapse of Germany in the final months of the war. Indeed, if there had been an extermination program, the Jews found by Allied forces at the end of the war would have long since been killed.

In the face of the advancing Soviet forces, large numbers of Jews were evacuated during the final months of the war from eastern camps and ghettos to the remaining camps in western Germany. These camps quickly became terribly overcrowded, which severely hampered efforts to prevent the spread of epidemics. Furthermore, the breakdown of the German transportation system made it impossible to supply adequate food and medicine to the camps.

Captured German Documents

At the end of the Second World War, the Allies confiscated a tremendous quantity of German documents dealing with Germany's wartime Jewish policy, which was sometimes officially referred to as the "final solution." But not a single German document has ever been found which even refers to an extermination program. To the contrary, the documents clearly show that the German "final solution" policy was one of emigration and deportation, not extermination.

Consider, for example, the confidential German Foreign Office memorandum of August 21, 1942. (note 4) "The present war gives Germany the opportunity and also the duty of solving the Jewish problem in Europe," the memorandum notes. The policy "to promote the evacuation of the Jews [from Europe] in closest cooperation with the agencies of the Reichsführer SS [Himmler] is still in force." The memo noted that "the number of Jews deported in this way to the East did not suffice to cover the labor needs."

The document quotes German Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop as saying that "at the end of this war, all Jews would have to leave Europe. This was an unalterable decision of the Führer [Hitler] and also the only way to master this problem, as only a global and comprehensive solution could be applied and individual measures would not help very much."

The memorandum concludes by stating that the "deportations [of Jews to the East] are a further step on the way of the total solution ... The deportation to the [Polish] General Government is a temporary measure. The Jews will be moved on further to the occupied [Soviet] eastern territories as soon as the technical conditions for it are given."

This unambiguous document, and others like it, are routinely suppressed or ignored by those who uphold the Holocaust extermination story.

Unreliable Testimony

Holocaust historians rely heavily on so-called "survivor testimony" to support the extermination story. But such "evidence" is notoriously unreliable. As one Jewish historian has pointed out, "most of the memoirs and reports [of "Holocaust survivors"] are full of preposterous verbosity, graphomanic exaggeration, dramatic effects, overestimated self-inflation, dilettante philosophizing, would-be lyricism, unchecked rumors, bias, partisan attacks and apologies." (note 5)

Hitler and the 'Final Solution'

There is no documentary evidence that Adolf Hitler ever gave an order to exterminate the Jews, or that he knew of any extermination program. Instead, the record shows that the German leader wanted the Jews to leave Europe, by emigration if possible and by deportation if necessary.

A document found after the war in the files of the Reich Ministry of Justice records his thinking on the Jews. In the spring of 1942, State Secretary Schlegelberger noted in a memorandum that Hitler's Chief of Chancellery, Dr. Hans Lammers, had informed him: "The Führer has repeatedly declared to him [Lammers] that he wants to see the solution of the Jewish problem postponed until after the war is over." (note 6)

And on July 24, 1942, Hitler emphasized his determination to remove all Jews from Europe after the war: "The Jews are interested in Europe for economic reasons, but Europe must reject them, if only out of self-interest, because the Jews are racially tougher. After this war is over, I will rigorously hold to the view ... that the Jews will have to leave and emigrate to Madagascar or some other Jewish national state." (note 7)

Himmler's SS and the Camps

Jews were an important part of Germany's wartime labor force, and it was in Germany's interest to keep them alive.

The head of the SS camp administration office sent a directive dated Dec. 28, 1942, to every concentration camp, including Auschwitz. It sharply criticized the high death rate of inmates due to disease, and ordered that "camp physicians must use all means at their disposal to significantly reduce the death rate in the various camps." Furthermore, it ordered: "The camp doctors must supervise more often than in the past the nutrition of the prisoners and, in cooperation with the administration, submit improvement recommendations to the camp commandants ... The camp doctors are to see to it that the working conditions at the various labor places are improved as much as possible."

Finally, the directive stressed that "The Reichsführer SS [Himmler] has ordered that the death rate absolutely must be reduced." (note 8)

The head of the SS department that supervised the concentration camps, Richard Gluecks, sent a circular letter to each camp commandant dated January 20, 1943. In it he ordered: "As I have already pointed out, every means must be used to lower the death rate in the camp." (note 9)

Six Million?

There is no real evidence for the incessantly repeated claim that the Germans exterminated six million Jews. It is clear, though, that millions of Jews "survived" German rule during the Second World War, including many who were interned in Auschwitz and other so-called "extermination camps." This fact alone should raise serious doubts about the extermination story.

A leading newspaper of neutral Switzerland, the daily *Baseler Nachrichten*, carefully estimated in June 1946 that no more than 1.5 million European Jews could have perished under German rule during the war. (note 10)

One-Sided 'Holocaustomania'

Even after more than 40 years, the stream of Holocaust films and books shows no sign of diminishing.

This relentless media campaign, which Jewish historian Alfred Lilienthal calls "Holocaustomania," portrays the fate of the Jews during the Second World War as the central event of history. There is no end to the heavy-handed motion pictures, the simplistic television specials, the vindictive hunt for "Nazi war criminals," the one-sided "educational courses," and the self-righteous appearances by politicians and celebrities at Holocaust "memorial services."

Britain's chief rabbi, Immanuel Jakobovits, has accurately described the Holocaust campaign as "an entire industry, with handsome profits for writers, researchers, film-makers, monument builders, museum planners and even politicians." He added that some rabbis and theologians are "partners in this big business." (note 11)

Non-Jewish victims just don't merit the same concern. For example, there are no American memorials, "study centers," or annual observances for Stalin's victims, who vastly outnumber Hitler's.

Who Benefits?

The perpetual Holocaust media blitz is routinely used to justify enormous American support for Israel and to excuse otherwise inexcusable Israeli policies, even when they conflict with American interests.

The sophisticated and well-financed Holocaust media campaign is crucially important to the interests of Israel, which owes its existence to massive annual subsidies from American taxpayers. As Prof. W.D. Rubinstein of Australia has candidly acknowledged: "If the Holocaust can be shown to be a 'Zionist myth,' the strongest of all weapons in Israel's propaganda armory collapses." (note 12)

Jewish history teacher Paula Hyman of Columbia University has observed: "With regard to Israel, the Holocaust may be used to forestall political criticism and suppress debate; it reinforces the sense of Jews as an eternally beleaguered people who can rely for their defense only upon themselves. The invocation of the suffering endured by the Jews under the Nazis often takes the place of rational argument, and is expected to convince doubters of the legitimacy of current Israeli government policy." (note 13)

One major reason that the Holocaust story has proven so durable is that the governments of the major powers also have a vested interest in maintaining it. The victorious powers of the Second World War -- the United States, Soviet Russia and Britain -- have a stake in portraying the defeated Hitler regime as negatively as possible. The more evil and satanic the Hitler regime appears, the more noble and justified seems the Allied cause.

For many Jews, the Holocaust has become both a flourishing business and a kind of new religion, as noted Jewish author and newspaper publisher Jacobo Timerman points out in his book, *The Longest War*. He reports that many Israelis, using the word Shoah, which is Hebrew for Holocaust, joke that "There's no business like Shoah business." (note 14)

The Holocaust media campaign portrays Jews as totally innocent victims, and non-Jews as morally retarded and unreliable beings who can easily turn into murderous Nazis under the right circumstances. This self-serving but distorted portrayal is meant to strengthen Jewish group solidarity and self-awareness.

A key lesson of the Holocaust story for Jews is that non-Jews are never completely trustworthy. If a people as cultured and as educated as the Germans could turn against the Jews, so the thinking goes, than surely no non-Jewish nation can ever be completely trusted. The Holocaust message is thus one of contempt for humanity.

Holocaust Hatemongering

The Holocaust story is sometimes used to promote hatred and hostility, particularly against the German people as a whole, eastern Europeans and the leadership of the Roman Catholic church.

The well-known Jewish writer, Elie Wiesel, is a former Auschwitz inmate who served as chairman of the official U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. He received the 1986 Nobel Peace Prize. This dedicated Zionist wrote in his book, *Legends of Our Time*: "Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate -- healthy, virile hate -- for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German." (note 15)

Let Both Sides Be Heard

As even defenders of the orthodox extermination story concede, skepticism about the Holocaust story has grown dramatically in recent years.

Responding to this trend, officials in some countries -- including France and Israel -- have made it a crime to challenge the Holocaust story. Revisionists in France and Germany have been heavily fined for their views. Teachers in the United States and elsewhere have been summarily dismissed from their positions for daring to doubt the Holocaust story. Criminal thugs have brutally attacked prominent Holocaust revisionists; one was even killed for his views.

In spite of desperate restrictions on free speech, frantic media attacks against those who "deny the Holocaust," a seemingly perpetual Holocaust media campaign, and even physical attacks, considerable headway is being made. More and more thoughtful people in the United States and around the world are willing to express doubts about at least some of the more sensational Holocaust claims.

Summary

The Holocaust extermination story is breaking down as suppressed evidence becomes better known, and as more people become aware of the facts about what is certainly the most hyped and politicized chapter of modern history.

Artificially maintaining the hatreds and passions of the past prevents genuine reconciliation and lasting peace.

Revisionism promotes historical awareness and international understanding. That's why the work of the Institute for Historical Review is so important and deserves your support.

Notes

1. *Books and Bookmen*, London, April 1975, p. 5, and in *Stars and Stripes* (Europe), Jan. 24, 1993, p. 14.
2. Ruper Butler, *Legions of Death* (England: 1983), pp. 235-237, and R. Faurisson, *Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-87, pp. 389-403.
3. Nuremberg document PS-3311 (USA-293). IMT blue series, Vol. 32, pp. 153-158; IMT, Vol. 3, pp. 566- 568.; NMT green series, Vol. 5, pp. 1133, 1134.
4. Nuremberg document NG-2586-J. NMT green series, Vol. 13, pp. 243-249.
5. Samuel Gringauz in *Jewish Social Studies* (New York), January 1950, Vol. 12, p. 65.
6. Nuremberg document PS-4025. D. Irving, *Göring: A Biography* (New York: 1989), p. 349.
7. H. Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespräche im Führerhaupt quartier* (Stuttgart: 1976), p. 456.
8. Nuremberg document PS-2171, Annex 2; NC and A red series, Vol. 4, pp. 833-834.
9. Nuremberg document NO-1523; NMT green series, Vol. 5, pp. 372-373.
10. *Baseler Nachrichten*, June 13, 1946, p. 2.

11. H. Shapiro, "Jakobovits," *Jerusalem Post* (Israel), Nov. 26, 1987, p. 1.
 12. *Quadrant* (Australia), Sept. 1979, p. 27.
 13. *New York Times Magazine*, Sept. 14, 1980, p. 79.
 14. *The Longest War* (New York: Vintage, 1982), p. 15.
 15. *Legends of Our Time* (New York: Schocken Books, 1982), chap. 12, p. 142.
-

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



The Liberation of the Camps: Facts vs. Lies

by [Theodore J. O'Keefe](#)

Nothing has been more effective in establishing the authenticity of the Holocaust story in the minds of Americans than the terrible scenes US troops discovered when they entered German concentration camps at the close of World War II.

At Dachau, Buchenwald, Dora, Mauthausen, and other work and detention camps, horrified US infantrymen encountered heaps of dead and dying inmates, emaciated and diseased. Survivors told them hair-raising stories of torture and slaughter, and backed up their claims by showing the GIs crematory ovens, alleged execution gas chambers, supposed implements of torture, and even shrunken heads and lampshades, gloves, and handbags purportedly made from skin flayed from dead inmates.

US government authorities, mindful that many Americans who remembered the atrocity stories fed them during World War I still doubted the Allied propaganda directed against the Hitler regime, resolved to "document" what the GIs had found in the camps. Prominent newsmen and politicians were flown in to see the harrowing evidence, while the US Army Signal Corps filmed and photographed the scenes for posterity. Famous journalist Edward R. Murrow reported, in tones of horror, but no longer of disbelief, what he had been told and shown, and Dachau and Buchenwald were branded on the hearts and minds of the American populace as names of infamy unmatched in the sad and bloody history of this planet.

For Americans, what was "discovered" at the camps -- the dead and the diseased, the terrible stories of the inmates, all the props of torture and terror -- became the basis not simply of a transitory propaganda campaign but of the conviction that, yes, it was true: the Germans did exterminate six million Jews, most of them in lethal gas chambers.

What the GIs found was used, by way of films that were mandatory viewing for the vanquished populace of Germany, to "re-educate" the German people by destroying their national pride and their will to a united, independent national state, imposing in their place overwhelming feelings of collective guilt and political impotence. And when the testimony, and the verdict, of the Nuremberg Tribunal incorporated most, if not all, of the horror stories Americans were told about Dachau, Buchenwald, and other places captured by the US Army, the Holocaust could pass for one of the most documented, one of the most authenticated, one of the most proven historical episodes in the human record.

A Different Reality

But it is known today that, very soon after the liberation of the camps, American authorities were aware that the real story of the camps was quite different from the one in which they were coaching military public information officers, government spokesmen, politicians, journalists, and other mouthpieces.

When American and British forces overran western and central Germany in the spring of 1945, they were followed by troops charged with discovering and securing any evidence of German war crimes.

Among them was Dr. Charles Larson, one of America's leading forensic pathologists, who was assigned to the US Army's Judge Advocate General's Department. As part of a US War Crimes Investigation Team, Dr. Larson performed autopsies at Dachau and some twenty other German camps, examining on some days more than 100 corpses. After his grim work at

Dachau, he was questioned for three days by US Army prosecutors. ([note 1](#))

Dr. Larson's findings? In an 1980 newspaper interview he said: "What we've heard is that six million Jews were exterminated. Part of that is a hoax." ([note 2](#)) And what part was the hoax? Dr. Larson, who told his biographer that to his knowledge he "was the only forensic pathologist on duty in the entire European Theater" of Allied military operations, ([note 3](#)) confirmed that "never was a case of poison gas uncovered." ([note 4](#))

Typhus, Not Poison Gas

If not by gassing, how did the unfortunate victims at Dachau, Buchenwald and Bergen-Belsen perish? Were they tortured to death or deliberately starved? The answers to these questions are known as well.

As Dr. Larson and other Allied medical men discovered, the chief cause of death at Dachau, Belsen and the other camps was disease, above all typhus, an old and terrible scourge of mankind that until recently flourished in places where populations were crowded together in circumstances where public health measures were unknown or had broken down. Such was the case in the overcrowded internment camps in Germany at war's end, where, despite such measures as systematic delousing, quarantine of the sick and cremation of the dead, the virtual collapse of Germany's food, transport, and public health systems led to catastrophe.

Perhaps the most authoritative statement of the facts as to typhus and mortality in the camps has been made by Dr. John E. Gordon, M.D., Ph.D., a professor of preventive medicine and epidemiology at the Harvard University School of Public Health, who was with US forces in Germany in 1945. Dr. Gordon reported in 1948 that "The outbreaks in concentration camps and prisons made up the great bulk of typhus infection encountered in Germany." Dr. Gordon summarized the causes for the outbreaks as follows: ([note 5](#))

Germany in the spring months of April and May [1945] was an astounding sight, a mixture of humanity travelling this way and that, homeless, often hungry and carrying typhus with them ...

Germany was in chaos. The destruction of whole cities and the path left by advancing armies produced a disruption of living conditions contributing to the spread of the disease. Sanitation was low grade, public utilities were seriously disrupted, food supply and food distribution was poor, housing was inadequate and order and discipline were everywhere lacking. Still more important, a shifting of populations was occurring such as few countries and few times have experienced.

Dr. Gordon's findings are corroborated by Dr. Russell Barton, today a psychiatrist of international repute, who entered Bergen-Belsen with British forces as a young medical student in 1945. Barton, who volunteered to care for the diseased survivors, testified under sworn oath in a Toronto courtroom in 1985 that "Thousands of prisoners who died at the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp during World War II weren't deliberately starved to death but died from a rash of diseases." ([note 6](#))

Dr. Barton further testified that on entering the camp he had credited stories of deliberate starvation but decided such stories were untrue after inspecting the well equipped kitchens and the meticulously maintained ledgers, dating back to 1942, of food cooked and dispensed each day.

Despite noisily publicized claims and widespread popular notions to the contrary, no researcher has been able to document a German policy of extermination through starvation in the German camps.

No 'Human Skin' Lampshades

What of the ghoulish stories of concentration camp inmates skinned for their tattoos, flayed to make lampshades and

handbags, or other artifacts? What of the innumerable "torture racks," "meathooks," whipping posts, gallows, and other tools of torment and death that are reported to have abounded at every German camp? These allegations, and even more grotesque ones proffered by Soviet prosecutors, found their way into the record at Nuremberg.

The lampshade and tattooed-skin charges were made against Ilse Koch, dubbed by journalists the "Bitch of Buchenwald," who was reported to have furnished her house with objects manufactured from the tanned hides of luckless inmates.

But General Lucius Clay, military governor of the US zone of occupied Germany, who reviewed her case in 1948, told his superiors in Washington: "There is no convincing evidence that she [Ilse Koch] selected inmates for extermination in order to secure tattooed skins or that she possessed any articles made of human skin." ([note 7](#)) In an interview General Clay gave years later, he stated about the material for the infamous lampshades: "Well, it turned out actually that it was goat flesh. But at the trial it was still human flesh. It was almost impossible for her to have gotten a fair trial." ([note 8](#)) Ilse Koch hanged herself in a German jail in 1967.

It would be tedious to itemize and refute the thousands of bizarre claims as to Nazi atrocities. That there were instances of German cruelty, however, is clear from the testimony of Dr. Konrad Morgen, a legal investigator attached to the Reich Criminal Police, whose statements on the witness stand at Nuremberg have never been challenged by proponents of the Jewish Holocaust story. Dr. Morgen informed the court that he had been given full authority by Heinrich Himmler, commander of Hitler's SS and the dread Gestapo, to enter any German concentration camp and investigate instances of cruelty and corruption on the part of camp personnel.

As he explained in sworn testimony at Nuremberg, Dr. Morgen investigated 800 such cases, resulting in more than 200 convictions. ([note 9](#)) Punishments included the death penalty for the worst offenders, including Hermann Florstedt, commandant of Lublin (Majdanek), and Karl Koch (Ilse's husband), commandant of Buchenwald.

While German camp commandants in certain cases did inflict physical punishment, such acts had to be approved by authorities in Berlin, and it was required that a camp physician first certify the good health of the prisoner to be disciplined, and then be on hand at the actual beating. ([note 10](#)) After all, throughout most of the war the camps were important centers of industrial activity. The good health and morale of the prisoners was critical to the German war effort, as is evidenced in a January 1943 order issued by SS General Richard Glücks, chief of the office that supervised the concentration camps. It held the camp commanders "personally responsible for exhausting every possibility to preserve the physical strength of the detainees." ([note 11](#))

Camp Survivors: Merely Victims?

US Army investigators, working at Buchenwald and other camps, quickly ascertained what was common knowledge among veteran inmates: that the worst offenders, the cruelest denizens of the camps, were not the guards but the prisoners themselves. Common criminals of the same stripe as those who populate US prisons today committed many villainies, particularly when they held positions of authority, and fanatical Communists, highly organized to combat their many political enemies among the inmates, eliminated their foes with Stalinist ruthlessness.

Two US Army investigators at Buchenwald, Egon W. Fleck and Edward A. Tenenbaum, carefully investigated circumstances in the camp before its liberation. In a detailed report submitted to their superiors, they revealed, in the words of Alfred Toombs, their commander, who wrote a preface to the report, "how the prisoners themselves organized a deadly terror within the Nazi terror." ([note 12](#))

Fleck and Tenenbaum described the power exercised by criminals and Communists as follows:

The trustees, who in time became almost exclusively Communist Germans, had the power of life and death over all other inmates. They could sentence a man or a group to almost certain death ... The Communist trustees were directly responsible for a large part of the brutalities at Buchenwald.

Colonel Donald B. Robinson, chief historian of the American military government in Germany, summarized the Fleck-Tenenbaum report in an article published in an American magazine shortly after the war. Colonel Robinson wrote succinctly of the American investigators' findings: "It appeared that the prisoners who agreed with the Communists ate; those who didn't starved to death." ([note 13](#))

Additional corroboration of inmate brutality has been provided by Ellis E. Spackman, who, as Chief of Counter-Intelligence Arrests and Detentions for the US Seventh Army, was involved in the liberation of Dachau. Spackman, later a professor of history at San Bernardino Valley College in California, wrote in 1966 that at Dachau "the prisoners were the actual instruments that inflicted the barbarities on their fellow prisoners." ([note 14](#))

'Gas Chambers'

In December 1944 US Army officers Colonel Paul Kirk and Lt. Colonel Edward J. Gully inspected the German concentration camp at Struthof-Natzweiler in Alsace. They submitted their findings to their superiors, who subsequently forwarded their report to the US War Crimes Division. While, significantly, the full text of their report has never been published, it has been revealed, by a historian supportive of Holocaust claims, that the two investigators were careful to characterize equipment exhibited to them by French informants as a "so-called lethal gas chamber," and to claim it was "allegedly used as a lethal gas chamber." ([note 15](#)) (Emphasis added)

Both the careful phraseology of the Natzweiler report, and its effective suppression, stand in stark contrast to the credulity, the confusion, and the blaring publicity that accompanied official reports of alleged gas chambers at Dachau. At first, a US Army photo depicting a GI gazing at a steel door marked with a skull and crossbones and the German words for: "Caution! Gas! Mortal danger! Don't open!," was identified as showing the murder weapon. ([note 16](#))

Later, however, it was evidently decided that the apparatus in question was merely a standard delousing chamber for clothing, and another alleged gas chamber, this one cunningly disguised as a shower room, was exhibited to American congressmen and journalists as the site where thousands breathed their last. While there exist numerous reports in the press as to the operation of this second "gas chamber," no official report by trained Army investigators has yet surfaced to reconcile such problems as the function of the shower heads: Were they "dummies," or did lethal cyanide gas stream through them? (Each theory has appreciable support in journalistic and historiographical literature.)

As with Dachau, so with Buchenwald, Bergen-Belsen, and the other camps liberated by the Allies in western Germany. There was no end of propaganda about "gas chambers," "gas ovens," and the like, but so far not a single detailed description of the murder weapon and its function, not a single report of the kind that is mandatory for the successful prosecution of any assault or murder case in America at that time and today, has come to light.

Furthermore, a number of Holocaust authorities have now publicly decreed that there were no gassings, no extermination camps in Germany after all. (We are now told that "gassing" and "extermination" camps were located exclusively in what is now Poland, in areas captured by the Soviet Red Army and made off-limits to western investigators.)

Dr. Martin Broszat of the Munich-based Institute for Contemporary History, which is funded by the German government, stated categorically in a 1960 letter to the German weekly *Die Zeit*: "Neither in Dachau nor in Bergen-Belsen nor in Buchenwald were Jews or other prisoners gassed." ([note 17](#)) Professional "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal stated in 1975 and again in 1993 that "there were no extermination camps on German soil." ([note 18](#))

Dachau "gas chamber" No. 2, which was once presented to a stunned and grieving world as a weapon that claimed hundreds of thousands of lives, is now described in the brochure issued to tourists at the modern Dachau "memorial site" in these words: "This gas chamber, camouflaged as a shower room, was not used." ([note 19](#))

The Propaganda Intensifies

More than 50 years after American troops entered Dachau, Buchenwald and other German camps, and trained American investigators established the facts as to what had gone on in them, the government in Washington, the entertainment media in Hollywood, and the print media in New York continue to churn out millions of words and images annually on the horrors of the camps and the infamy of the Holocaust. Despite the fact that, with the exception of the defeated Confederacy, no enemy of America has ever so suffered so complete and devastating defeat as did Germany in 1945, the mass media and the politicians and bureaucrats behave as if Hitler, his troops, and his concentration camps continue to exist in an eternal present, and our opinion makers continue to distort, through ignorance or malice, the facts about the camps.

Time for the Truth

It is time that the government and the professional historians reveal the facts about Dachau, Buchenwald and the other camps. It is time they let the American public know how the inmates died, and how they didn't die. It is time that the claims of mass murder by gassing are clarified and investigated in the same manner as any other claims of murder. It is time that the free ride certain groups have enjoyed as the result of unchallenged Holocaust claims be terminated, just as it is time to end the scapegoating of other groups, including Germans, eastern Europeans, the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the wartime leadership of America and Britain, either for their alleged role in the Holocaust or their supposed failure to stop it.

Above all, it is time that the citizens of this great Republic have the facts about the camps, facts they have a right to know, a right that is fundamental to the exercise of their authority and their will in the governance of their country. As citizens and as taxpayers, Americans of all ethnic backgrounds, of all faiths, have a basic right and an overriding interest in determining the facts of incidents that are deemed by those in positions of power to be significant in determining America's foreign and educational policy, as well as its selection of past events to be memorialized in our civic life.

Today the alleged facts of the Holocaust are at issue all over the civilized world. The truth will be decided only by recourse to the facts, in the public forum: not by concealing the facts, denying the truth, stonewalling reality. The truth will out, and it is time the government of this country, and governments and international bodies throughout the world, make public the evidence of what actually transpired in the German concentration camps in the years 1933-1945, so that we may put paid to the lies, without fear or favor, and carry out the work of reconciliation and renewal that is and must be the granite foundation of mutual tolerance between peoples and of a peace based on justice.

Summary

The conclusions of the early US Army investigations as to the truth about the wartime German concentration camps have since been corroborated by all subsequent investigators and can be summarized:

1. The harrowing scenes of dead and dying inmates were not the result of a German policy of "extermination," but rather the result of epidemics of typhus and other disease brought about largely by the effects of Allied aerial attacks.
2. Stories of Nazi supercriminals and sadists who turned Jews and others into handbags and lampshades for their private profit or amusement were sick lies or diseased fantasies; indeed, the German authorities punished corruption and cruelty on the part of camp commanders and guards.
3. On the other hand, portrayals of the newly liberated inmates as saints and martyrs of Hitlerism were quite often very far from the truth; indeed, most of the brutalities inflicted on camp detainees were the work of their fellow prisoners, in contravention of German policy and German orders.
4. The alleged homicidal showers and gas chambers were used either for bathing camp inmates or delousing their clothes; the claim that they were used to murder Jews or other human beings is a contemptible fabrication. Orthodox historians and professional "Nazi-hunters" have quietly dropped claims that inmates were gassed at Dachau, Buchenwald and other camps in Germany. They continue, however, to keep silent regarding the lies about Dachau and Buchenwald, as well as to evade an open discussion of the evidence for homicidal gassing at Auschwitz and the other camps captured by the Soviets.

Notes

1. John D. McCallum, *Crime Doctor* [a biography of Dr. Charles P. Larson] (Mercer, Wash.: The Writing Works, 1978), pp. 44-46, 59, 69; See also: J. Cobden, "The Dachau Gas Chamber Myth," *The Journal of Historical Review*, March-April 1995, pp. 17-18.
 2. Jane Floerchinger, "Concentration Camp Conditions Killed Most Inmates, Doctor Says," *The Wichita Eagle*, April 1, 1980, p. 4C.
 3. J. D. McCallum, *Crime Doctor* (1978), p. 46.
 4. *The Wichita Eagle*, April 1, 1980, p. 4C.
 5. John E. Gordon, "Louse-Borne Typhus Fever in the European Theater of Operations, U.S. Army, 1945," in Forest Ray Moulton, editor, *Rickettsial Diseases of Man* (Washington, DC: American Academy for the Advancement of Science, 1948), pp. 16-27. Quoted in: Friedrich P. Berg, "Typhus and the Jews," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1988-89, pp. 444-447, and in Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (IHR, 1993), pp. 46-47.
 6. "Disease killed Nazis' prisoners, MD says," *Toronto Star*, Feb. 8, 1985, p. A2. On Barton's similar testimony in a 1988 Toronto trial, see: Barbara Kulaszka, ed., *Did Six Million Really Die?* (Toronto: Samisdat, 1992), pp. 175-180, and, Robert Lenski, *The Holocaust on Trial* (1990), pp. 157-160, and, M. Weber, "Bergen-Belsen Camp: The Suppressed Story," *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1995, pp. 27, 30 (n. 30).
 7. "Clay Explains Cut in Ilse Koch Term," *New York Times*, Sept. 24, 1948, p. 3.
 8. Interview with Lucius Clay, 1976, Official Proceeding of the George C. Marshall Research Foundation. Quoted in M. Weber, "Buchenwald: Legend and Reality," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-87 (Vol. 7, No. 4), pp. 406-407.
 9. International Military Tribunal (IMT), *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg: 1947-1949 ["blue series"])*, Vol. 20, pp. 489, 438.
 10. Eugen Kogon *The Theory and Practice of Hell* (New York: Berkley Books [pb.], 1984), pp. 108-109. See also: "Punishment for Mistreating SS Camp Prisoners," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1995, p. 33.
 11. Nuremberg document NO-1523. Published in *Trials of War Criminals Before the Nuernberg Military Tribunal (NMT "green series")*, Vol. 4, pp. 372-373.
 12. Egon W. Fleck and Edward A. Tenenbaum, *Buchenwald: A Preliminary Report*, US Army, 12th Army Group, April 24, 1945. National Archives, RG 331, SHAEF, G-5, 17.11, Jacket 10, Box 151. Quoted in: M. Weber, "Buchenwald: Legend and Reality," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-87, pp. 408-409.
 13. Donald B. Robinson, "Communist Atrocities at Buchenwald," *American Mercury*, October 1946, pp. 397-404.
 14. *San Bernardino Sun-Telegram*, March 13, 1966. Quoted in: James J. Martin, *The Man Who Invented 'Genocide'* (IHR, 1984), pp. 110-111.
 15. "Concentration Camp at Natzwiller [sic]," RG 331, Records of Allied Operations and Occupation, SHAEF/G-5/2717, Modern Military, National Archives (Washington, DC). Quoted in: Robert H. Abzug, *Inside the Vicious Heart* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 9-10, 181 (n. 5).
 16. John Cobden, *Dachau: Reality and Myth* (IHR, 1994), pp. 25-29. See also: *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1993, pp. 9-11; *The Journal of Historical Review*, March-April 1995, p. 16.
 17. "Keine Vergasung in Dachau," *Die Zeit* (Hamburg), August 19, 1960. Facsimile reprint, and English-language translation, in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1993, p. 12.
 18. *Letters in Books & Bookmen* (London), April 1975, p. 5, and in *The Stars and Stripes* (European edition), Jan. 24, 1993, p. 14. Wiesenthal's 1993 *Stars and Stripes* letter is reprinted in facsimile in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1993, p. 10.
 19. Memorial Site Concentration Camp Dachau. Leaflet published by the International Dachau-Committee (Dachau, Germany), no date.
-

About the Author

Theodore J. O'Keefe, educated at Harvard University, is the author of numerous published articles, essays and reviews on historical and political subjects. For some years he served as editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*, which is published by the Institute for Historical Review.

The original version of this revised and updated essay first appeared in *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1995 (Vol. 15, no. 4), pp. 18-23.

Revised 11/2002

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



What is 'Holocaust Denial'?

In recent years, more and more attention has been devoted to the supposed danger of "Holocaust denial." Politicians, newspapers and television warn about the growing influence of those who reject the Holocaust story that some six million European Jews were systematically exterminated during the Second World War, most of them in gas chambers.

In several countries, including Israel, France, Germany and Austria, "Holocaust denial" is against the law, and "deniers" have been punished with stiff fines and prison sentences. Some frantic Jewish community leaders are calling for similar government measures in North America against so-called "deniers." In Canada, David Matas, Senior Counsel for the "League for Human Rights" of the Zionist B'nai B'rith organization, says: (note 1)

The Holocaust was the murder of six million Jews, including two million children. Holocaust denial is a second murder of those same six million. First their lives were extinguished; then their deaths. A person who denies the Holocaust becomes part of the crime of the Holocaust itself.

Often overlooked in this controversy is the crucial question: Just what constitutes "Holocaust denial"?

Six Million?

Should someone be considered a "Holocaust denier" because he does not believe -- as Matas and others insist -- that six million Jews were killed during World War II? This figure was cited by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg in 1945-1946. It found that "the policy pursued [by the German government] resulted in the killing of six million Jews, of which four million were killed in the extermination institutions." (note 2)

Yet if that is so, then several of the most prominent Holocaust historians could be regarded as "deniers." Professor Raul Hilberg, author of the standard reference work, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, does not accept that six million Jews died. He puts the total of deaths (from all causes) at 5.1 million. Gerald Reitlinger, author of *The Final Solution*, likewise did not accept the six million figure. He estimated the figure of Jewish wartime dead might be as high as 4.6 million, but admitted that this was conjectural due to a lack of reliable information.

Human Soap?

Is someone a "Holocaust denier" if he says that the Nazis didn't use Jewish fat to make soap? After examining all the evidence (including an actual bar of soap supplied by the Soviets), the Nuremberg Tribunal declared in its Judgment that "in some instances attempts were made to utilize the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap." (note 3)

In 1990, though, Israel's official "Yad Vashem" Holocaust memorial agency "rewrote history" by admitting that the soap story was not true. "Historians have concluded that soap was not made from human fat. When so many people deny the Holocaust ever happened, why give them something to use against the truth?," said Yad Vashem official Shmuel Krakowski. (note 4)

Wannsee Conference?

Is someone a "Holocaust denier" if he does not accept that the January 1942 "Wannsee conference" of German bureaucrats was held to set or coordinate a program of systematic mass murder of Europe's Jews? If so, Israeli Holocaust historian Yehuda Bauer must be wrong -- and a "Holocaust denier" -- because he recently declared: "The public still repeats, time after time, the silly story that at Wannsee the extermination of the Jews was arrived at." In Bauer's opinion, Wannsee was a meeting but "hardly a conference" and "little of what was said there was executed in detail." (note 5)

Extermination Policy?

Is someone a "Holocaust denier" if he says that there was no order by Hitler to exterminate Europe's Jews? There was a time when the answer would have been yes. Holocaust historian Raul Hilberg, for example, wrote in the 1961 edition of his study, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, that there were two Hitler orders for the destruction of Europe's Jews: the first given in the spring of 1941, and the second shortly thereafter. But Hilberg removed mention of any such order from the revised, three-volume edition of his book published in 1985. (note 6) As Holocaust historian Christopher Browning has noted: (note 7)

In the new edition, all references in the text to a Hitler decision or Hitler order for the "Final Solution" have been systematically excised. Buried at the bottom of a single footnote stands the solitary reference: "Chronology and circumstances point to a Hitler decision before the summer ended." In the new edition, decisions were not made and orders were not given.

A lack of hard evidence for an extermination order by Hitler has contributed to a controversy that divides Holocaust historians into "intentionalists" and "functionalists." The former contend that there was a premeditated extermination policy ordered by Hitler, while the latter hold that Germany's wartime "final solution" Jewish policy evolved at lower levels in response to circumstances. But the crucial point here is this: notwithstanding the capture of literally tons of German documents after the war, no one can point to documentary evidence of a wartime extermination order, plan or program. This was admitted by Professor Hilberg during his testimony in the 1985 trial in Toronto of German-Canadian publisher Ernst Zündel. (note 8)

Auschwitz

So just what constitutes "Holocaust denial"? Surely a claim that most Auschwitz inmates died from disease and not systematic extermination in gas chambers would be "denial." But perhaps not. Jewish historian Arno J. Mayer, a Princeton University professor, wrote in his 1988 study *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The 'Final Solution' in History*: "... From 1942 to 1945, certainly at Auschwitz, but probably overall, more Jews were killed by so-called 'natural' causes than by 'unnatural' ones." (note 9)

Even estimates of the number of people who died at Auschwitz -- allegedly the main extermination center -- are no longer clear cut. At the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal, the Allies charged that the Germans exterminated four million people at Auschwitz. (note 10) Until 1990, a memorial plaque at Auschwitz read: "Four Million People Suffered and Died Here at the Hands of the Nazi Murderers Between the Years 1940 and 1945." (note 11) During a 1979 visit to the camp, Pope John Paul II stood before this memorial and blessed the four million victims.

Is it "Holocaust denial" to dispute these four million deaths? Not today. In July 1990, the Polish government's Auschwitz State Museum, along with Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust center, conceded that the four million figure was a gross exaggeration, and references to it were accordingly removed from the Auschwitz monument. Israeli and Polish officials announced a tentative revised toll of 1.1 million Auschwitz dead. (note 12) In 1993, French Holocaust researcher Jean-Claude Pressac, in a much-discussed book about Auschwitz, estimated that altogether about 775,000 died there during the war years. (note 13)

Professor Mayer acknowledges that the question of how many really died in Auschwitz remains open. In *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* he wrote (p. 366):

... Many questions remain open ... All in all, how many bodies were cremated in Auschwitz? How many died there all told? What was the national, religious, and ethnic breakdown in this commonwealth of victims? How many of them were condemned to die a 'natural' death and how many were deliberately slaughtered? And what was the proportion of Jews among those murdered in cold blood among these gassed? We have simply no answers to these questions at this time.

Gas Chambers

What about denying the existence of extermination "gas chambers"? Here too, Mayer makes a startling statement (on page 362 of his book): "Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable." While Mayer believes that such chambers did exist at Auschwitz, he points out that

most of what is known is based on the depositions of Nazi officials and executioners at postwar trials and on the memory of survivors and bystanders. This testimony must be screened carefully, since it can be influenced by subjective factors of great complexity.

Höss Testimony

One example of this might be the testimony of Rudolf Höss, an SS officer who served as commandant of Auschwitz. In its Judgment, the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal quoted at length from his testimony to support its findings of extermination. (note 14)

It is now well established that Höss' crucial testimony, as well as his so-called "confession" (which was also cited by the Nuremberg Tribunal), are not only false, but were obtained by beating the former commandant nearly to death. (note 15) Höss' wife and children were also threatened with death and deportation to Siberia. In his statement -- which would not be admissible today in any United States court of law -- Höss claimed the existence of an extermination camp called "Wolzek." In fact, no such camp ever existed. He further claimed that during the time that he was commandant of Auschwitz, two and a half million people were exterminated there, and that a further half million died of disease. (note 16) Today no reputable historian upholds these figures. Höss was obviously willing to say anything, sign anything and do anything to stop the torture, and to try to save himself and his family.

Forensic Investigations

In his 1988 book, Professor Mayer calls for "excavations at the killing sites and in their immediate environs" to determine more about the gas chambers. In fact, such forensic studies have been made. The first was conducted in 1988 by American execution equipment consultant, Fred A. Leuchter, Jr. He carried out an on-site forensic examination of the alleged gas chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek to determine if they could have been used to kill people as claimed. After a careful study of the alleged killing facilities, Leuchter concluded that the sites were not used, and could not have been used, as homicidal gas chambers. Furthermore, an analysis of samples taken by Leuchter from the walls and floors of the alleged gas chambers showed either no or minuscule traces of cyanide compound, from the active ingredient of Zyklon B, the pesticide allegedly used to murder Jews at Auschwitz. (note 17)

A confidential forensic examination (and subsequent report) commissioned by the Auschwitz State Museum and conducted by Institute of Forensic Research in Krakow has confirmed Leuchter's finding that minimal or no traces of cyanide compound can be found in the sites alleged to have been gas chambers. (note 18)

The significance of this is evident when the results of the forensic examination of the alleged homicidal gas chambers are compared with the results of the examination of the Auschwitz disinfestation facilities, where Zyklon B was used to delouse mattresses and clothing. Whereas no or only trace amounts of cyanide were found in the alleged homicidal gas chambers, massive traces of cyanide were found in the walls and floor in the camp's disinfestation delousing chambers.

Another forensic study has been carried out by German chemist Germar Rudolf. On the basis of his on-site examination and analysis of samples, the certified chemist and doctoral candidate concluded: "For chemical-technical reasons, the claimed mass gassings with hydrocyanic acid in the alleged 'gas chambers' in Auschwitz did not take place ... The supposed facilities for mass killing in Auschwitz and Birkenau were not suitable for this purpose ..." (note 19)

Finally, there is the study of Austrian engineer Walter Lüftl, a respected expert witness in numerous court cases, and former president of Austria's professional association of engineers. In a 1992 report he called the alleged mass extermination of Jews in gas chambers "technically impossible." (note 20)

Discredited Perspective

So just what constitutes "Holocaust denial"? Those who advocate criminal persecution of "Holocaust deniers" seem to be still living in the world of 1946 where the Allied officials of the Nuremberg Tribunal have just pronounced their verdict. But the Tribunal's findings can no longer be assumed to be valid. Because it relied so heavily on such untrustworthy evidence as the Höss testimony, some of its most critical findings are now discredited.

For purposes of their own, powerful special interest groups desperately seek to keep substantive discussion of the Holocaust story taboo. One of the ways they do this is by purposely mischaracterizing revisionist scholars as "deniers." But the truth can't be suppressed forever: There is a very real and growing controversy about what actually happened to Europe's Jews during World War II.

Let this issue be settled as all great historical controversies are resolved: through free inquiry and open debate in our journals, newspapers and classrooms.

Notes

1. *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), Jan. 22, 1992.
2. *Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal* (IMT "blue series"), Vol. 22, p. 496.
3. IMT "blue series," Vol. 22, p. 496.
4. *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), April 25, 1990; See also: M. Weber, "Jewish Soap," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991.
5. *Canadian Jewish News* (Toronto), Jan. 30, 1992.
6. See: Barbara Kulaszka, ed., *Did Six Million Really Die: Report of the Evidence in the Canadian 'False News' Trial of Ernst Zndel* (Toronto: Samisdat, 1992), pp. 192, 300, 349.
7. "The Revised Hilberg," *Simon Wiesenthal Annual*, Vol. 3, 1986, p. 294.
8. B. Kulaszka, ed., *Did Six Million Really Die* (Toronto: 1992), pp. 24-25.
9. A. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The 'Final Solution' in History* (Pantheon, 1988), p. 365.
10. Nuremberg document 008-USSR.; IMT "blue series," Vol. 39, pp. 241, 261.
11. B. Kulaszka, ed., *Did Six Million Really Die* (Toronto: 1992), p. 441.
12. Y. Bauer, "Fighting the Distortions," *Jerusalem Post* (Israel), Sept. 22, 1989; Auschwitz Deaths Reduced to a Million," *Daily Telegraph* (London), July 17, 1990; "Poland Reduces Auschwitz Death Toll Estimate to 1 Million," *The Washington Times*, July 17, 1990.
13. J.-C. Pressac, *Les Cr/metoires d'Auschwitz: La machinerie du meurtre de masse* (Paris: CNRS, 1993). See also: R. Faurisson, "Jean-Claude Pressac's New Auschwitz Book," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1994, p. 24.
14. IMT "blue series," Vol. 22, p. 485; Nuremberg document 3868-PS (USA-819), in IMT "blue series," Vol. 33, pp. 275-279.
15. Rupert Butler, *Legions of Death* (England: 1983), pp. 235-237; C. Hitchens, "Whose History is it?," *Vanity Fair* (New York), Dec. 1993, p. 117.
16. See: R. Faurisson, "How the British Obtained the Confession of Rudolf Höss," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1986-87, pp. 389-403.
17. A deluxe edition of *The Leuchter Report* is available from the IHR for \$20.00, plus \$2.00 shipping.
18. The complete text of this report was published in English in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991.
19. G. Rudolf, *Gutachten ueber die Bildung und Nachweisbarkeit von Cyanidverbindungen in den 'Gaskammern' von*

Auschwitz (London: 1993). See: *The Journal of Historical Review*, Nov.-Dec. 1993, pp. 25-26.
20. "The 'Lüftl Report'," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1992-93.

[**Main**](#) | [**Leaflets**](#) | [**Journal**](#) | [**Books**](#) | [**Contact us**](#) | [**Search**](#) | [**Support IHR**](#) | [**Subscribe**](#)



Inside the Auschwitz 'Gas Chambers'

Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.

Introduction

1988 was a very informative and likewise disturbing year. I was appalled to learn that much of what I was taught in school about twentieth-century history and World War II was a myth, if not a lie. I was first amazed; then annoyed; then aware: the myth of the Holocaust was dead.

Like all American children born during and after World War II, I was taught about the genocide perpetrated by the Nazis on the Jews. By the time I had reached college, I had no reason to disbelieve any of my education, except that I had some problems swallowing the numbers of decedents, said to total some six million. But there it stopped. I believed in the Nazi genocide. I had no reason to disbelieve.

Some 24 years later, a very believing engineer sat at his desk working one snowy January afternoon in 1988, when the telephone rang. This very believing engineer was about to receive a very shocking history lesson, one which would cause him to question that 50-year-old Holocaust lie and the application of that lie to generations of children. "Hello, this is Robert Faurisson" -- and that very believing engineer would believe no more.

Background

I have for the past nine years worked with most, if not all, of the states in the United States having capital punishment. I design and manufacture execution equipment of all types, including electrocution systems, lethal injection equipment, gallows and gas-chamber hardware.

I have consulted for, or supplied equipment to, most of the applicable states and the federal government.

Because of my association with the states in this capacity, I was recommended to the Zündel defense as a consultant on gas chambers by Warden Bill Armontrout of the Missouri State Penitentiary.

After answering my telephone on that cold January afternoon, I met with Dr. Robert Faurisson twice in Boston and, as a result of these meetings, I was summoned to Toronto to meet with Ernst Zündel, attorney Douglas Christie and the rest of Zündel's very able staff.

Dr. Robert Faurisson had postulated 13 years ago that a gas-chamber specialist should be sought who could evaluate the alleged gas chambers in Poland and report on their efficacy for execution purposes.

Valentine's Day weekend found me and Carolyn, my wife of two weeks, in Toronto. Two days of lengthy meetings followed, during which I was shown photos of the alleged German gas chambers in Poland, German documents and Allied aerial photographs. My examination of this material led me to question whether these alleged gas chambers were, in fact, execution facilities. I was asked if I would go to Poland and undertake a physical inspection and forensic analysis resulting

in a written evaluation of these alleged execution gas chambers, some at places I had never even heard of.

After due consideration, I agreed and made plans to leave for Poland, awaiting a time of minimal snow covering. I also stated that although the photos and documents seemed to support the view that these places were, indeed, not execution facilities, I would reserve final judgment until after my examination and, if I determined that these facilities were, in fact, or could have been, execution gas chambers, I would state this in my report. The final report was to be utilized as evidence in Ernst Zündel's defense in his pending criminal trial at Toronto, and I had to be prepared to testify under oath.

Preparations for the trip required me to take sample bags, documentation journals and tools. Because we were in a Communist country, I would have to be careful with the tools. Very few tourists carry hammers, chisels, star drills and tape measures while travelling. I hid them in the lining of my valise and hoped for the best. Further, I had maps of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria, in the event that we might have to make a hasty and unscheduled exit. And finally, I had gifts with which we bribed the museum people to supply us with copies of documents from the Museum Archives.

Our Staff

I was fortunate to have a competent and dependable party of professionals: my wife Carolyn, my general assistant; Mr. Howard Miller, draftsman; Mr. Jürgen Neumann, cinematographer; Mr. Tjudar Rudolf, interpreter. All knew that, if caught, the Polish government would take a dim view of our activities and purpose, let alone my removal of forensic samples from national shrines and monuments.

And the two ex officio members of our party, Mr. Ernst Zündel and Dr. Robert Faurisson, who could not accompany us in person, but who nevertheless were with us every step of the way in spirit.

The Trip

On February 25, 1988, we left for Poland. Neumann and Rudolf, the Canadian contingent, joined me and the remainder of our team in Frankfurt.

We arrived at Cracow in the late afternoon and spent our first night at the Hotel Orbis. We consumed the first of our three decent meals while in Poland. The following day we drove to Oswiecim (Auschwitz). We arrived at the Auschwitz hotel and were greeted by the smell of sulphur naphthal disinfectant, a smell I had not encountered for many years. The hotel is apparently the old officers' quarters for the camp. We ate lunch at the hotel dining room, a cafeteria style facility. This was our first unidentifiable meal, starch soup and sundries.

We made a reconnaissance tour of the camp, lasting into the dim light of the Polish afternoon and several snow squalls, a common occurrence. We ate no supper, in that we found no place to eat in Auschwitz after sundown our first evening.

Auschwitz and Birkenau

The following day we began our work in the alleged gas chamber at the Auschwitz [camp] facility. Unfortunately, we were unable to accomplish much due to constant interruptions by both official and unofficial Sunday tours. Carolyn stood guard at one entrance and Tjudar at the other, advising myself, Jürgen and Howard of their arrival. It was too dangerous to take forensic samples and tape, so we left for Birkenau [camp site] about noon.

At Birkenau we began a four-hour walk into the damp Polish cold and through snow squalls so dense we could not see each other at a distance of a few feet. Unfortunately, we did not expect to spend that much time walking through the camp and, since vehicles are not permitted within the camp, we left Carolyn behind in the car. Since we forgot to leave her the keys, she nearly froze in the cold Polish afternoon. We visited the barracks, crematories II, III, IV and V, the sauna and the alleged burning pits. We took samples, documented our activities on video tape and in still photos, and made scale drawings of these facilities, carefully documenting the removal locations of all the forensic samples. We had to break into the sauna building,

since it was locked.

At crematory II, I descended into the depths of the alleged gas chamber, a wet, dank subterranean place not visited by man in almost 50 years, since the building had been reduced to rubble, probably by a German military demolition team. Fortunately, there were fewer guards and less pedestrian traffic, making working conditions considerably better than they had been earlier at Auschwitz.

Having been instructed by our empty stomachs of the evening before, we found and ate at the restaurant at the bus station, the only legitimate restaurant in Auschwitz. We returned to the Auschwitz hotel for the night.

The following day, Monday, we again began our work at Auschwitz [camp site], the Sunday tours having subsided. We were able to get our samples, tapes and documentation. We had, by this time, obtained blueprints of the alleged gas-chamber facility and were able to follow the structural changes back to the dates in question. We also verified the existence of the floor drain for the periods of alleged gas chamber usage. Upon completion at Auschwitz, we drove again to Birkenau to take our control sample at delousing facility 1. Unfortunately, the building was locked and again we had to break and enter in order to access the delousing chamber. Again we ate at the bus station, and retired early to the Auschwitz hotel.

Tuesday morning, while awaiting Tijudar's unsuccessful attempt to obtain a can of Zyklon B, Jürgen and I made video tapes of locations within the camp. We moved from the Auschwitz hotel to a hostel nearby, obtaining newly vacated rooms. We ate at the bus station and retired early.

On Wednesday morning [the 2nd] we ate a very enjoyable breakfast of ham, cheese and bread (our second decent meal in Poland) and began our trip to Lublin to see the Majdanek camp site. After one final look in at Auschwitz, we set off by car for Majdanek.

Majdanek

Several hours later, we arrived at Majdanek (Lublin), and visited the museum, the reconstructed alleged gas chamber and the crematory. We finally arrived at disinfection [buildings] 1 and 2, and examined the facilities. It was extremely difficult to work, in that a guard made rounds every 10 or 15 minutes. The alleged gas chambers were blocked by gates and not accessible for a detailed inspection by the general public. It was necessary for me to trespass beyond these gates in forbidden areas. Again Carolyn and Tijudar stood watch while I made measurements and did a detailed examination in these areas. Once we were caught short: I was forced to hurdle the gate, and was still in the air and in mid-jump when the guard entered. Fortunately, he was more interested in Jürgen and his camera to see me before I touched ground.

Return

The camp closed in early afternoon and the guard rather nastily told us to leave. By three o'clock we were en route to Warsaw, a trip that would take five hours through rain and snow. Our hotel reservation had been fouled up but, fortunately, with the help of an embassy attache, we were able to secure rooms at another hotel.

We had our third edible meal in Poland that evening, and went to bed in preparation for our trip home on Thursday. The following morning [March 3] we had breakfast and proceeded to the airport for our return trip.

We boarded the Polish airlines plane after clearing customs -- my suitcase containing twenty pounds of the forbidden samples, fortunately none of which was found. I did not breathe easy until we cleared the passport checkpoint at Frankfurt. Our team split at Frankfurt for the return trips to the United States and Canada, respectively. After our return, I delivered the forensic samples to the test laboratory in Massachusetts. Upon receipt of the test results, I prepared my report, combining my knowledge of gas execution facilities and procedures with the research I had completed at crematories and with retort manufacturers in the United States. With the results of my research I believe you are all familiar.

Upon completion of my report I testified at Toronto -- but that is another story.

The Findings:

1. Gas Chambers

The results published in the Leuchter Report are the important thing. Categorically, none of the facilities examined at Auschwitz, Birkenau or Lublin (Majdanek) could have supported, or in fact did support, multiple executions utilizing hydrogen cyanide, carbon monoxide or any other allegedly or factually lethal gas. Based upon very generous maximum usage rates for all the alleged gas chambers, totalling 1,693 persons per week, and assuming these facilities could support gas executions, it would have required sixty-eight (68) years to execute the alleged number of six millions of persons. This must mean the Third Reich was in existence for some seventy-five (75) years. Promoting these facilities as being capable of effecting mass, multiple or even singular executions is both ludicrous and insulting to every individual on this planet. Further, those who do promote this mistruth are negligent and irresponsible for not investigating these facilities earlier and ascertaining the truth before indoctrinating the world with what may have become the greatest propaganda ploy in history.

2. Crematories

Of equal importance are Exterminationist errors relating to the crematories. If these crematories, operated at a theoretical rate of maximum output per day, without any down time and at a constant pace (an impossible situation), and we accept the figure of at least six million executed, the Third Reich lasted for at least forty-two (42) years, since it would take thirty-five (35) years at an impossible minimum to cremate these six million souls.

No one by any stretch of the imagination would allege (or even believe) that the Third Reich ever lasted for seventy-five (75) or even forty-two (42) years, yet they would have us believe that six million souls were executed with equipment that could not possibly have functioned, in less than one-seventh of the absolute minimum time it could possibly have taken.

3. Forensics

Forensic samples were taken from the visited sites. A control sample was removed from delousing facility 1 at Birkenau. It was postulated that because of the high iron content of the building materials at these camps the presence of hydrogen cyanide gas would result in a ferric-ferro-cyanide compound being formed, as evidenced by the Prussian blue staining on the walls in the delousing facilities.

A detailed analysis of the 32 samples taken at the Auschwitz-Birkenau complexes showed 1,050 mg/kg of cyanide and 6,170 mg/kg of iron. Higher iron results were found at all of the alleged gas chambers but no significant cyanide traces. This would be impossible if these sites were exposed to hydrogen cyanide gas, because the alleged gas chambers supposedly were exposed to much greater quantities of gas than the delousing facility. Thus, chemical analysis supports the fact that these facilities were never utilized as gas execution facilities.

4. Construction

Construction of these facilities shows that they were never used as gas chambers. None of these facilities were sealed or gasketed. No provision was ever made to prevent condensation of gas on the walls, floor or ceiling. No provision ever existed to exhaust the air-gas mixture from these buildings. No provision ever existed to introduce or distribute the gas throughout the chamber. No explosion-proof lighting existed and no attempt was ever made to prevent gas from entering the crematories, even though the gas is highly explosive. No attempt was made to protect operating personnel from exposure to the gas or to protect other non-participating persons from exposure. Specifically, at Auschwitz, a floor drain in the alleged gas chamber was connected directly to the camp's storm drain system. At Majdanek a depressed walkway around the alleged gas chambers would have collected gas seepage and resulted in a death trap for camp personnel. No exhaust stacks ever existed. Hydrogen cyanide gas is an extremely dangerous and lethal gas, and nowhere were there any provisions to effect any amount of safe handling. The chambers were too small to accommodate more than a small fraction of the alleged

numbers. Plain and simple, these facilities could not have operated as execution gas chambers.

5. Conclusion

After a thorough examination of the alleged execution facilities in Poland and their associated crematories, the only conclusion that can be arrived at by a rational, responsible person is the absurdity of the notion that any of these facilities were ever capable of, or were utilized as, execution gas chambers.

About the Author

Fred A. Leuchter, Jr., has been widely acknowledged as America's leading specialist on the design and fabrication of homicidal gas chambers and other equipment used in execution of convicted criminals. His expertise has been acknowledged by state governments and in periodicals such as *The Atlantic* (Feb. 1990), *The New York Times* (Oct. 13, 1990) and *The New York Times Book Review* (Nov. 22, 1992), as well as on the "Phil Donahue Show," where he appeared as a guest. After receiving his Bachelor's degree from Boston University in 1964, he did postgraduate work at the Harvard Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. Leuchter holds patents for numerous highly sophisticated technical devices, including sextants, surveying instruments and optical encoding equipment.

Leuchter spoke at length about his investigation at Auschwitz and other camp sites in sworn courtroom testimony, April 20-21, 1988, in the Toronto "Holocaust" trial of German-Canadian publisher Ernst Zündel. Leuchter's detailed Report on his investigation and findings has been published in numerous editions in all major languages.

Infuriated by his stunning court testimony and his Report, powerful special interest groups responded with an intense worldwide campaign against Leuchter. This vicious campaign of slander and vilification ultimately succeeded in destroying his career.

This paper was first presented at the Ninth IHR Conference (1989), and was published in the Summer 1989 issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

An illustrated edition of the headline-making Leuchter Report, with an introduction by French professor Robert Faurisson, is available from the IHR for \$17.00, postpaid. A deluxe edition is available for \$22.00 postpaid.

INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, California 92659
<http://www.ihr.org>

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



'Jewish soap'

by [Mark Weber](#)

One of the most lurid and slanderous Holocaust claims is the story that the Germans manufactured soap from the bodies of their victims. Although a similar charge during the First World War was exposed as a hoax almost immediately afterwards, it was nevertheless revived and widely believed during the Second. More important, this accusation was "proved" at the main Nuremberg trial of 1945-1946, and has been authoritatively endorsed by numerous historians in the decades since. In recent years, though, as part of a broad retreat from the most obviously untenable aspects of the "orthodox" extermination story, Holocaust historians have grudgingly conceded that the human soap tale is a wartime propaganda lie. In their retreat, though, these historians have tried to dismiss the soap story as a mere wartime "rumor," neglecting to mention that international Jewish organizations and then Allied governments endorsed and sanctioned this libelous canard.

Wartime rumors that the Germans were manufacturing soap from the corpses of slaughtered Jews were based in part on the fact that soap bars distributed by German authorities in Jewish ghettos and camps bore the impressed initials "RIF," which many took to stand for "Rein juedisches Fett" or "Pure Jewish Fat." (It did not seem to matter that the letters were "RIF" and not "RJF.") These rumors spread so widely in 1941 and 1942 that by late 1942 German authorities in Poland and Slovakia were expressing official concern about their impact.

According to a Polish source quoted in a secret wartime U.S. Army military intelligence report, for example, the Germans were operating a "human soap factory" in 1941 at Turek, Poland. "The Germans had brought thousands of Polish teachers, priests and Jews there and after extracting the blood serum from their bodies, had thrown them on large pots and melted off grease to make soap," the intelligence report added.

Macabre "Jewish soap" jokes became popular in the ghettos and camps, and many non-Jews on the outside came to believe the story. When trains loaded with Jewish deportees stopped temporarily at rail stations, Poles reportedly would gleefully shout at them: "Jews to soap!" Even British prisoners of war interned at Auschwitz in 1944 testified later about the wartime rumors that corpses of gassing victims were being turned into soap there.

In spite of its inherently incredible character, the soap story became an important feature of Jewish and Allied war propaganda. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, wartime head of both the World Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Congress, publicly charged in November 1942 that Jewish corpses were being "processed into such war-vital commodities as soap, fats and fertilizer" by the Germans. He further announced that the Germans were "even exhuming the dead for the value of the corpses," and were paying fifty marks for each body.

In late 1942, the Congress Weekly, published by the American Jewish Congress, editorialized that the Germans were turning Jews "by scientific methods of dissolution into fertilizer, soap and glue." An article in the same issue reported that Jewish deportees from France and Holland were being processed into "soap, glue and train oil" in at least two special factories in Germany. Typical of many other American periodicals, the influential New Republic reported in early 1943 that the Germans were "using the bodies of their Jewish victims to make soap and fertilizer in a factory at Siedlce."

During June and July 1943, two prominent representatives of the Moscow-based "Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee" toured the United States and raised more than two million dollars for the Soviet war effort at a series of mass meetings. At each of these rallies, Soviet Jewish leader Solomon Mikhoels showed the crowd a bar of soap that he said was made from Jewish

corpses.

After the war the soap story was given important legitimacy at the main Nuremberg trial. L. N. Smirnov, Chief Counsellor of Justice for the USSR, declared to the Tribunal:

... The same base, rationalized SS technical minds which created gas chambers and murder vans, began devising such methods of complete annihilation of human bodies, which would not only conceal the traces of their crimes, but also to serve in the manufacturing of certain products. In the Danzig Anatomical Institute, semi-industrial experiments in the production of soap from human bodies and the tanning of human skin for industrial purposes were carried out.

Smirnov quoted at length from an affidavit by Sigmund Mazur, an Institute employee, which was accepted as Nuremberg exhibit USSR-197. It alleged that Dr. Rudolf Spanner, the head of the Danzig Institute, had ordered the production of soap from corpses in 1943. According to Mazur's affidavit, Dr. Spanner's operation was of interest to high-ranking German officials. Education Minister Bernhard Rust and Health Leader Dr. Leonardo Conti, as well as professors from other medical institutes, came to witness Spanner's efforts. Mazur also claimed to have used the "human soap" to wash himself and his laundry.

A human soap "recipe," allegedly prepared by Dr. Spanner (Nuremberg document USSR-196), was also presented. Finally, a sample of what was supposed to be a piece of "human soap" was submitted to the Nuremberg Tribunal as exhibit USSR-393.

In his closing address to the Tribunal, chief British prosecutor Sir Hartley Shawcross echoed his Soviet colleague: "On occasion, even the bodies of their victims were used to make good the wartime shortage of soap." And in their final judgment, the Nuremberg Tribunal judges found that "attempts were made to utilize the fat from the bodies of the victims in the commercial manufacture of soap."

It is worth emphasizing here that the "evidence" presented at the Nuremberg Tribunal for the bogus soap story was no less substantial than the "evidence" presented for the claims of mass extermination in "gas chambers." At least in the former case, an actual sample of soap supposedly made from corpses was submitted in evidence.

After the war, supposed Holocaust victims were solemnly buried, in the form of soap bars, in Jewish cemeteries. In 1948, for example, four such bars wrapped in a funeral shroud were ceremoniously buried according to Jewish religious ritual at the Haifa cemetery in Israel. Other bars of "Jewish soap" have been displayed as grim Holocaust relics at the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, the Stutthof Museum near Gdansk (Danzig), the Yivo Institute in New York, the Holocaust Museum in Philadelphia, the Jewish Holocaust Centre in Melbourne (Australia), and at various locations in Israel.

Numerous Jews who lived in German ghettos and camps during the war helped keep the soap story alive many years later. Ben Edelbaum, for example, wrote in his 1980 memoir *Growing Up in the Holocaust*:

Often with our rations in the ghettos, the Germans had included a bar of soap branded with initials R.J.F. which came to be known as "RIF" soap. It wasn't until the war had ended that we learned the horrible truth about the bar of soap. Had we known in the ghetto, every bar of "RIF" soap would have been accorded a sacred Jewish funeral in the cemetery at Marysin. As it was, we were completely oblivious to its origin and used the bones and flesh of our murdered loved ones to wash our bodies.

Nesse Godin was transferred from a ghetto in Lithuania to the Stutthof concentration camp in the spring of 1944. In a 1983 interview, she recalled her arrival there:

That day they gave us a shower and a piece of soap. After the war we found out the soap was made out of pure Jew fat, Rein Juden Fett, marked in the initials on the soap that I washed with. For all I know sometimes maybe there was a little bit of my father's fat in that soap that I washed with. How do you think I

feel when I think about that?

Mel Mermelstein, the former Auschwitz inmate who was featured in the sensationalized April 1991 cable television movie "Never Forget" (and who sued the Institute for Historical Review and three other defendants for \$11 million), declared in a 1981 sworn deposition that he and other camp inmates used soap bars made from human fat. It was an "established fact," he insisted, that the soap he washed with was made from Jewish bodies.

Renowned "Nazi hunter" Simon Wiesenthal repeated the soap tale in a series of articles published in 1946 in the Austrian Jewish community paper *Der Neue Weg*. In the first of these he wrote:

During the last weeks of March the Romanian press reported an unusual piece of news: In the small Romanian city of Folticeni twenty boxes of soap were buried in the Jewish cemetery with full ceremony and complete funeral rites. This soap had been found recently in a former German army depot. On the boxes were the initials RIF, "Pure Jewish Fat." These boxes were destined for the Waffen-SS. The wrapping paper revealed with completely cynical objectivity that this soap was manufactured from Jewish bodies. Surprisingly, the thorough Germans forgot to describe whether the soap was produced from children, girls, men or elderly persons.

Wiesenthal went on:

After 1942 people in the General Government [Poland] knew quite well what the RIF soap meant. The civilized world may not believe the joy with which the Nazis and their women in the General Government thought of this soap. In each piece of soap they saw a Jew who had been magically put there, and had thus been prevented from growing into a second Freud, Ehrlich or Einstein.

In another article he observed: "The production of soap from human fat is so unbelievable that even some who were in concentration camps find it difficult to comprehend."

Over the years, numerous supposedly reputable historians have promoted the durable soap story. Journalist-historian William L. Shirer, for example, repeated it in his best-selling work, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*.

Leading Soviet war propagandist Ilya Ehrenburg wrote in his postwar memoir: "I have held in my hand a cake of soap stamped with the legend 'pure Jewish soap', prepared from the corpses of people who had been destroyed. But there is no need to speak of these things: thousands of books have been written about them."

A standard history studies textbook used in Canadian secondary schools, Canada: The Twentieth Century, told students that the Germans "boiled" the corpses of their Jewish victims "to make soap." *The Anatomy of Nazism*, a booklet published and distributed by the Zionist "Anti-Defamation League" of B'nai B'rith, stated: "The process of brutalization did not end with the mass murders themselves. Large quantities of soap were manufactured from the corpses of those murdered."

A detailed 1981 work, *Hitler's Death Camps*, repeated the soap story in lurid detail. While noting that "some historians claim that the Nazi manufacture of soap from human fat is just a grim rumor," author Konnilyn Feig nevertheless accepted the story because "most East European camp scholars ... validate the soap stories, and other kinds of bars made from humans are displayed in Eastern Europe -- I have seen many over the years."

New York Rabbi Arthur Schneier repeated the tale at the opening ceremony of the largest Holocaust meeting in history. In his invocation to the "American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors," held in Washington in April 1983, the Rabbi solemnly declared: "We remember the bars of soap with the initials RJF -- Rein jdisches Fett, Pure Jewish Fat -- made from the bodies of our loved ones."

In spite of all the apparently impressive evidence, the charge that the Germans manufactured soap from human beings is a falsehood, as Holocaust historians are now belatedly acknowledging. The "RIF" soap bar initials that supposedly stood for

"Pure Jewish Fat" actually indicated nothing more sinister than "Reich Center for Industrial Fat Provisioning" ("Reichsstelle für Industrielle Fettversorgung"), a German agency responsible for wartime production and distribution of soap and washing products. RIF soap was a poor quality substitute that contained no fat at all, human or otherwise.

Shortly after the war the public prosecutor's office of Flensburg, Germany, began legal proceedings against Dr. Rudolf Spanner for his alleged role in producing human soap at the Danzig Institute. But after an investigation the charge was quietly dropped. In a January 1968 letter, the office stated that its inquiry had determined that no soap from human corpses was made at the Danzig Institute during the war.

More recently, Jewish historian Walter Laqueur "denied established history" by acknowledging in his 1980 book, *The Terrible Secret*, that the human soap story has no basis in reality. Gitta Sereny, another Jewish historian, noted in her book *Into That Darkness*: "The universally accepted story that the corpses were used to make soap and fertilizer is finally refuted by the generally very reliable Ludwigsburg Central Authority for Investigation into Nazi Crimes."

Deborah Lipstadt, a professor of modern Jewish history, similarly "rewrote history" when she confirmed in 1981: "The fact is that the Nazis never used the bodies of Jews, or for that matter anyone else, for the production of soap."

In April 1990, professor Yehuda Bauer of Israel's Hebrew University, regarded as a leading Holocaust historian, as well as Shmuel Krakowski, archives director of Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust center, confirmed that the human soap story is not true. Camp inmates "were prepared to believe any horror stories about their persecutors," Bauer said. At the same time, though, he had the chutzpah to blame the legend on "the Nazis."

In fact, blame for the soap story lies rather with individuals such as Simon Wiesenthal and Stephen Wise, organizations like the World Jewish Congress, and the victorious Allied powers, none of whom has ever apologized for promoting this vile falsehood.

Why did Bauer and Krakowski decide that this was the appropriate time to officially abandon the soap story? Krakowski himself hints that a large part of the motivation for this "tactical retreat" has been to save what's left of the sinking Holocaust ship by throwing overboard the most obvious falsehoods. In the face of the growing Revisionist challenge, easily demonstrable falsehoods like the soap story have become dangerous embarrassments because they raise doubts about the entire Holocaust legend. As Krakowski put it: "Historians have concluded that soap was not made from human fat. When so many people deny the Holocaust ever happened, why give them something to use against the truth?"

The bad faith of those making this calculated and belated concession to truth is shown by their failure to note that the soap myth was authoritatively "confirmed" at Nuremberg, and by their unwillingness to deal with the implications of that confirmation for the credibility of the Tribunal and other supposedly trustworthy authorities in establishing other, more fundamental aspects of the Holocaust story.

The striking contrast between the prompt postwar disavowal by the British government of the infamous "human soap" lie of the First World War, and the way in which a similarly baseless propaganda story from the Second World War was officially endorsed by the victorious Allied powers and then authoritatively maintained for so many years not only points up the dispiriting lack of integrity on the part of so many Western historians, but underscores the general decline in Western ethical standards during this century.

The "human soap" story demonstrates anew the tremendous impact that a wartime rumor, no matter how fantastic, can have once it has taken hold, particularly when it is disseminated as a propaganda lie by influential individuals and powerful organizations. That so many intelligent and otherwise thoughtful people could ever have seriously believed that the Germans distributed bars of soap brazenly labeled with letters indicating that they were manufactured from Jewish corpses shows how readily even the most absurd Holocaust fables can be -- and are -- accepted as fact.

[Mark Weber](#) is editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*, published six times yearly by the Institute for Historical Review. He studied history at the University of Illinois (Chicago), the University of Munich, Portland State University, and Indiana University (M.A., 1977). For five days in March 1988, he testified as a recognized expert witness on the "final solution" and the Holocaust issue in a Toronto District Court case. He is the author of many published articles, reviews and essays on various aspects of modern European history. Weber has appeared as a guest on numerous radio talk shows, and on the nationally-syndicated "Montel Williams" television show.

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum

A Costly and Dangerous Mistake

Theodore J. O'Keefe

Hard by the Washington Monument, within clear view of the Jefferson Memorial, an easy stroll down the Mall to the majestic Lincoln Memorial, has arisen, on some of the most hallowed territory of the United States of America, a costly and dangerous mistake. On ground where no monument yet marks countless sacrifices and unheralded achievements of Americans of all races and creeds in the building and defense of this nation, sits today a massive and costly edifice, devoted above all to a contentious and false version of the ordeal in Europe, during World War II, of non-American members of a minority, sectarian group.

In the deceptive guise of tolerance, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum promotes a propaganda campaign, financed through the unwitting largesse of the American taxpayer, in the interests of Israel and its adherents in America.

How did the federal government allow the creation of such a monstrosity? What is its meaning for American policy and for American values? And what must the American people do to regain control of the land their servants in Washington handed over to a foreign interest, and to establish an enterprise thereon, whether a museum or otherwise, informed by and conducted according to American principles and interests?

Origins

In the late 1970s, during the presidency of James Earl "Jimmy" Carter, a propaganda campaign to promote the "Holocaust," the alleged systematic slaughter of some six million Jews by the Germans during the Second World War, was organized and carried out from Hollywood and New York. As Benjamin Meed, an important functionary of the Council that controls the Holocaust Museum, wrote in 1990: (note 1) Almost a dozen years ago, a new phenomena [sic] developed. The Holocaust was introduced into schools, colleges, and universities. Television broadcast programs on the Holocaust and millions of Americans watched them. Soon, Americans took great interest in the lessons of the Holocaust, its uniqueness and its universal message.

Why the urgency of this campaign? Two factors were paramount: first, the beginnings, more than three decades after the end of the Second World War, of an objective, scholarly assessment of the facts of the alleged German policy to exterminate European Jewry. (note 2)

Second, the need to justify Zionist theory and practice in the face of unprecedented international resistance to Israeli intransigence (including the famous UN General Assembly Resolution that equated Zionism with racism), and to defend Israel's aggressive policy under the leadership of the former terrorist, Prime Minister Menachem Begin. (note 3)

The US Holocaust Memorial Council

In 1978 President Carter, his administration beleaguered at home and abroad, succumbed to pressure from the new "Holocaust" lobby (and thus America's influential Israel-first minority) by creating, through executive order, the President's

Commission on the Holocaust. Two years later, on October 7, 1987, Congress passed -- unanimously -- a law establishing the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, charged principally with constructing and overseeing the operation of "a permanent living memorial to the victims of the holocaust" and with providing "for appropriate ways for the Nation to commemorate the Days of Remembrance, as an annual, national, civic commemoration of the Holocaust ..." (note 4)

A priceless tract of public land was turned over to the Council, and, after years of costly delay (during which the Council's budget swelled from \$2.5 million to over \$18 million a year), the US Holocaust Memorial Museum was finally completed and opened, to great media fanfare, in April 1993.

A Sectarian, Alien Agenda

Besides soliciting tens of millions of dollars in tax-deductible donations to finance the Holocaust Museum, the US Holocaust Memorial Council has busied itself with promoting an agenda of unalloyed support for minority, Zionist ends.

The membership of the Council, a US federal agency, has been overwhelmingly Jewish since its founding in 1980. The Council's two different chairmen -- Elie Wiesel and Harvey Meyerhoff -- have both been committed to the support of the State of Israel, and the chairs of the Council's most important committees have been likewise Jewish and Zionist.

The chief fund-raiser for the Holocaust Museum [and later Council Chairman], Miles Lerman, was formerly American vice chairman for the State of Israel Bonds Organization, promoting tax-free investment in a country which receives by far the largest amount of US foreign aid per year. Working the same wealthy Jewish-Americans he has long dealt with in his fund-raising for Israel, Lerman has helped raise nearly \$160 million in tax-deductible contributions. The biggest donors have been rewarded by having various components of the museum named for them (e.g. the Wexner Learning Center).

Nor is erecting and operating the Museum the only function with which the Holocaust Memorial Council has been charged. Another of its duties is to commemorate the "Days of Remembrance for Victims of the Holocaust," which Congress has raised to "an annual, national, civic commemoration of the Holocaust." Like the Israeli Yom ha-Shoah ("Day of the Holocaust"), on which they are based, the Days of Remembrance are dated according to the lunar Hebrew calendar, and thus, like Passover or Chanukah, fluctuate from year to year. These foreign days of lamentation are currently celebrated, under the flag of the Republic, to prayers and chants in Hebrew, across the land in governmental settings from the Capital Rotunda to city halls.

Need it be stated that no group of American victims of persecution, let alone another foreign group, enjoys any such federally mandated and tax-supported day, or days, of recognition?

Museum's One-Sided 'History'

Although the Council during its early years made noises about recognizing the ordeals of non-Jews during the Second World War, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum is relentlessly Judeocentric. While here and there are nods to non-Jewish groups oppressed by the German National Socialists (although never to groups victimized by Germany's enemies, above all by Stalin's USSR), the larger holocaust of the Second World War, which claimed an estimated 75 to 80 million lives around the world, is ignored in preference to the Jewish ordeal. Thus, to cite just one telling example, the Museum's "Life before the Holocaust" exhibit refers strictly to Jewish life before the Holocaust. (note 5)

Where, in fact, non-Jews figure in the Museum, they figure largely as villains: the Germans and their allies and collaborators; the Western allies, including America, who refused to accept a large immigration before the war; the American political and military leaders who refused to authorize costly bombing raids on the Auschwitz "gas chambers."

Soviet Liberators?

The Museum's message that support for Jews is the sole measure of decency during the Second World War leads to

anomalies which, in an American museum raised on ground hallowed to the principles of liberty on which this republic is based, can only be called shocking. That the victims of World War II atrocities by the Allies -- massacres such as the firebombing of Tokyo and Dresden, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Soviet slaughter of Polish prisoners at Katyn, the mass rapes carried out by the Red Army at the war's end -- receive no mention is deplorable. But the Museum's treatment of the armed forces which defended Stalin's savage Soviet tyranny is nothing short of grotesque.

Communists appear in this Museum only in the guise of "resistance fighters" and "liberators." For example, the submachine gun and false papers of Samuel Weissberg, a Communist Party member who rose to high rank in a Communist guerrilla group in North France, are on honored display, no less precious a relic in the Museum's permanent exhibit than the standard heaps of shoes and hair. (note 6)

Even more unsettling is the honor given to Stalin's notorious Red Army, which compiled a bloody and shameful record of atrocities across Europe during, and after, the war. As the US Holocaust Memorial Council's newsletter fulsomely puts it, "Flags will hang in the museum to honor the millions of Soviet soldiers who drove Nazi forces westward and who were the first allied forces to liberate and publicize the existence of the camps." In the words of Council chairman Meyerhoff, these martial banners of the Red tyranny have a single association: "Much more than simply wartime memorabilia, these military artifacts are a significant contribution to memory, one that will remind future generations of the pivotal role Soviet forces played in defeating Nazism ..." (note 7)

What must the millions of Americans originating or descending from the European nations -- Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia -- for which the Red "military artifacts" symbolize invasion, tyranny, oppression, and persecution of religion, think as they see the fierce armies of their persecutors hailed as "liberators"?

Israel in the Museum

Just as one might guess from the circumstance that the Museum's director, Jeshajahu Weinberg, and the head of its "Learning Center," Yechiam Halevy, were brought in from Israel, the Museum's treatment of the state of Israel is adulatory. An emotive tribute to the founding of Israel is an integral part of the exhibition. That the establishment of Israel, and its expansion in subsequent wars, has meant colonial occupation and oppression for millions of the land's native Palestinians, and dispossession and exile for millions more, goes unmentioned -- another grotesquery in an American museum supposed to instruct in the dangers of intolerance and disregard of human rights.

As for the momentous collaboration between Hitler's German state and the Zionist Jewish Agency in the 1930s, which through the Haavara Agreement enabled the transfer of vital capital and the influx of tens of thousands of highly skilled Jewish immigrants to Palestine -- that is passed over in utter silence. (note 8)

'Historical Correctness'

The Museum's skewed history is not simply a matter of one-sidedness and omission. It has further committed itself to a fixed and final interpretation of the surprisingly scanty and sometimes suspect evidence for a German policy of annihilating European Jewry, largely in gas chambers, in numbers approaching six million. This despite a considerable body of research and scholarship that has arisen over past two decades in many lands, and which contests, by academic means, the substance of the Holocaust "extermination thesis." (note 9)

That the US Holocaust Memorial Council is aware of the work of revisionist scholars is clear: the Council's literature is replete, not with substantive refutations of revisionist scholarship, but with slander and polemic. To cite one characteristic example, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Newsletter of May 1992 featured a front-page attack on Holocaust revisionism by Professor Deborah Lipstadt. In this article, Lipstadt decried the revisionists for producing material that looked scholarly, then lauded the US Holocaust Memorial Museum as "among the most efficacious ways" of "combatting this pernicious trend," while neglecting to specify a single error of revisionist scholarship. (note 10)

While the US Holocaust Memorial Council recognizes that there is a historical debate on the Holocaust, it takes official notice of the dissenting position only to attack it. That an American institution, supported by the taxes of all Americans, should commit itself to inflexible historical orthodoxy -- in the service of a single American minority -- is an intolerable imposition on our First Amendment rights, as well as a mockery of the Western, and American, ideal of objective scholarship.

A Center for Education?

Council Chairman Meyerhoff has stated: "The Museum is primarily an educational institution." (note 11) From the Council's own literature, however, it is clear what Meyerhoff means by education. The "role-playing" for children as well as adults who visit the Museum (visitors issued "identity cards" bearing the name and alleged fate of various Holocaust victims); the high-tech computer and video effects, and the recordings of speech and music that augment the Museum's tendentiously described artifacts; and the Museum's goal, as proclaimed by its Zionist fund-raising chairman, Miles Lerman, of insuring that "Children in Dubuque, families in Tucson, and schoolteachers in Atlanta will learn the history and the lessons of Auschwitz as thoroughly as they learn the history of their own communities": all these show that the US Holocaust Memorial Museum is a propaganda enterprise that seeks to indoctrinate all Americans in a uniquely and partisanly Jewish (and Zionist) version of not merely the past, but the present and the future. (note 12)

The American Response

What is the American response to a partisan museum constructed in a place solemnly consecrated to the heroes and the values of our Republic, to be lavishly operated with taxpayer dollars at a time when, even in our country's capital, thousands sleep homeless in the shadow of our national monuments? What is the American response to an ambitious propaganda agenda that aims to impose a sectarian "Holocaust remembrance" in schools where our children cannot pray, in town halls and federal buildings from which the religious symbols of the majority are banned in the name of freedom of worship?

Over two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." (note 13)

Nearly 150 years ago, Abraham Lincoln said: "I insist, that if there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never entrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions." (note 14)

The US Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Council that runs it, as agencies of the government in which the American people is sovereign, must be removed from the special interest that now controls it.

The scope and purpose of the Museum must be expanded, from its present one-sided emphasis on foreign Jewish sufferings, real and imagined, in Europe during the 1930s and 1940s to a compassionate yet realistic concern for all victims, but above all for American victims, of historic injustice.

The Museum must be made a place where Americans of every heritage, and scholars of every viewpoint, may gather, educate, and be educated, without accusation and in the absence of propaganda. Until it is, the men and women who founded and built and suffered and fought and died for America, of every race, nationality and creed, will rest uneasy.

Notes

1. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum Newsletter (Washington, DC), August, 1990, "Survivors Play Major Role in Establishing the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum," p. 1. Meed is president of the American Gathering of Holocaust Survivors, and chairman of the Council's Content and Days of Remembrance committees.
2. In 1976, Professor Arthur Butz's book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century: The Case Against the Presumed Extermination of European Jewry* was first published in England; in November 1978 Professor Robert Faurisson's

article, "The Problem of the Gas Chambers," was published in the Paris daily Le Monde. Professor Butz has commented on the simultaneous and independent appearance of a variety of earlier academic criticisms of the wartime propaganda version of Jewry's ordeal in "The International Holocaust Controversy," The Journal of Historical Review, Spring 1980, pp. 5-22.

3. By resolution of the United Nations General Assembly on Nov. 10, 1975, Zionism was condemned as "a form of racism and racial discrimination."
4. Public Law 96-388, 1, Oct. 7, 1980, 94 Stat. 1547.
5. Statements regarding the Museum's permanent exhibit, except where otherwise noted, are derived from the floor plan and photographs in United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, a brochure published in 1991 by the USHMC.
6. U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Newsletter, "French Resistance Fighter's Weapon Will Help Tell Story of Underground Movement," Sept. 1991, p. 4.
7. U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Newsletter, "Russian Embassy Presents Flags of Liberating Units to Museum," Fall 1992, p. 6.
8. For the most complete account of relations between the Nazis and the Zionists, see Francis Nicosia, *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question*, (Austin: Univ. of Texas, 1985). See also: M. Weber, "Zionism and the Third Reich," *The Journal of Historical Review*, July-August 1993, pp. 29-37.
9. The most complete survey of Holocaust revisionist writings to date is Carlo Mattogno's "The Myth of the Extermination of the Jews -- Part II," in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1988, pp. 261-302.
10. U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Newsletter, May 1992, "Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth," p. 6.
11. US Holocaust Memorial Museum Newsletter, Nov. 1991, "Wexner Family Donates \$5 Million to Fund Interactive Learning Center," p. 1.
12. The "identity cards" and other features of the Museum are described in the brochure cited in note 5, above. Lerman's statement is in a fund-raising letter mailed out by the Museum to potential Jewish contributors in 1991.
13. From "A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom," 1779, in *Jefferson: Magnificent Populist*, edited by Martin Larson, (Greenwich, Conn.: Devin-Adair, 1981), p. 319.
14. "Speech at Peoria, Ill.," Oct. 16, 1854, in *The American Intellectual Tradition*, Vol. 1, edited by David Hollinger and Charles Capper (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1989), p. 382.

Theodore J. O'Keefe, educated at Harvard University, is the author of numerous published articles, essays and reviews on historical and political subjects. For some years he served as editor of this Journal. This essay is available, in convenient leaflet form, from the IHR at the following prices: Ten copies for \$2; Fifty copies for \$5; 100 copies or more, 8 cents each.

[Main](#) | [Leaflets](#) | [Journal](#) | [Books](#) | [Contact us](#) | [Search](#) | [Support IHR](#) | [Subscribe](#)



Simon Wiesenthal: Fraudulent 'Nazi hunter'

by [Mark Weber](#)

For more than 40 years, Simon Wiesenthal has been tracking hundreds of "Nazi criminals" from his "Jewish Documentation Center" in Vienna. For his work as the world's most prominent "Nazi hunter," he has been awarded several honorary degrees and numerous medals, including Germany's highest decoration. In a formal White House ceremony in August 1980, a teary-eyed President Carter presented him with a special gold medal awarded by the US Congress. President Reagan praised him in November 1988 as one of the "true heroes" of this century.

This living legend was portrayed in flattering terms by the late Laurence Oliver in the 1978 film fantasy "The Boys From Brazil," and by Ben Kingsley in the 1989 HBO made-for-television movie "Murderers Among Us: The Simon Wiesenthal Story." One of world's most prominent Holocaust organizations bears his name: the Simon Wiesenthal Center of Los Angeles.

Wiesenthal's reputation as a moral authority is undeserved. The man whom The Washington Post has called the "Holocaust's Avenging Angel" (1) has a little known but well-documented record of reckless disregard for truth. He has lied about his own wartime experiences, misrepresented his postwar "Nazi-hunting" achievements, and has spread vile falsehoods about alleged German atrocities.

Different stories

Szymon (Simon) Wiesenthal was born on December 31, 1908, in Buczacz, a town in the province of Galicia (now Buchach in Ukraine) in what was then the eastern fringe of the Austro-Hungarian empire. His father was a prosperous wholesale sugar merchant.

In spite of all that has been written about him, just what Wiesenthal did during the war years under German occupation remains unclear. He has given conflicting stories in three separate accounts of his wartime activities. The first was given under oath during a two day interrogation session in May 1948 conducted by an official of the US Nuremberg war crimes commission. (2) The second is a summary of his life provided by Wiesenthal as part of a January 1949 "Application for Assistance" to the International Refugee Committee. (3) And the third account is given in his autobiography, *The Murderers Among Us*, first published in 1967. (4)

Soviet engineer or factory mechanic?

In his 1948 interrogation, Wiesenthal declared that "between 1939 and 1941" he was a "Soviet chief engineer working in Lvov and Odessa." (5) Consistent with that, he stated in his 1949 declaration that from December 1939 to April 1940 he worked as an architect in the Black Sea port of Odessa. But according to his autobiography, he spent the period between mid-September 1939 and June 1941 in Soviet-ruled Lvov, where he worked "as a mechanic in a factory that produced bedsprings." (6)

'Relative freedom'

After the Germans took control of Galicia province in June 1941, Wiesenthal was interned for a time in the Janowska concentration camp near Lvov, from where he was transferred a few months later to a camp affiliated with the repair works (OAW) in Lvov of the Ostbahn ("Eastern Railroad") of German-ruled Poland. Wiesenthal reported in his autobiography that he worked there "as a technician and draftsman," that he was rather well treated, and that his immediate superior, who was "secretly anti-Nazi," even permitted him to own two pistols. He had his own office in a "small wooden hut," and enjoyed "relative freedom and was permitted to walk all over the yards." (7)

Partisan fighter?

The next segment of Wiesenthal's life -- from October 1943 to June 1944 -- is the most obscure, and his accounts of this period are contradictory. During his 1948 interrogation, Wiesenthal said that he fled from the Janowska camp in Lvov and joined a "partisan group which operated in the Tarnopol-Kamenopodolsk area."⁸ He said that "I was a partisan from October 6, 1943, until the middle of February 1944," and declared that his unit fought against Ukrainian forces, both of the SS "Galicia" division and of the independent UPA partisan force.⁹

Wiesenthal said that he held the rank of lieutenant and then major, and was responsible for building bunkers and fortification lines. Although he was not explicit, he suggested that this (supposed) partisan unit was part of the Armia Ludowa ("Peoples Army"), the Polish Communist military force established and controlled by the Soviets.¹⁰

He said that he and other partisans slipped into Lvov in February 1944, where they were "hidden by friends of the A.L. ['People's Army'] group." On June 13, 1944, his group was captured by the German Secret Field Police. (Although Jewish partisans caught in hiding were often shot, Wiesenthal reports that he was somehow spared.) Wiesenthal told much the same story in his 1949 statement. He said that he fled from internment in early October 1943 and then "fought against the Germans as a partisan in the forest" for eight months -- from October 2, 1943, to March 1944. After that, he was "in hiding" in Lvov from March to June 1944.

Wiesenthal tells a totally different story in his 1967 autobiography. He reports there that after escaping from the Ostbahn Repair Works on Oct. 2, 1943, he lived in hiding in the houses of various friends until June 13, 1944, when he was discovered by Polish and German police and returned to a concentration camp. He makes no mention of any partisan membership or activity.¹¹

According to both his 1948 interrogation and his 1967 autobiography, he tried to commit suicide on June 15, 1944, by cutting his wrists. Remarkably, though, he was saved from death by German SS doctors and recovered in an SS hospital.¹² He remained in the Lvov concentration camp "with double rations" for a time, and then, he reports in his autobiography, he was transferred to various work camps. He spent the remaining chaotic months, until the end of the war, in different camps until he was liberated from Mauthausen (in Austria) by American forces on May 5, 1945.¹³

Did Wiesenthal invent a past as a heroic wartime partisan? Or did he later try to suppress his record as a Communist fighter? Or is the true story altogether different -- and too shameful to admit?

'Nazi agent'?

Did Wiesenthal voluntarily work for his wartime oppressors? That's the accusation leveled by Austrian Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, himself of Jewish ancestry and leader for many years of his country's Socialist Party. During an interview with foreign journalists in 1975, Kreisky charged Wiesenthal with using "Mafia methods," rejected his pretense of "moral authority," and suggested that he was an agent for the German authorities. Some of his more pertinent remarks, which appeared in Austria's leading news magazine Profil, include:¹⁴

I really know Mr. Wiesenthal only from secret reports, and they are bad, very nasty. I say this as Federal Chancellor ... And I say that Mr. Wiesenthal had a different relationship with the Gestapo than I did. Yes, and this can be proven. I can't say more [now]. Everything else, I'll say in court.

My relationship with the Gestapo is unambiguous. I was their prisoner, their inmate, and I was interrogated. His relationship was a different one, I can say, and this will come out clearly. It's bad enough what I've already said here. But he can't clear himself by charging me with defaming his honor in the press, as he might wish. It's not that simple, because that would mean a big court case ... A man like this doesn't have the right to pretend to be a moral authority. That's what I say. He doesn't have the right ...

Whether a man who, in my view, is an agent, yes, that's right, and who uses Mafia methods ... Such a man has to go ...

He is no gentleman, and I would say, to make this clear, so that he won't become a moral authority, because he is not ... He shouldn't pretend to be a moral authority ...

I say that Mr. Wiesenthal lived in that time in the Nazi sphere of influence without being persecuted. Right? And he lived openly without being persecuted, right? Is that clear? And you perhaps know, if you know what was going on, that no one could risk that.

He wasn't a "submarine" ... that is, submerged and in hiding, but instead, he was completely in the open without having to, well, ever risk persecution. I think that's enough. There were so many opportunities to be an agent. He didn't have to be a Gestapo agent. There were many other services.

In response to these damning words, Wiesenthal began efforts to bring a lawsuit against the Chancellor. Eventually, though, both Wiesenthal and Kreisky backed away from a major legal clash.

Mauthausen myths

Before he became famous as a "Nazi hunter," he made a name for himself as a propagandist. In 1946 Wiesenthal published *KZ Mauthausen*, an 85-page work that consists mainly of his own amateurish sketches purporting to represent the horrors of the Mauthausen concentration camp. One drawing depicts three inmates who had been bound to posts and brutally put to death by the Germans.¹⁵

The sketch is completely phony. It was copied -- with some minor alterations -- from photographs that appeared in *Life* magazine in 1945, which graphically record the firing-squad execution in December 1944 of three German soldiers who had been caught operating as spies behind the lines during the "Battle of the Bulge."¹⁶ The source of the Wiesenthal drawing is instantly obvious to anyone who compares it with the *Life* photos.¹⁷

The irresponsible character of this book is also shown by Wiesenthal's extensive citation therein of the supposed "death bed confession" of Mauthausen Commandant Franz Ziereis, according to which four million were gassed to death with carbon monoxide at the nearby Hartheim satellite camp.¹⁸ This claim is totally absurd, and no serious Holocaust historian still accepts it.¹⁹ Also according to the Ziereis "confession" cited by Wiesenthal, the Germans supposedly killed another ten million people in Poland, Lithuania and Latvia.²⁰ In fact, this fraudulent "confession" was obtained by torture.²¹

Years later, Wiesenthal was still lying about Mauthausen. In a 1983 interview with the daily newspaper *USA Today*, he said of his experience in Mauthausen: "I was one of 34 prisoners alive out of 150,000 who had been put there."²² This is a blatant falsehood. The years have apparently not been kind to Wiesenthal's memory, because in his own autobiography he wrote that "almost 3,000 prisoners died in Mauthausen after the Americans liberated us on May 5, 1945."²³ Another former inmate, Evelyn Le Chene, reported in her standard work about Mauthausen that there were 64,000 inmates in the camp when it was liberated in May 1945.²⁴ And according to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, at least 212,000 inmates survived internment in the Mauthausen camp complex.²⁵

After the war Wiesenthal worked for the US Office of Strategic Services (the forerunner of the CIA) and the US Army's Counter-Intelligence Corps (CIC). He was also vice chairman of the Jewish Central Committee in the US occupation zone of Austria.²⁶

'Human soap'

Wiesenthal has given circulation and credence to one of the most scurrilous Holocaust stories, the charge that the Germans manufactured soap from the corpses of murdered Jews. According to this tale, the letters "RIF" in bars of German-made soap allegedly stood for "Pure Jewish Fat" ("Rein judisches Fett"). In reality, the initials stood for "National Center for Industrial Fat Provisioning" ("Reichsstelle für industrielle Fettversorgung").²⁷

Wiesenthal promoted the "human soap" legend in articles published in 1946 in the Austrian Jewish community paper *Der Neue Weg* ("The New Path"). In an article entitled "RIF," he wrote: "The terrible words 'transport for soap' were first heard at the end of 1942. It was in the [Polish] General Government, and the factory was in Galicia, in Belzec. From April 1942 until May 1943, 900,000 Jews were used as raw material in this factory." After the corpses were turned into various raw materials, Wiesenthal wrote, "The rest, the residual fat stuff, was used for soap production."

He continued: "After 1942 people in the General Government knew quite well what the RIF soap meant. The civilized world may not believe the joy with which the Nazis and their women in the General Government thought of this soap. In each piece of soap they saw a Jew who had been magically put there, and had thus been prevented from growing into a second Freud, Ehrlich or Einstein."²⁸

In another imaginative article published in 1946 entitled "Belzec Soap Factory," Wiesenthal alleged that masses of Jews were exterminated in electrocution showers:²⁹

The people, pressed together and driven on by the SS, Latvians and Ukrainians, go through the open door into the "bath." Five hundred persons could fit at a time. The floor of the "bath chamber" was made of metal and shower heads hung from the ceiling. When the room was full, the SS turned on the 5,000 volts of electric current in the metal plate. At the same time water poured from the shower heads. A short scream and the execution was over. An SS chief physician named Schmidt determined through a peep hole that the victims were dead. The second door was opened and the "corpse commando" came in and quickly removed the dead. It was ready for the next 500.

Today no serious historian accepts the stories that Jewish corpses were manufactured into bars of soap or that Jews were electrocuted to death at Belzec (or anywhere).

Wiesenthal's imaginative view of history is not limited to the twentieth century. In his 1973 book *Sails of Hope*, he argued that Christopher Columbus was a secret Jew, and that his famous voyage to the western hemisphere in 1492 was actually a search for a new homeland for Europe's Jews.³⁰

Wiesenthal is not always wrong, of course. In 1975 and again in 1993 he publicly acknowledged that "there were no extermination camps on German soil."³¹ He thus implicitly conceded that the claims made at the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal and elsewhere that Buchenwald, Dachau and other camps in Germany proper were "extermination camps" are not true.

'Fabrications' about Eichmann

In more than 40 years of "Nazi hunting," Wiesenthal's role in locating and capturing Adolf Eichmann is often considered his greatest achievement.³² (Eichmann headed the wartime SS Jewish affairs department. He was kidnapped by Israeli agents in Argentina in May 1960 and hanged in Jerusalem after a trial that received worldwide media attention.)

But Isser Harel, the Israeli official who headed the team that seized Eichmann, has declared unequivocally that Wiesenthal had "absolutely nothing" to do with the capture. (Harel is a former head of both the Mossad and Shin Bet, Israel's foreign and domestic security agencies.)³³

Wiesenthal not only "had no role whatsoever" in the apprehension, said Harel, but in fact he endangered the entire Eichmann operation. In a 278-page manuscript, Harel carefully refuted every claim by Wiesenthal about his supposed role in identifying and capturing Eichmann. Claims by Wiesenthal and his many friends about his supposedly crucial role in capturing the former SS officer, said Harel, have no foundation in fact. Many specific assertions and incidents described in two books by Wiesenthal, said the Israeli official, are "complete fabrications."³⁴

"Wiesenthal's reports and statements at that period prove beyond any doubt that he had no notion of Eichmann's whereabouts," said Harel.³⁵ (For example, just before Eichmann's capture in Argentina, Wiesenthal was placing him in Japan and Saudi Arabia.)³⁶

Characterizing Wiesenthal as a rank opportunist, Harel summed up: "All the information supplied by Wiesenthal before and in anticipation of the [Eichmann] operation was utterly worthless, and sometimes even misleading and of negative value."³⁷

Reckless charges in Walus case

One of Wiesenthal's most spectacular cases involved a Polish-born Chicago man named Frank Walus. In a letter dated December 10, 1974, he charged that Walus "delivered Jews to the Gestapo" in Czestochowa and Kielce in Poland during the war. This letter prompted a US government investigation and legal action.³⁸ The Washington Post dealt with the case in a 1981 article entitled "The Nazi Who Never Was: How a witch hunt by judge, press and investigators branded an innocent man a war criminal." The lengthy piece, which was copyrighted by the American Bar Association, reported:³⁹

In January 1977, the United States government accused a Chicagoan named Frank Walus of having committed atrocities in Poland during World War II.

In the following years, this retired factory worker went into debt in order to raise more than \$60,000 to defend himself. He sat in a courtroom while eleven Jewish survivors of the Nazi occupation of Poland testified that they saw him murder children, an old woman, a young woman, a hunchback and others ...

Overwhelming evidence shows that Walus was not a Nazi War criminal, that he was not even in Poland during World War II.

... In an atmosphere of hatred and loathing verging on hysteria, the government persecuted an innocent man. In 1974, Simon Wiesenthal, the famous "Nazi hunter" of Vienna, denounced Walus as "a Pole in Chicago who performed duties with the Gestapo in the ghettos of Czestochowa and Kielce and handed over a number of Jews to the Gestapo."

The Chicago weekly newspaper Reader also reported on the case in a detailed 1981 article headlined: "The Persecution of Frank Walus: To Catch a Nazi: The U.S. government wanted a war criminal. So, with the help of Simon Wiesenthal, the Israeli police, the local press and Judge Julius Hoffman, they invented one."⁴⁰ The article stated:

... It is logical to assume that the "reports received by Wiesenthal [against Walus] actually were rumors... In other words, Simon Wiesenthal had no evidence against Walus. He denounced him anyway.

While [Judge] Hoffman had the Walus case under advisement, Holocaust aired on television. During the same period, in April 1978, Simon Wiesenthal came to Chicago, where he gave interviews taking credit for the Walus case. "How Nazi-Hunter Helped Find Walus," was the Sun-Times headline on a story by Bob Olmstead. Wiesenthal told Sun-Times Abe Peck that he "has never had a case of mistaken identity." "I know there are thousands of people who wait for my mistake," he said.

It was only after an exhausting legal battle that the man who was vilified and physically attacked as "the butcher of Kielce" was finally able to prove that he had spent the war years as a peaceful farm laborer in Germany. Frank Walus died in August

1994, a broken and bitterly disappointed man, man.

Wiesenthal's recklessness in the Walus case should have been enough to permanently discredit him as a reliable investigator. But his Teflon reputation survived even this.

Wrong about Mengele

Much of the Wiesenthal myth is based on his hunt for Joseph Mengele, the wartime physician at Auschwitz known as the "Angel of Death." Time and time again, Wiesenthal claimed to be close on Mengele's heels. Wiesenthal reported that his informants had "seen" or "just missed" the elusive physician in Peru, Chile, Brazil, Spain, Greece, and half a dozen locations in Paraguay.⁴¹

One of the closest shaves came in the summer of 1960. Wiesenthal reported that Mengele had been hiding out on a small Greek island, from where he escaped by just a few hours. Wiesenthal continued to peddle this story, complete with precise details, even after a reporter whom he had hired to check it out informed him that the tale was false from beginning to end.⁴²

According to another Wiesenthal report, Mengele arranged for the murder in 1960 of one of his former victims, a woman he had supposedly sterilized in Auschwitz. After spotting her, and her distinctive camp tattoo, at a hotel in Argentina where he was staying, Mengele allegedly arranged to have her killed because he feared that she would expose him. It turned out that the woman was never in a concentration camp, had no tattoo, had never met Mengele, and her death was a simple mountaineering accident.⁴³

Mengele regularly dined at the finest restaurants in Asuncion, the Paraguayan capital, Wiesenthal said in 1977, and supposedly drove around the city with a bevy of armed guards in his black Mercedes Benz.⁴⁴

Wiesenthal announced in 1985 that he was "100 percent sure" that Mengele had been hiding out in Paraguay until at least June 1984, and charged that the Mengele family in Germany knew exactly where. As it turned out, Wiesenthal was completely wrong. It was later definitively established that Mengele had died in 1979 in Brazil, where he had been living for years in anonymous poverty.⁴⁵

Israel's ambassador to Paraguay from 1968 to 1972, Benjamin (Benno) Varon, remarked in 1983 on the Mengele campaign: "Wiesenthal makes periodic statements that he is about to catch him, perhaps since Wiesenthal must raise funds for his activities and the name Mengele is always good for a plug." Wiesenthal "failed miserably" in the Mengele case, the diplomat said on another occasion.⁴⁶ In the Mengele case, former Mossad chief Harel remarked, "Wiesenthal's folly borders on the criminal."⁴⁷

In truth, the bulging Mengele file in Wiesenthal's Vienna "Documentation Center" was such a jumble of useless information that, in the words of the London Times, it "only sustained his self-confirmatory myths and gave scant satisfaction to those who apparently needed a definitive answer to Mengele's fate."⁴⁸

In the considered view of Gerald Posner and John Ware, coauthors of *Mengele: The Complete Story*, Wiesenthal spent years assiduously cultivating a mythical "self-image of a tireless, dogged sleuth, pitted against the omnipotent and sinister might of Mengele and a vast Nazi network." Because of his "knack of playing to the gallery," Posner and Ware concluded, Wiesenthal "ultimately compromised his credibility."⁴⁹

'Incompetence and arrogance'

Eli Rosenbaum, an official with the US government's "Nazi hunting" Office of Special Investigations and an investigator for the World Jewish Congress, took aim at Wiesenthal's carefully cultivated "Nazi hunter" reputation in a detailed 1993 book, *Betrayal*.⁵⁰ For example, Rosenbaum mentioned, Wiesenthal "had all these reports placing Mengele in almost every country

in Latin America except the one he was in -- namely, Brazil."⁵¹

Wiesenthal, wrote Rosenbaum, has been a "pathetically ineffective" investigator who had "gone far beyond the buffoonery and false boasts in prior years." Much of his illustrious career, Rosenbaum said, has been characterized by "incompetence and arrogance."⁵²

Bruno Kreisky once summed up his attitude towards the "Nazi hunter" in these words:⁵³

The engineer Wiesenthal, or whatever else his title is, hates me because he knows that I despise his activity. The Wiesenthal group is a quasi-political Mafia that works against Austria with disgraceful methods. Wiesenthal is known as someone who isn't very careful about the truth, who is not very selective about his methods and who uses tricks. He pretends to be the "Eichmann hunter," even though everyone knows that this was the work of a secret service, and that Wiesenthal only takes credit for that.

'Commercializing' the Holocaust

The Los Angeles Wiesenthal Center pays the Vienna "Nazi Hunter" \$75,000 a year for the use of his name, the director of Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust center said in 1988.

Both the Center and Wiesenthal "commercialize" and "trivialize" the Holocaust, the director added.

Wiesenthal "threw out" the figure of "11 million who were murdered in the Holocaust -- six million Jews and five million non-Jews," said the Yad Vashem official. When asked why he gave these figures, Wiesenthal replied: "The gentiles will not pay attention if we do not mention their victims, too." Wiesenthal "chose 'five million (gentiles)' because he wanted a 'diplomatic' number, one that told of a large number of gentile victims but in no way was larger than that of Jews ..." ⁵⁴

"What Wiesenthal and the Los Angeles Center that bears his name do is to trivialize the Holocaust," commented The Jewish Press, a weekly that claims to be the largest-circulation English-language Jewish community paper in America.

In recent years Wiesenthal has been concerned about the growing impact of Holocaust revisionism. In "A Message from Simon Wiesenthal" published by the Center that bears his name, he said: "Today, when I see the rise of antisemitism here in Europe ... the popularity of Le Pen, of David Duke, of the Holocaust revisionists, then I am convinced more than ever about the need for our new [Wiesenthal Center] Beit Hashoah-Museum of Tolerance" in Los Angeles.⁵⁵

Wiesenthal is often asked why he does not forgive those who persecuted Jews half a century ago. His stock answer is that although he has the right to forgive for himself, he does not have the right to forgive on behalf of others.⁵⁶ On the basis of this sophistical logic, though, neither does he have the right to accuse and track down anyone in the name of others. Wiesenthal has never confined his "hunt" to those who victimized him personally.

'Driven by hatred'

It is difficult to say just what drives this remarkable man. Is it a craving for fame and praise? Or is he trying to live down a shameful episode from his past?

Wiesenthal clearly enjoys the praise he receives. "He is a man of considerable ego, proud of testimonials and honorary degrees," the Los Angeles Times has reported.⁵⁷ Bruno Kreisky has given a simpler explanation. He said that Wiesenthal is "driven by hatred."⁵⁸

In light of his well-documented record of deceit, lies and incompetence, the extravagant praise heaped upon this contemptible man is a sorry reflection of the venal corruptibility and unprincipled self-deception of our age.

Notes

1. Quoted in: M. Weber, "'Nazi Hunter' Caught Lying," *The Spotlight* (Washington, DC), Oct. 26, 1981, p. 9.
2. Interrogation of S. Wiesenthal on May 27 and 28, 1948, conducted by Curt Ponger of the Interrogation Branch of the Evidence Division of the Office (U.S.) Chief of Counsel for War Crimes. Interrogation No. 2820. On file at the National Archives (Washington, DC), "Records of the U.S. Nürnberg War Crimes Trials Interrogations, 1946-49," Record Group 238, microfilm M-1019, roll 79, frames 460-469 and 470-476. Also cited in: "New Documents Raise New Doubts About Simon Wiesenthal's War Years," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1988-89 (Vol. 8, No. 4), pp. 489-503.
3. PCIRO (International Refugee Organization, Austria) "Application for Assistance" filled out and signed by Wiesenthal. Dated Jan. 16, 1949. (This was a trial exhibit in the Walus court case. Photocopy in author's possession.)
4. Simon Wiesenthal, *The Murderers Among Us: The Simon Wiesenthal Memoirs*. Edited by Joseph Wechsberg. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967)
5. Interrogation of S. Wiesenthal, May 27, 1948, pp. 1-2.
6. *The Murderers Among Us*, p. 27.
7. *The Murderers Among Us*, pp. 29-35. This account is not inconsistent with his 1948 and 1949 statements; See also: Simon Wiesenthal, *Justice Not Vengeance* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld: 1989), pp. 7-9.
8. Interrogation of May 27, 1948, p. 2. In a signed 1945 statement, Wiesenthal wrote:

"... I escaped on October 18, 1943, from the Lemberg [Lvov] hard labor camp where I was kept as a prisoner during my two years of labor at the railroad works... and went into hiding until joining Jewish partisans on November 21, 1943, who operated there. It was while fighting in the partisan ranks against the Nazis that we managed to collect and bury for safekeeping considerable amount of evidence... When the partisans were dispersed by the Germans I fled to Lemberg on February 10, 1944, and again went into hiding. On June 13, 1944, I was found during a house to house search and was immediately sent to the famous Lacki camp, near that city ..." Source: "Curriculum Vitae of Ing. Wiesenthal, Szymon." SHAEF, Subject: War Crimes, July 6, 1945. Records of USAEUR, War Crimes Branch, National Archives (Suitland, Maryland), Records Group 338, Box 534, Folder 000-50-59.

9. Wiesenthal's alleged partisans activities are also recounted in Alan Levy, *The Wiesenthal File* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), pp. 50-53.
10. Interrogation of May 28, 1948, pp. 1-2.
11. Interrogation of May 28, 1948, p. 5.
12. *The Murderers Among Us*, pp. 35-37.
13. *The Murderers Among Us*, pp. 37-38; Interrogation, May 27, 1948, p. 2, and May 28, 1948, p. 5; A. Levy, *The Wiesenthal File* (1994), p. 54.
14. *The Murderers Among Us*, pp. 39-44; Interrogation, May 27, 1948, pp. 2-3.
15. Interview with foreign journalists in Vienna, Nov. 10, 1975. Text published in: "War Wiesenthal ein Gestapo-Kollaborateur?," *Profil* (Vienna), No. 47, Nov. 18, 1975, pp. 16, 22-23; Reprinted in: Robert H. Drechsler, *Simon Wiesenthal: Dokumentation* (Vienna: 1982), pp. 215-218, 222-223; Quoted in part in A. Levy, *The Wiesenthal File* (1994), p. 349, and in, S. Wiesenthal, *Justice Not Vengeance* (New York: 1989), pp. 7, 299. Kreisky was not alone in charging that Wiesenthal had collaborated with the German Gestapo. Wim Van Leer, columnist for the English-language daily *Jerusalem Post*, stated in May 1986 that a high-level police official in Vienna, citing confidential police records, had told him during the early 1960s that these and other charges against Wiesenthal were true. Source: J. Bushinsky, "Nazi hunter sues over charges of links to Gestapo," *Chicago Sun-Times*, Jan. 31, 1987.
16. Simon Wiesenthal, *KZ Mauthausen* (Linz and Vienna: Ibis-Verlag, 1946). Facsimile reprint in: Robert H. Drechsler, *Simon Wiesenthal: Dokumentation* (Vienna: 1982), p. 64.
17. "Firing Squad," *Life* magazine, US edition, June 11, 1945, p. 50.
18. M. Weber and K. Stimely, "The Sleight-of-Hand of Simon Wiesenthal," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984 (Vol. 5, No. 1), pp. 120-122; *D. National-Zeitung* (Munich), May 21, 1993, p. 3.
19. S. Wiesenthal, *KZ Mauthausen* (1946). See also facsimile reprint in: Robert H. Drechsler, *Simon Wiesenthal: Dokumentation* (Vienna: 1982), pp. 42, 46. This "confession" is a somewhat altered version of Nuremberg document NO-1973; A new edition of Wiesenthal's 1946 book has been published under the title *Denn sie Wussten*,

was sie tun: Zeichnungen und Aufzeichnungen aus dem KZ Mauthausen (Vienna: F. Deuticke, 1995). I am grateful to Robert Faurisson for bringing this to my attention. He points out in a July 1995 essay that Wiesenthal has deleted from this new edition both the "death bed confession" of Ziareis as well as his drawing of the three Mauthausen inmates.

20. According to the Encyclopaedia Judaica ("Mauthausen," Vol. 11, p. 1138), a grand total of 206,000 persons were inmates of Mauthausen and its satellite camps (including Hartheim) at one time or another.
21. S. Wiesenthal, *KZ Mauthausen* (1946). Facsimile reprint in: R. Drechsler, *Simon Wiesenthal: Dokumentation*, p. 47.
22. R. Faurisson, "The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie?," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Winter 1981, pp. 330, 361. See also: Hans Fritzsche, *The Sword in the Scales* (London: 1953), p. 185; Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution* (London: Sphere, pb., 1971), p. 515; M. Weber, "The Nuremberg Trials and the Holocaust," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1992 (Vol. 12, No. 2), p. 182.
23. *USA Today*, April 21, 1983, p. 9A.
24. *The Murderers Among Us*, p. 44.
25. Evelyn Le Chene, *Mauthausen: The History of a Death Camp* (London: 1971), pp. 166-168 and 190-191.
26. "Mauthausen", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (New York and Jerusalem: 1971), vol. 11, p. 1138.
27. C. Moritz, ed., *Current Biography 1975* (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1975), p. 442; Wiesenthal interrogation of May 27, 1948, p. 3.
28. Mark Weber, "Jewish Soap," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Summer 1991 (Vol. 11, No. 2), pp. 217-227; See also: Robert Faurisson, "La savon juif," *Annales d'Histoire Revisionniste* (Paris), No. 1, Printemps 1987, pp. 153-159.
29. *Der Neue Weg* (Vienna), No. 17/18, 1946, pp. 4-5. Article entitled "RIF" by "Ing. Wiesenth." (Simon Wiesenthal).
30. *Der Neue Weg* (Vienna), Nr. 19/20, 1946, pp. 14-15. Article entitled "Seifenfabrik Belsetz" ("Belzec Soap Factory"), by "Ing. S. Wiesenth."
31. S. Wiesenthal, *Sails of Hope* (Macmillan, 1973).
32. Letters by Wiesenthal in *Books and Bookmen* (London), April 1975, p. 5, and in *Stars and Stripes* (European edition), Jan. 24, 1993, p. 14. Facsimile of Stars and Stripes letter in *The Journal of Historical Review*, May-June 1993, p. 10; In 1986 Wiesenthal lied about his 1975 statement. In a letter dated May 12, 1986, to Prof. John George of Central State University in Edmond, Oklahoma (copy in author's possession), Wiesenthal wrote: "I have never stated that 'there were no extermination camps on German soil.' This quote is false, I could never have said such a thing."
33. For example, in a letter (dated Sept. 13, 1993), published in *The New York Times*, Sept. 29, 1993, Wiesenthal boasted: "I succeeded in putting a number of Nazis on trial who had perpetrated horrendous crimes in the Nazi era, including Adolf Eichmann, Franz Stangl, Gustav Wagner,..."
34. S. Birnbaum, "Wiesenthal's Claim on Eichmann Disputed by Former Mossad Head," *Jewish Telegraphic Agency Daily News Bulletin* (New York), April 4, 1989. (Dispatch dated April 3).
35. J. Schachter, "Wiesenthal had no role in Eichmann capture," *The Jerusalem Post*, May 18, 1991. Facsimile reprint in *Christian News*, May 27, 1991, p. 19. See also: Ruth Sinai, "Wiesenthal's role in Eichmann's capture disputed," *Associated Press*, *The Orange County Register*, Feb. 25, 1990, p. A 26; L. Lagnado, "How Simon Wiesenthal Helped a Secret Nazi," *Forward* (New York), Sept. 24, 1993, pp. 1, 3.
36. J. Schachter, *The Jerusalem Post*, May 18, 1991 (cited above). Facsimile in *Christian News*, May 27, 1991, p. 19.
37. Arnold Forster, *Square One* (New York: 1988), pp. 187-189. (Forster was general counsel of the Anti-Defamation League, a major Zionist organization.)
38. J. Goldberg, "Top Spy Says Wiesenthal Lied About His Exploits," *Forward* (New York), Nov. 12, 1993, pp. 1, 4; R. Sinai, "Wiesenthal's role...", *The Orange County Register*, Feb. 25, 1990 (cited above).
39. Michael Arndt, "The Wrong Man," *The Chicago Tribune Magazine*, Dec. 2, 1984, pp. 15-35, esp. p. 23; Charles Ashman and Robert J. Wagman, *The Nazi Hunters* (New York: Pharos Books, 1988), pp. 193-195.
40. "The Nazi Who Never Was," *The Washington Post*, May 10, 1981, pp. B5, B8.
41. "The Persecution of Frank Walus," *Reader* (Chicago), Jan. 23, 1981, pp. 19, 30. After Wiesenthal was ultimately proven wrong in a similar case in Canada, the *Toronto Sun* newspaper commented in an editorial: "It seems that material provided by professional Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal is wrong, but repeated anyway [in the media]." (Quoted by M. Weber in *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1984, pp. 120-122.)
42. Gerald L. Posner and John Ware, *Mengele: The Complete Story* (New York: Dell, 1987), pp. 220-221; Gerald Astor, *The 'Last' Nazi: The Life and Times of Dr. Joseph Mengele* (Toronto: Paperjacks, 1986), p. 202.
43. G. Posner and J. Ware, *Mengele: The Complete Story* (cited above), p. 220.
44. G. Posner and J. Ware, *Mengele* (cited above), pp. 179-180; G. Astor, *The 'Last' Nazi* (cited above), pp. 178-180.

45. Time magazine, Sept. 26, 1977, pp. 36-38. Cited in: G. Posner and J. Ware, Mengele (cited above), p. 219.
46. "Hunting the 'Angel of Death'," Newsweek, May 20, 1985, pp. 36-38. See also: M. Weber, "Lessons of the Mengele Affair," Journal of Historical Review, Fall 1985 (Vol. 6, No. 3), p. 382. On Wiesenthal's distortion of truth in the Mermelstein-IHR case, see: M. Weber, "Declaration," Journal of Historical Review, Spring 1982 (Vol. 3, No. 1), pp. 42-43; M. Weber, "Albert Speer and the 'Holocaust,'" Journal of Historical Review, Winter 1984 (Vol. 5, Nos. 2-4), p. 439.
47. Midstream, Dec. 1983, p. 24. Quoted in: G. Posner and J. Ware, Mengele (cited above), p. 219; Los Angeles Times, Nov. 15, 1985, p. 2.
48. J. Schachter, "Wiesenthal had no role in Eichmann capture," The Jerusalem Post, May 18, 1991. Facsimile reprint in Christian News, May 27, 1991, p. 19.
49. Tom Bower in The Times (London), June 14, 1985, p. 14. Quoted in: G. Posner and J. Ware, Mengele (cited above), pp. 222-223.
50. G. Posner and J. Ware, Mengele (cited above), pp. 222-223.
51. Betrayal, by Eli M. Rosenbaum, with William Hoffer. Published in 1993 by St. Martin's Press (New York). Reviewed by Jacob Heilbrunn in The New York Times Book Review, Oct. 10, 1993, p. 9.
52. Quoted in L. Lagnado, "How Simon Wiesenthal...," Forward (New York), Sept. 24, 1993, p. 3.
53. The New York Times Book Review, Oct. 10, 1993, p. 9; Forward (New York), Sept. 24, 1993, p. 3.
54. "Was hat Wiesenthal zu verbergen?," D. National-Zeitung (Munich), Nov. 11, 1988, p. 4.
55. David Sinai, "News We Doubt You've Seen," The Jewish Press (Brooklyn, NY), Dec. 23, 1988. Based on report in the Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz, Dec. 16, 1988.
56. "A Message from Simon Wiesenthal," Response: The Wiesenthal Center World Report, Winter 1992, p. 11.
57. Charles Ashman and Robert J. Wagman, The Nazi Hunters (New York: Pharos Books, 1988), p. 286; A. Popkin, "Nazi-Hunter Simon Wiesenthal: 'Information is Our Best Defense'," Washington Jewish Week, Oct. 29, 1987, p. 2.
58. Quoted in: M. Weber, The Spotlight, Oct. 26, 1981, p. 9.
59. Quoted in D. National-Zeitung (Munich), July 8, 1988, p. 7, and in, R. Drechsler, Simon Wiesenthal: Dokumentation (Vienna: 1982), p. 199.

This is a revised and updated version of an article that first appeared in The Journal of Historical Review, Winter 1989-90 (Volume 9, number 4), pages 439-452.



A Prominent False Witness: Elie Wiesel

By [Robert Faurisson](#)

ELIE WIESEL won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1986. He is generally accepted as a witness to the Jewish "Holocaust," and, more specifically, as a witness to the legendary Nazi extermination gas chambers. The Paris daily *Le Monde* emphasized at the time that Wiesel was awarded the Nobel Prize because: [\(note 1\)](#)

These last years have seen, in the name of so-called "historical revisionism," the elaboration of theses, especially in France, questioning the existence of the Nazi gas chambers and, perhaps beyond that, of the genocide of the Jews itself.

But in what respect is Elie Wiesel a witness to the alleged gas chambers? By what right does he ask us to believe in that means of extermination? In an autobiographical book that supposedly describes his experiences at Auschwitz and Buchenwald, he nowhere mentions the gas chambers. [\(note 2\)](#) He does indeed say that the Germans executed Jews, but ... by fire; by throwing them alive into flaming ditches, before the very eyes of the deportees! No less than that!

Here Wiesel the false witness had some bad luck. Forced to choose from among several Allied war propaganda lies, he chose to defend the fire lie instead of the boiling water, gassing, or electrocution lies. In 1956, when he published his testimony in Yiddish, the fire lie was still alive in certain circles. This lie is the origin of the term Holocaust. Today there is no longer a single historian who believes that Jews were burned alive. The myths of the boiling water and of electrocution have also disappeared. Only the gas remains.

The gassing lie was spread by the Americans. [\(note 3\)](#) The lie that Jews were killed by boiling water or steam (specifically at Treblinka) was spread by the Poles. [\(note 4\)](#) The electrocution lie was spread by the Soviets. [\(note 5\)](#)

The fire lie is of undetermined origin. It is in a sense as old as war propaganda or hate propaganda. In his memoir, *Night*, which is a version of his earlier Yiddish testimony, Wiesel reports that at Auschwitz there was one flaming ditch for the adults and another one for babies. He writes: [\(note 6\)](#)

Not far from us, flames were leaping from a ditch, gigantic flames. They were burning something. A lorry drew up at the pit and delivered its load -- little children. Babies! Yes, I saw it -- saw it with my own eyes ... Those children in the flames. (Is it surprising that I could not sleep after that? Sleep has fled from my eyes.)

A little farther on there was another ditch with gigantic flames where the victims suffered "slow agony in the flames." Wiesel's column was led by the Germans to within "three steps" of the ditch, then to "two steps." "Two steps from the pit we were ordered to turn to the left and made to go into a barracks."

An exceptional witness himself, Wiesel assures us of his having met other exceptional witnesses. Regarding Babi Yar, a place in Ukraine where the Germans executed Soviet citizens, among them Jews, Wiesel wrote: [\(note 7\)](#)

Later, I learn from a witness that, for month after month, the ground never stopped trembling; and that, from time to time, geysers of blood spurted from it.

These words did not slip from their author in a moment of frenzy: first, he wrote them, then some unspecified number of times (but at least once) he had to reread them in the proofs; finally, his words were translated into various languages, as is everything this author writes.

That Wiesel personally survived, was, of course, the result of a miracle. He says that: [\(note 8\)](#)

In Buchenwald they sent 10,000 persons to their deaths each day. I was always in the last hundred near the gate. They stopped. Why?

In 1954 French scholar Germaine Tillion analyzed the "gratuitous lie" with regard to the German concentration camps. She wrote: [\(note 9\)](#)

Those persons [who gratuitously lie] are, to tell the truth, much more numerous than people generally suppose, and a subject like that of the concentration camp world -- well designed, alas, to stimulate sado-masochistic imaginings -- offered them an exceptional field of action. We have known numerous mentally damaged persons, half swindlers and half fools, who exploited an imaginary deportation; we have known others of them -- authentic deportees -- whose sick minds strove to go even beyond the monstrosities that they had seen or that people said had happened to them. There have been publishers to print some of their imaginings, and more or less official compilations to use them, but publishers and compilers are absolutely inexcusable, since the most elementary inquiry would have been enough to reveal the imposture.

Tillion lacked the courage to give examples and names. But that is usually the case. People agree that there are false gas chambers that tourists and pilgrims are encouraged to visit, but they do not tell us where. They agree that there are false "eyewitnesses," but in general they name only Martin Gray, the well-known swindler, at whose request Max Gallo, with full knowledge of what he was doing, fabricated the bestseller *For Those I Loved*.

Jean-François Steiner is sometimes named as well. His bestselling novel *Treblinka* (1966) was presented as a work of which the accuracy of every detail was guaranteed by oral or written testimony. In reality it was a fabrication attributable, at least in part, to the novelist Gilles Perrault. [\(note 10\)](#) Marek Halter, for his part, published his *La Mémoire d'Abraham* in 1983; as he often does on radio, he talked there about his experiences in the Warsaw ghetto. However, if we are to believe an article by Nicolas Beau that is quite favorable to Halter, [\(note 11\)](#) little Marek, about three years old, and his mother left Warsaw not in 1941 but in October of 1939, before the establishment of the ghetto there by the Germans. Halter's book is supposed to have been actually written by a ghost writer, Jean-Noël Gurgan.

Filip Müller is the author of *Eyewitness Auschwitz: Three Years in the Gas Chambers*, [\(note 12\)](#) which won the 1980 prize of the International League against Racism and Anti-Semitism (LICRA). This nauseous best-seller is actually the work of a German ghost writer, Helmut Freitag, who did not hesitate to engage in plagiarism. [\(note 13\)](#) The source of the plagiarism is *Auschwitz: A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, another best-seller made up out of whole cloth and attributed to Miklos Nyiszli. [\(note 14\)](#)

Thus a whole series of works presented as authentic documents turns out to be merely compilations attributable to various ghost writers: Max Gallo, Gilles Perrault, Jean-Noël Gurgan (?), and Helmut Freitag, among others.

We would like to know what Germaine Tillion thinks about Elie Wiesel today. With him the lie is certainly not gratuitous. Wiesel claims to be full of love for humanity. However, he does not refrain from an appeal to hatred. In his opinion: [\(note 15\)](#)

Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate -- healthy, virile hate -- for what the German personifies and for what persists in the German. To do otherwise would be a betrayal of the dead.

At the beginning of 1986, 83 deputies of the German Bundestag took the initiative of proposing Wiesel for the Nobel Peace Prize. This would be, they said, "a great encouragement to all who are active in the process of reconciliation." ([note 16](#)) That is what might be called "going from National Socialism to national masochism."

Jimmy Carter needed a historian to preside over the President's Commission on the Holocaust. As Dr. Arthur Butz said so well, he chose not a historian but a "histrion": Elie Wiesel. Even the newspaper *Le Monde*, in the article mentioned above, was obliged to refer to the histrionic trait that certain persons deplore in Wiesel:

Naturally, even among those who approve of the struggle of this American Jewish writer, who was discovered by the Catholic François Mauriac, some reproach him for having too much of a tendency to change the Jewish sadness into "morbidity" or to become the high priest of a "planned management of the Holocaust."

As Jewish writer Leon A. Jick has written: "The devastating barb, 'There is no business like SHOAH-business' is, sad to say, a recognizable truth." ([note 17](#))

Elie Wiesel issues alarmed and inflammatory appeals against Revisionist authors. He senses that things are getting out of hand. It is going to become more and more difficult for him to maintain the mad belief that the Jews were exterminated or were subjected to a policy of extermination, especially in so-called gas chambers. Serge Klarsfeld has admitted that real proofs of the existence of the gas chambers have still not yet been published. He promises proofs. ([note 18](#))

On the scholarly plane, the gas chamber myth is finished. To tell the truth, that myth breathed its last breath several years ago at the Sorbonne colloquium in Paris (June 29-July 2, 1982), at which Raymond Aron and François Furet presided. What remains is to make this news known to the general public. However, for Elie Wiesel it is of the highest importance to conceal that news. Thus all the fuss in the media, which is going to increase: the more the journalists talk, the more the historians keep quiet.

But there are historians who dare to raise their voices against the lies and the hatred. That is the case with Michel de Boüard, wartime member of the Resistance, deportee to Mauthausen, member of the Committee for the History of the Second World War from 1945 to 1981, and a member of the Institut de France. In a poignant interview in 1986, he courageously acknowledged that in 1954 he had vouched for the existence of a gas chamber at Mauthausen where, it finally turns out, there never was one. ([note 19](#))

The respect owed to the sufferings of all the victims of the Second World War, and, in particular, to the sufferings of the deportees, demands on the part of historians a return to the proven and time-honored methods of historical criticism.

Notes

1. October 17, 1986. Front page.
2. There is one single allusion, extremely vague and fleeting, on pages 78-79: Wiesel, who very much likes to have conversations with God, says to Him: "But these men here, whom You have betrayed, whom You have allowed to be tortured, butchered, gassed, burned, what do they do? They pray before you!" (*Night*, New York, Discus/Avon Books, 1969, p. 79). In his preface to that same book, François Mauriac mentioned "the gas chamber and the crematory" (p. 8). The four crucial pages of "testimony" by Elie Wiesel are reproduced in facsimile in: Pierre Guillaume, *Droit et Histoire (La Vieille Taupe)*, 1986, pp. 147-150. In the German-language edition of *Night (Die Nacht zu begraben, Elischa [Ullstein, 1962])*, on 14 occasions the word "crematory" or "crematories" has been falsely given as "Gaskammer" ("gas chamber[s]"). In January of 1945, in anticipation of a Russian takeover, the Germans were evacuating Auschwitz. Elie Wiesel, a young teenager at the time, was hospitalized in Birkenau (the "extermination camp") after surgery on an infected foot. His doctor had recommended two weeks of rest and good food but, before his foot healed, the Russian takeover became imminent. Hospital patients were considered unfit for the long trip to the camps in Germany and Elie thus could have remained at Birkenau to await the Russians. Although his father had permission to stay with him as a hospital patient or orderly, father and son talked it over and

- decided to move out with the Germans. (See *Night*, p. 93. See also D. Calder, *The Sunday Sun* [Toronto, Canada], May 31, 1987, p. C4.)
3. See the US War Refugee Board Report, *German Extermination Camps: Auschwitz and Birkenau* (Washington, DC), November 1944.
 4. See Nuremberg document PS-3311 (USA-293). Published in the IMT "blue series," Vol. 32, pp. 153-158.
 5. See the report in *Pravda*, Feb. 2, 1945, p. 4, and the UP report in the *Washington (DC) Daily News*, Feb. 2, 1945, p. 2.
 6. *Night* (Avon/Discus). See esp. pp. 41, 42, 43, 44, 79, 93.
 7. *Paroles d'étranger* (Editions du Seuil, 1982), p. 86.
 8. "Author, Teacher, Witness," *Time* magazine, March 18, 1985, p. 79.
 9. "Le Système concentrationnaire allemand [1940-1944]," *Revue d'histoire de la Deuxième Guerre mondiale*, July 1954, p. 18, n. 2.
 10. *Le Journal du Dimanche*, March 30, 1985, p. 5.
 11. *Libération*, Jan. 24, 1986, p. 19.
 12. Published by Stein and Day (New York). Paperback edition of 1984. (xii + 180 pages.) With a foreword by Yehuda Bauer of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University, Jerusalem.
 13. Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: un caso di plagio*, Parma (Italy): 1986. See also: C. Mattogno, "Auschwitz: A Case of Plagiarism," *The Journal of Historical Review*, Spring 1990, pp. 5-24.
 14. Paperback edition, 1961, and later, published by Fawcett Crest (New York).
 15. *Legends of Our Time* (chapter 12: "Appointment with Hate"), New York: Schocken Books, 1982, p. 142, or, New York: Avon, 1968, pp. 177-178.
 16. *The Week in Germany* (published in New York by the German government in Bonn), Jan. 31, 1986, p. 2.
 17. "The Holocaust: Its Use and Abuse Within the American Public," *Yad Vashem Studies* (Jerusalem), 1981, p. 316.
 18. *VSD*, May 29, 1986, p. 37.
 19. *Ouest-France*, August 2-3, 1986, p. 6.

Summary

Elie Wiesel passes for one of the most celebrated eyewitnesses to the alleged Holocaust. Yet in his supposedly autobiographical book *Night*, he makes no mention of gas chambers. He claims instead to have witnessed Jews being burned alive, a story now dismissed by all historians. Wiesel gives credence to the most absurd stories of other "eyewitnesses." He spreads fantastic tales of 10,000 persons sent to their deaths each day in Buchenwald.

When Elie Wiesel and his father, as Auschwitz prisoners, had the choice of either leaving with their retreating German "executioners," or remaining behind in the camp to await the Soviet "liberators," the two decided to leave with their German captors.

It is time, in the name of truth and out of respect for the genuine sufferings of the victims of the Second World War, that historians return to the proven methods of historical criticism, and that the testimony of the Holocaust "eyewitnesses" be subjected to rigorous scrutiny rather than unquestioning acceptance.