

Eye Witness Testimony of Homicidal Gassings in German Concentration Camps During World War II

by Jürgen Graf

Edited by Russ Granata
<http://www.russgranata.com/>

1. Some basic comments

Nobody disputes that Jews were persecuted during The Second World War. That persecution was real and brutal; however, revisionist researchers dispute the existence of a National Socialist program aimed at a systematic destruction of the Jews, or that there were extermination camps with gas chambers for the killing of Jewish prisoners, and that the persecution resulted in six million Jewish lives. Revisionists don't dispute that Jews were shot in the eastern war zone, they only question the number of victims which are presented in the official literature.

What happened between 1941 and 1945 was for revisionists an atrocity which in principal is not unlike countless other atrocities recorded in history. It happened only too often in the past that some people were discriminated against, deported for use as slave labor where many of them also died of malnutrition, sickness or exhaustion. In almost every war, civilians have been shot, and other criminal acts against civilians have been committed, consequently, in contrast to official historians, revisionists do not accept the "Holocaust" as being unique.

One thing is certain; if official historiography is correct, one would have to acknowledge the uniqueness of the crime, not because of the number of victims; nobody denies the fact that communism claimed many more victims than National Socialism, but because of the method applied. Mass murder has been recorded many times in history, but never in chemical slaughter houses. Therefore, the question about the existence or non-existence, of homicidal gas chambers is of utmost importance. What is commonly described as the "Holocaust" would have been impossible without homicidal gas chambers because the Germans would not have had the means to achieve the alleged systematic mass murder.

2. The most common objections against revisionism

The revisionist thesis must at first seem absurd to anyone who has never critically looked at the "Holocaust." Every person raised in the western hemisphere has consistently heard from early childhood on, about the extermination of the Jews, the gas chambers and the six million; to doubt this, would be like stating the Second World War never happened. In discussions with people who never read our writings, revisionists are always challenged with three most common objections, which go approximately like this:

Objection one: To where did the million Jews disappear? For instance before The Second World War, about three million Jews lived in Poland; then after that war, there were a few tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands at the most. This proves that 2.5 to 3

million Polish Jews were murdered by the Germans.

Objection two: In the spring of 1945 when American troops liberated a number of concentration camps, they found piles of corpses and walking skeletons. Everyone saw those pictures. Are they all Hollywood fakes?

Objection three: Countless eye-witnesses described mass murder in gas chambers. Were they really all liars? It is impossible for that many people to tell the same story independently from one another. Furthermore, many killers, the most prominent being Rudolf Höss, the first commandant of the Auschwitz concentration camp, confessed that they participated in mass murder. Were these confessions all extracted by torture?

Today I am going to address number three of these objections, dealing with eye-witness testimony. But first, a few short observations about the other two.

Let's start with the question, what happened to the missing Jews, if they were not murdered. Another speaker will deal with this issue in detail, I will only respond with an easy to understand counter argument, and I am indebted to the French researcher, Jean-Marie Boisdefeu, for this: [\(1\)](#)

At the time of the colonial regime in Algiers, about one million Frenchmen lived there. When the National Liberation Front came to power, the number was reduced to approximately 100,000. Does this mean the Algerian Freedom Fighters killed 900,000 Frenchmen? Certainly not, the answer would be that most French settlers went on their own accord back to France before independence was achieved. Therefore, the lack of Polish Jews is no proof that they were all murdered. Is it not possible that a large portion, maybe even the majority of them, are still alive, just not living in Poland, but in other countries instead?

The demographic changes in Poland, as pointed out by J.M. Boisdefeu, were much more drastic; the whole eastern half, where until 1939 most of the Jews lived, was annexed by the USSR, and for compensation Poland gained large portions of German territory where hardly any Jews had lived before the war, as compared to Algiers, where the borders remained largely intact.

A short story, published on November 24, 1978 in the State Times (Baton Rouge, Louisiana) explains much more vividly than any complicated demographic study, the fate of the Polish Jews, and I quote:

The Steinbergs once flourished in a small Jewish village in Poland. That was before Hitler's death camps.

Now more than 200 far-flung survivors and descendants are gathered here to share a special four-day celebration that began, appropriately, on Thanksgiving day. Relatives came Thursday from Canada, France, England, Argentina, Columbia, Israel and from at least 13 cities across the United States.

"It's fabulous," said Iris Krasnow of Chicago, "There are five generations here -

from 3 months old to 85. People are crying and having a wonderful time. It's almost like World War II refugee reunion."

[STATE-TIMES, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 24 Nov. 1978 p.8-A]

Let's move on to the second objection to revisionism, the one about the pictures of corpses and walking skeletons which were found in the liberated camps. Those pictures are by no means forgeries produced in Hollywood; unfortunately they are real. However, all historians, orthodox as well as revisionists, agree that the corpses we see on those pictures are not murder victims, but casualties of epidemics and malnutrition. Toward the end of 1944, the situation in the concentration camps steadily worsened due to the collapse of Germany. The destruction by bombings of the transport system led to shortages of food, and the still-functioning western camps were totally overcrowded due to transfers of inmates from the eastern camps. Epidemics spread, which, due to shortages, could not be brought under control, so that consequently, the death toll in Dachau, for instance, from the beginning of January 1945 to the end of April, 1945, was no less than 15,384 persons. This was more than during the five prior war years! The total casualty figure from the beginning of 1940 to the end of 1944 amounted to 12,455.

(2) Now, the above-mentioned photographs have absolutely nothing to do with the so-called "Holocaust" mostly in gas chambers which was aborted in the fall of 1944, according to orthodox historians. But still the pictures are persistently shown to prove the "Holocaust," and the "proof" for the existence of homicidal gas chambers in Auschwitz and Treblinka is fraudulently obtained by showing pictures of victims of malnutrition, typhus and dysentery. These are some of the antics used by representatives of official historiography.

3. The value of eye-witness testimony in the official "Holocaust" literature

Raul Hilberg's book, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, (3) is viewed as the most comprehensive work on the "Holocaust." The persecution of the European Jews, that is to say the anti-Jewish policies practiced by the Germans and their allies is on hundreds of pages in the three volumes, complete with footnotes on source material. However that book is not called *The Persecution of the European Jews*, the title is *The Destruction of the European Jews*, and it is therefore misleading, because only an insignificant portion of this immense work deals with the fundamentals of the "Holocaust," namely the alleged destruction of Jews in extermination camps. In the German edition of this book, Hilberg deals with "Extermination" on only 19 of 1,351 pages. Adding the 11 pages dealing with "Evacuation of the Extermination Camps," we have a total of 30 pages, a little over 2% devoted to extermination of Jews. (4) The attentive reader of those 30 pages, including references, soon realizes that Hilberg bases his narrative exclusively on eye-witness accounts and not on documents. Why?--because just as there are no documents describing the construction and operation of gas chambers for the killing of humans, there are no documents about a German plan for physical extermination of Jews.

The book, *Les crematoires d'Auschwitz*, (5) published in 1994 from the pen of the French researcher Jean-Claude Pressac, was hailed by the Western World as the refutation of revisionism. Pressac promises in the preface not to rely on "always unsound" eye-witness

testimony, but instead on documents.⁽⁶⁾ The reader then discovers to his amazement, that Pressac relies on eye-witness accounts as a source every time he describes human gassings!

In 1996, the Frenchman Jacques Baynac was the first representative of the orthodox "Holocaust" account to acknowledge that there is no scientific evidence for the existence of human killing chambers in the National Socialist war camps. He writes:⁽⁷⁾

For a scientific historian, eye-witness testimony does not portray real history. It is an object of history. One eye-witness testimony doesn't weigh much, and multiple ones not much more, because none of them is based on documentation. The postulate of scientific historiography must be, without exaggeration: No paper (s), no proof.

4. The three types of evidence

Let's recount what the anti-revisionist historian J. Baynac admitted in 1996:

The vicious accusation of mass killings, aimed at the German people for over half a century, is based solely on eye-witness accounts. We revisionists are not satisfied with them. Our method is to investigate the fate of the Jews during World War II the same way other historical events are investigated, a method accepted in criminology--which means that there is an order of importance regarding evidence: Forensic evidence comes first, documentary proof is next, and eye-witness accounts are last.⁽⁸⁾

Permit me to demonstrate this with a plain example. A man was knifed to death; the murder weapon, a knife with traces of blood and fingerprints, was found near the corpse. An eye-witness accuses Mr. X. In the beginning of the investigation, the police have the knife examined to see if the blood type of the victim is the same as that of the blood on the knife; if the wound could have been caused by that knife, and if the fingerprints on the grip are those of the accused. If the results of this investigation is contrary to the eye-witness account, the result of the investigation counts. If, for instance, the fingerprints on the grip are not those of Mr. X and if the investigator determines that the stab wound was made by a right handed person, whereas Mr. X is left-handed, the investigator will conclude that the eye-witness is wrong (maybe because Mr. X looks like the real murderer), or he lied on purpose because he and Mr. X are antagonists, and he would like to harm him by accusing him of murder.

There are good reasons for attorneys to rate eye-witness accounts as unreliable. First, human memory is imperfect because it is always possible that a witness will mix up what he/she has experienced with what was later read or heard. Secondly, emotions, things such as sympathies and anti-sympathies, often play a role. Legally, one has to differentiate between accounts of partial and impartial witnesses. If, for instance, an

impartial witness describes a car accident, the police will, when in doubt, put more credence into his testimony than in that of the occupants of the car because they will likely implicate each other.

Documentary proof, as mentioned, is placed between forensic evidence and eye-witness testimony. Two illustrations, not related to the "Holocaust" topic, show why. The first illustration will demonstrate the superiority of objective proof evidence over documents:

Let's assume that Archaeologists find a document showing a city where today there is nothing but seemingly undisturbed ground. Digging starts, but nothing is found. Since even after thousands of years there should still be some traces, the document must be inaccurate. The objective proof, since there are no remains of a city, prevails over the document; the document is not recording historical reality, but a fable. The document itself may be real, but the contents are faulty.

The second illustration demonstrates the superiority of documentary proof over eye-witness testimony. Let's assume a man is accused of having committed a crime in a city at a certain time. He denies having been in that city at that time, presents an eye-witness who swears that both of them went for a mountain hike and didn't meet anyone. But now the police find in the city where the crime was committed, a hotel bill displaying the date of the crime and his signature. Thus, because of documentary proof, the eye-witness is shown to be a liar. One can assume he lied to protect his friend, or that he was paid for it.

This simple illustration demonstrates the unreliability of eye-witness testimony; and since the accusation of a mass murder of millions in chemical slaughterhouses rests exclusively on eye-witness testimony, one has to be suspicious, especially since the witnesses are not impartial, but almost exclusively former Jewish concentration camp inmates who suffered during their internment and can hardly be expected to be objective toward those who interned them.

5. Eye witness testimony vs. forensic- and documentary proof

We have just demonstrated what methods the police would use to solve a normal, non-political crime. When confronted with a spectacular and monstrous crime like the "Holocaust," one must assume that the victorious powers would do everything in their power to preserve the evidence of this crime immediately after they liberated the camps. It would have been crucial to obtain expert analysis--how the murder weapon was used, what type of gas was used, and in what facilities.

The Soviets captured the Auschwitz and Majdanek concentration camps almost undamaged--the structures which were allegedly used as gas chambers were partially intact, partially in ruins. According to eye-witness testimony, in both camps the insecticide Zyklon-B which contains Prussian blue, was used for mass murder (small doses of carbon monoxide, from containers was allegedly used in Majdanek).

Chemists, engineers and architects should have immediately examined the premises, following strict scientific guidelines to ascertain if mass murder was possible in the manner and in the time frame portrayed by eye-witnesses. Furthermore, the structures

allegedly used as homicidal gas chambers should have been examined to ascertain if they could have been used for that purpose. Next, the crematories should have been examined to see if they could have handled the alleged number of corpses, and they should have checked to see if there were any traces of mass burnings in trenches, etc.

None of that happened. True, a Soviet commission, right after the liberation of Majdanek (in July 1944), examined a few things and wrote a report, [\(9\)](#) but this report is not even quoted in the official "Holocaust" literature, because the Soviet scientists acted in an obviously flawed and fraudulent manner. [\(10\)](#) For instance, the presence of Zyklon-B containers was seen as proof for human gassings, even though it was widely known that this insecticide was used in almost all concentration camps, as well as on the battlefield, to fight lice which spread typhus. It was also sold abroad. In 1943, twelve tons of Zyklon-B was sold to the Finnish army, for example, and nobody in the Finnish army claims that it was used to exterminate Jews. [\(11\)](#) Consequently, the mere presence of Zyklon-B containers is no proof that humans were homicidally gassed, just as the presence of a hatchet in a household does not suggest that a crime has been committed.

Aside from this, the victorious powers never bothered to provide forensic proof for alleged killings in gas chambers. Not at Nuremberg, nor in any of the many Nazi court cases in the Federal Republic of Germany, was an expert opinion advanced which dealt with the alleged murder weapon.

Revisionists did what the accusers against the Germans neglected to do. First they studied blueprints of the alleged gas chambers in Auschwitz and Majdanek and discovered that the rooms where humans were allegedly gassed were in actuality morgues or basements to store corpses, whereas the gas chambers in Majdanek were constructed as such, but were not for killing human beings, but rather were for de-lousing clothing. Then, revisionists tried to ascertain if it was technically possible to alter those rooms in such a way that they could be used for mass killings with Zyklon-B. They came to the conclusion that this was not possible partly because of technical or chemical reasons. [\(12\)](#) If those conclusions are erroneous, our adversaries had plenty of opportunities to correct them and come up with their own analysis. Nothing like that to date has occurred. Why?

Let's recap: The examination of German blueprints demonstrates that the facilities identified by eye-witnesses as homicidal gas chambers, were not planned or constructed for that purpose, and furthermore technical and chemical analysis confirms that mass killings in those facilities were impossible with Zyklon-B. Documentary and forensic proof contradicts eye-witness testimony.

Let me cite two more examples from the "Holocaust"-thematic. In the first one, eye-witness testimony is refuted using forensic proof; in the second one, by documentary proof.

According to official historiography, between the middle of May and the beginning of July of 1944, anywhere from 180,000 to 400,000 Hungarian Jews-- the number of victims varies depending on the source--allegedly were killed in gas chambers in Auschwitz-Birkenau. [\(13\)](#) Everyone agrees that the crematories could never handle that

many corpses, therefore according to eye-witnesses, large numbers of corpses were burned in open pits. During this time frame, Auschwitz-Birkenau was repeatedly photographed by allied reconnaissance planes. The most important photograph is that of May 31, 1944. : It is alleged that on that day 15,000 Hungarian Jews arrived in Birkenau, and 180,000 had arrived during the prior two weeks, for an average arrival rate of 13,000 per day. Now there is no sign of alleged mass killings and mass burnings in the May 31 photograph: [\(14\)](#) No sign of ditches or dirt piles; no sign of lineups in front of the crematory or the alleged gas chamber; no smoke-darkened sky as described by eye-witnesses. The same is the case when reviewing the rest of the photographs. Thus, the eye-witness testimony is exposed as false; the mass killing of Hungarian Jews in Auschwitz-Birkenau did not take place. (In the opinion of revisionists, Auschwitz was a transit camp for most of the Hungarian Jews and this thesis can be partially substantiated with documents).

In the second example presented in this context, eye-witness testimonies are demolished by documents. According to witnesses, small children were murdered at Auschwitz, since they were unfit for work. However, at the beginning of April 2000, Carlo Mattogno and I found a list in a Moscow archive which had been compiled by four Jewish physician inmates shortly after the liberation of Auschwitz, at the request of the Soviets. This is a list of the names of over 1,000 Jewish prisoners whom the Germans considered physically unfit to be moved from hospitalization. Included were the names of 97 Jewish boys and 83 Jewish girls between the ages of a few months and 15 years. [\(15\)](#) Now, if the eye-witness testimony is to be believed, those children would have been murdered as useless consumers of food, and would not have been hospitalized.

6. Are there really "Thousands of Witnesses"?

A person of average intelligence, confronted with the arguments of revisionists, is not going to question the superiority of documentary and forensic proof versus eye-witnesses, but will insist that it is impossible for "Thousands of Witnesses" to lie. Therefore the gas chamber stories must be essentially true even if the number of victims is inflated. This argument has a basic flaw. There are no "Thousands of Witnesses." Only someone who saw what happened and can give a fair description of an event is assumed to be a witness. When at the court case in April of this year against the Swiss revisionist Gaston-Armand Amaudruz, in Lausanne, two former Jewish concentration camp inmates, Toman and Klein, appeared; the former a co-plaintiff, and the latter as a witness for the prosecution. [\(16\)](#) The press reported that they were gas chamber witnesses. But in reality, neither one of them admittedly witnessed a human gassing. They observed many people enter gas chambers and not leave them. (Toman and Klein further stated that they continually saw flames belching from the chimneys of the crematory, which is impossible, as any expert will attest). The two Jews at the Amaudruz court case are a typical example of many of the so-called gas chamber witnesses. They only convey what they heard from others or what they have read. The number of witnesses who actually describe gassings, number a few dozen at best. For decades, while reading "Holocaust" literature, the same names pop up: Höss, Broad, Vrba, Müller, Tauber, Dragon, Nyiszli, Bendel, Gerstein, Wiernic, and a few more. If one wants to examine the trustworthiness of those witnesses, as I did in my book *Auschwitz: Perpetrator Confessions and Witnesses of the Holocaust*, [\(17\)](#) he

has a solvable job in front of him, since he only needs to concentrate on a few accounts. The whole "Holocaust" rests on their credibility.

7. Do eye-witness accounts jibe? (Concur)

The opponents of revisionism claim that revisionists use small discrepancies in witness testimony blown out of proportion to deny the most horrendous crime in human history. They argue that eye witness testimony concurs on decisive issues, therefore, small discrepancies are inconsequential. Regarding this matter, allow me to quote the Italian anti-revisionist Valentina Pisanty: [\(18\)](#)

To not believe in this atrocity is like not believing a murder has been committed, even though the guilty was heard yelling: "I am going to kill Rossi!" Rossi disappears and dozens of individuals witnessed the crime. If at the court case, two witnesses disagree as to the color of the murderer's tie, or one claims it happened at 17:35 and the other at 17:40, is this then to say, no crime was committed and Mr. Rossi is strolling around on the beach in the Maldive Islands (...)?

Well, in reality, eye-witness testimony is much more conflicting than Mrs. Pisanty presumes. For instance, in Belzec, where 600,000 Jews were allegedly killed, witnesses describe no less than eight different killing methods, starting with a metal plate in an underground water reservoir, in which Jews were allegedly killed with electricity; to trains where Jews were locked in and then doused with hot lime which slowly chewed the flesh from their bones, up to killings with diesel exhaust in a shack. [\(19\)](#) The Italian revisionist Carlo Mattogno comments sarcastically on Mrs. Pisanty's glossary as follows: [\(20\)](#)

In court cases against revisionism, one discovers that judges invariably violate procedure and that witnesses for the prosecution convey different versions. One witness claims Mr. Rossi was killed in a steam chamber; the next swears he was suffocated with chlorine; still another mentions an undefined "black substance" as the murder weapon; then one asserts that he was electrocuted while standing on a metal plate, which raised the ire of a further witness who saw with his own eyes how Mr. Rossi climbed down a shaft, half full of water; the next witness was present when Mr. Rossi was killed with carbon monoxide; and still another person who paid attention, claims Rossi died because the air was pumped out of his room. The judge justifies his verdict by stating that all witnesses concurred in one aspect: Mr. Rossi was killed.

Amidst all of this, one needs to remember that Mr. Rossi's body was never found, just as the bodies of the millions of victims allegedly killed in the camps were never found; not a trace, no ash, no bone fragments, no teeth.....

In the early war years, contradictory stories about killing methods in Auschwitz were also

told. In those tales prepared by the Polish resistance as war propaganda, Zyklon-B was never mentioned; instead, witnesses talked about poison gas, electric bathrooms, or a pneumatic hammer when describing the murder weapon. ⁽²¹⁾ Six days after the liberation of the camp, on February 2, 1945, the Jewish reporter Boris Polevoi, wrote in *Pravda* that in Auschwitz hundreds of prisoners were simultaneously electrocuted on a conveyor belt. *Pravda* also found gas chambers in Auschwitz, although in the wrong place; not in the western part of the Birkenau camp, but in the east. Soon, the electrical conveyor belt and the gas chambers in the eastern part disappeared forever into the historical dust bin and in the following reports a radically new variation emerged:

It is alleged that in Birkenau, mass murder was committed with the insecticide Zyklon-B in the crematories, as well as in two farm structures.

8. How eye-witness testimony was co-ordinated

Since February 1945, witnesses are in agreement that in Auschwitz, Zyklon-B was used as the murder weapon, even though they contradicted each other on many other issues. When looking closely at those accounts, one soon realizes that they contain many technical and scientific impossibilities which deprives them of any credibility. Let me cite just one example: The time specified for the cremation of the bodies is unrealistically short. Today, in a modern crematory, the time needed to cremate one body in a one-muffle crematory oven, is approximately one hour; the same holds true for the crematories of Auschwitz-Birkenau. ⁽²²⁾ The Auschwitz witnesses mention much shorter times; Dov Paisikovic, for instance, states that the cremation of one body took about four minutes! ⁽²³⁾ Rudolf Höss, the first Auschwitz commandant wrote in his notes compiled while in Polish captivity, that three bodies were cremated in a one-muffle furnace in twenty minutes. ⁽²⁴⁾ Since it takes three times longer to cremate three bodies just as it takes three times as long to burn a three kilogram piece of wood as compared to a one kilogram piece, the time mentioned by Höss is nine times lower than the real time needed--but that didn't deter any of the witnesses from repeating this tale over the years, as for example in Philip Müller's book, published in 1979, claiming that three bodies were cremated in twenty minutes! ⁽²⁵⁾ The proponents of the orthodox "Holocaust" version are correct in stating that it is impossible for so many witnesses, independent from one another, to come up with the same story, but the witnesses did not arrive at those stories independently.

Soon after the liberation of the camp, testimony of the former inmates was co-ordinated by the Soviets, which can easily be verified. From the 14th of February to March 8, 1945, a Soviet commission recorded all the atrocities committed in Auschwitz. In that report, the commission assert that no less than 4 million people were killed in Auschwitz. ⁽²⁶⁾ The Auschwitz museum adhered to this absurd figure until the early 1990's. Today they speak of 1.5 million victims, which is still ten times too high. Reading eye-witness testimony from 1945, one is constantly confronted with the 4 million figure, which forces one to conclude that the commission instructed the first witnesses as to what figure to quote, and then the rest of them simply copied this figure.

This explains many of the impossibilities which appear in witness testimonies--for

example the impossibility of low burning and gassing times. If 4 million persons were murdered in Auschwitz and their corpses cremated without leaving even a trace, then gas chambers and crematories must have been in operation all the time and at a record pace!

9. Jewish witnesses instantly break down when cross examined.

The French researcher, Professor Robert Faurisson, was the first to point to this important aspect regarding witness testimony: In the usual everyday court case, the counsel for the defense cross examines the witness. If he/she lies, controversies are discovered. But during all these years, this procedure was never used when the Jewish "Gas Chamber Witnesses" were interviewed. Those liars could go from one court case to the next and travel from conference to conference to tell their fairy tales because nobody dared to ask critical questions. [\(27\)](#) Since 1945, questioning the validity of the testimony of a Jewish witness has been prohibited, because you see by doing that, one would be persecuting again the few, who through some miracle, escaped the gas chambers!

In 1946, the Counsel for the defense, Dr. Otto Zippel, in a British court case against Dr. Bruno Tesch and Karl Weinbacher, was perhaps the first attorney who dared to ask some Jewish witnesses a few critical questions. Tesch and Weinheimer were representatives of the German Association for Pest Control, which produced Zyklon-B, that same insecticide which saved the lives of tens of thousands of inmates in Auschwitz by killing typhus spreading lice. At the court case, the Romanian Jew, Charles Sigismund Bendel, witness for the prosecution, testified that 4 million people were killed in Auschwitz with Zyklon-B. In Crematory IV, 1,000 people were alleged to have been crowded into a room measuring 10 meters long, 4 meters wide and 1.6 meters high, and then homicidally gassed. When Dr. Zippel asked how it is possible to place 1,000 people into a room of 64 cubic meters, Bendel answered: "It could only be achieved by German methods." Zippel pursued: "You earnestly believe, 10 people can be put into ½ a cubic meter?" Bendel's answer: "The 4 million gassed in Auschwitz are testimony to it." [\(28\)](#) Thus, the "Cross Examination" was over. Dr. Tesch and Weinbacher, accused of contributing to the killing of 4 million people, were found guilty and hanged based on Bendel's testimony.

In 1985, almost four decades later in Toronto Canada at a court case against the revisionist Ernst Zündel, Jewish "Gas Chamber" witnesses were faced with a lawyer who cross-examined them mercilessly. Witness for the defense was the famous Dr. Rudolf Vrba. Vrba, a Slovakian Jew who escaped Auschwitz in 1944 and together with his fellow Jew Alfred Wetzler, wrote an account regarding the camp which was published in New York in November of 1944, as part of the report from the War Refugee Board. In his book *I Cannot Forgive* published in 1964, he describes how in January 1943, to commemorate the visit by SS Reichsführer Heinrich Himmler, the first crematory in Auschwitz-Birkenau was initiated by gassing 3,000 Jews. [\(29\)](#) (Vrba is obviously not bothered by the fact that the first crematory in Birkenau was put into operation in March and not in January of 1943, and that Himmler's last visit was in July of 1942). The following occurred at the Zündel case between Zündel's counsel, Douglas Christie and Vrba: [\(30\)](#)

- **Christie:** I would like to ask you, if you actually saw him arrive in January 1943, or is this only a.....
- **Vrba:** In September 1943 or in January?
- **Christie:** In your book it says January 1943.
- **Vrba:** No, I saw him in July 1943 and then in 1943....
- **Christie:** But here it says January 1943.
- **Vrba:** That must be a mistake.
- **Christie:** A mistake?
- **Vrba:** Yes.
- **Christie:** Well, well. But on this occasion you saw him arrive?
- **Vrba:** The first time, I saw him arrive because he was as close to me as you are now. (...) Out of courtesy he came a step closer.
- **Christie:** Well, well.
- **Vrba:** The second time I saw him in a car, the same one as in the first time.(...) Maybe it was him, maybe it was only his deputy, I don't think it matters. (...)
- **Christie:** You are telling this court, you really saw Heinrich Himmler looking through a peephole into a gas chamber?
- **Vrba:** No, I never claimed I was present when he looked into the gas chamber, only that I put a story together which I have heard many times from numerous people who were present and told me everything. (...)
- **Christie:** But in your book you write, YOU saw everything and you don't mention that you are writing hearsay.
- **Vrba:** In this case, I wrote hearsay.

Vrba finally admitted that he used "Poetic License" when he wrote the book.

10. The "Perpetrator Confessions"

It's a known fact that one can force a defenseless prisoner to admit to anything. In the European witch-hunt of the middle ages, numerous women admitted to riding brooms through the air and to having intercourse with the Devil. It was commonplace, after the war, to extort confessions from Germans through torture. One example is the confession

of the first Auschwitz commandant, Rudolf Höss, who admitted in British prison, that until November 1943, while he was in charge in Auschwitz, 2.5 million people were murdered, and a further 500,000 died of malnutrition and sicknesses. [\(31\)](#) This is double the number of people brought into Auschwitz between 1940 and 1945! Höss further stated that he visited the Treblinka camp in June of 1941, but in reality, Treblinka was established 13 months later, in July of 1942! The writer Rupert Butler, in his book *Legions of Death* [\(32\)](#) published in 1983, told how the British obtained the confession from Höss: By torturing him for 3 days! In other cases a more cunning tactic was used: As reward for being released or for a more lenient judgment, the accused admitted the alleged crimes. A classical example is the SS-man Perry Board, who did his tour of duty in Auschwitz and was captured by the British. There, because he spoke English, he worked as an interpreter and later wrote a report in which he states that in Auschwitz, mass murder was committed on the largest scale recorded in history. [\(33\)](#) Consequently, the British could have shot or hanged him, or imprisoned him for life, since every German and especially SS personnel, were outside the law--but none of this happened--he was released!

Much the same happened in the Nazi Court cases in Germany. Nobody bothered to check if the alleged mass murder had really been committed--instead, only the guilt of the individual was determined. Denial of mass murder put the accused in a hopeless situation, because he was then classified as an "impenitent liar." That's why most of the accused never denied mass murder of Jews in gas chambers, only their personal guilt, and if they were contradicted by witnesses, they claimed they were following orders. [\(34\)](#)

That's how "Eye witness testimony" and "Perpetrator confessions" came about and were used as proof for millions of murders in gas chambers. If these mass murders really happened, we wouldn't have to rely on those confessions and testimonies--after all, we don't need confessions or witness testimony to prove that the Americans dropped atomic bombs on Japan in 1945.

Let me point out one more of the more grotesque controversies in the official "Holocaust" picture. Orthodox historians, when asked why there are no documents regarding the extermination of Jews, and why there are no mass graves in the "Extermination Camps," answer that the Germans tried to erase the proof; that's why they never wrote anything down and destroyed any existing documentation. They allegedly incinerated the bodies of the gassed and scattered the ash and the bone fragments. That's why we only heard about the mass murders from "countless eye-witnesses." Those eminent "Historians" are unable to explain why the Germans didn't get rid of those "countless eye-witnesses." Every Jew leaving a concentration camp alive bears witness to the fact that it was never the intention of the Germans to exterminate all Jews. In February of this year I discovered a report from a Polish Jew, Samuel Zylbersztain, the survivor of no less than ten camps: the "Extermination" camp Treblinka, the "Extermination" camp Majdanek, and eight more "common" camps. [\(35\)](#) The Jews want us to believe that these eye-witness reports are proof that the "Holocaust" occurred, when they are proof of the exact opposite!

11. A Jewish University Professor comments on the value of eye-witness testimony.

Of late, the "Holocaust" propaganda has taken on enormous proportions in the Western World. The overwhelming majority of people basically believe in the official version of the "Holocaust," because that's what they read in the newspapers, hear on the radio, and see on television. But they are fed up with this topic. Of late, the Zionists are using the real or imagined sufferings of their people not only as an excuse to oppress the Palestinians, and to illegally occupy Arab territory, but also to extort money from a number of countries, which annoys a lot of people. David Irving, the British historian, clearly states why anti-Semitism is on the rise in the Western World: [\(36\)](#)

What is it in them that generates so much hatred? They would do well to think about that. There is no doubt that they are hated today, in part, because of all the "Holocaust propaganda" they are constantly spreading. It has become impossible to open a newspaper or see a television program these days without coming across the Holocaust. Holocaust, Holocaust, Holocaust, everywhere Holocaust. The Holocaust has "hijacked" all the media all over Western culture. The world is fed up with it. People are losing their patience and are liable to resort to acts of violence against Jews. If the Jews don't stop, they can expect a real Holocaust.

Intelligent Jews realize that the despicable policies of Jewish leaders, which they justify with "gas chambers" and the "six million", is responsible for the rise in anti-Semitism and could possibly lead to pogroms on a scale the world has never witnessed. The Jewish university professor Norman Finkelstein, whose parents were interned in German concentration camps during the war, directed, because of this, a scathing attack against The Holocaust Industry. He wrote: [\(37\)](#)

I do not recall a single friend (or parent of a friend) asking a single question about what my mother and father endured. This was not respectful silence. It was indifference. In this light, one cannot but be skeptical of the outpourings of anguish in later years, after the Holocaust industry was firmly established. (...) One of my father's lifelong friends was a former inmate with him in Auschwitz, a seemingly incorruptible left-wing idealist who on principle refused German compensation after the war. Eventually he became a director of the Israeli Holocaust museum Yad Vashem. Reluctantly and with genuine disappointment, my father finally admitted that even this man had been corrupted by the Holocaust industry, tailoring his beliefs for power and profit. As the rendering of the Holocaust assumed ever more absurd forms, my mother liked to quote (with intentional irony) Henry Ford: "History is bunk." The tales of "Holocaust survivors", all concentration camp inmates, all heroes of the resistance--were a special source of wry amusement in my home. My parents often wondered why I would grow so indignant at the falsification and exploitation of the Nazi genocide. The most obvious answer is that it has been used to justify criminal policies of the Israeli state and US support for these policies. There is a personal motive as well. I do care about the memory of my family's persecution. The current campaign of the Holocaust industry to extort money from Europe in the name of the "needy Holocaust victims" has shrunk the

moral stature of their martyrdom to that of a Monte Carlo casino.

Maybe Prof. Finkelstein didn't realize when he wrote those condemning words that he is jeopardizing the foundations of the official Holocaust account. The stories of the so-called survivors, to use Finkelstein's words, were for his parents, who were familiar first-hand with the conditions in the concentration camps, "a special source of wry amusement," and the repetition of the Holocaust "assumed even more absurd forms."

Since there is no forensic or documentary proof about any extermination of Jews in gas chambers, but only eye-witnesses, Finkelstein, by making fun of witness testimony, demolishes, to put it graphically, the pillars upon which the Holocaust roof rests.

Mysteriously, without any supporting pillars, the roof remains in the air. A miracle! But one needs to believe in miracles if one accepts the official version of the lot of the Jews during World War II, because if the story is true, chemical and physical norms were deactivated throughout that time.

NOTES

1. Jean-Marie Boisdefeu, *La controverse sur l'extermination des Juifs par les Allemands. Volume II: Réalités de la "Solution Finale"*, Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, Berchem 1996, p. 107.
2. Johann Neuhäusler, *Wie war das im KZ Dachau?*, Kuratorium für Sühnemal KZ Dachau, Munich 1981, p. 27.
3. Raul Hilberg, *Die Vernichtung der europäischen Juden [The Destruction of the European Jews]*, Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt 1997, 3 volumes.
4. Regarding the chapter dealing with the "extermination operations" and the "extermination center," in *Die Vernichtung der europäischen Juden [The Destruction of the European Jews]* (see previous notes) appearing on pages 1027-1057.
5. Jean-Claude Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz*, CNRS, Paris 1994.
6. *ibid.*, p. 2.
7. *Le Nouveau Quotidien*, Lausanne, 3. September 1996.
8. Regarding the hierarchy of proofs see Manfred Köhler, *Professor Dr. Ernst Nolte: Auch Holocaust-Lügen haben kurze Beine!*, Cromwell Press, London 1994, and also Manfred Köhler, "Der Wert von Aussagen und Geständnissen zum Holocaust", in Ernst Gauss (Editor), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 199, [and *Dissection of the Holocaust*, Theses & Dissertations Press, 2000.]
9. The Soviet expertise concerning Majdanek is located in a Moscow archive (Gossudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoj Federatsii, 7021-107-9).
10. Compare Jürgen Graf und Carlo Mattogno, *KL Majdanek. Eine historische und technische Studie*, Castle Hill Publisher, Hastings 1998.
11. William B. Lindsay, "Zyklon B, Auschwitz and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch", in: *Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 4, No. 3, autumn 1983, p. 261 ff.
12. The most exacting examination concerning the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz is the Rudolf-Report (Cromwell Press, London 1993; expanded and updated edition from Castle Hill Publisher, Hastings, 2000). For the gas chamber of Majdanek,

compare chapter 6 by Graf/Mattogno, *KL Majdanek*, see prior notation.

13. Compare with Jürgen Graf, "Was geschah mit den nach Auschwitz deportierten, jedoch dort nicht registrierten Juden?" in *Vierteljahreshfte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, Hastings, Nr. 2/2000. ["What Happened to the Jews who were Deported to Auschwitz but were not Registered There?" <http://www.russgranata.com/Orange-eng.html>]

14. John Ball, *Air Photo Evidence*, Ball Ressource Services, Delta/B.C. (Canada) 1992.

15. Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoj Federatsii, 7021-108-23.

16. Concerning this trial, see the pamphlet *Der Amaudruz-Prozess. Eine Justizfarce*, Vérité et Justice, C.P. 355, 1618 Châtel-St. Denis, Switzerland 2000.

17. Published 1994 by Neue Visionen, Würenlos/Switzerland.

18. Valentina Pisanty, *L'irritante questione delle camere a gas. Logica del negazionismo*, Bompiani, Milan 1998, p. 191.

19. Concerning this, see, for example Carlo Mattogno, *Il mito dello sterminio ebraico*, Sentinella d'Italia, Monfalcone 1985, or Jürgen Graf, *Der Holocaust auf dem Prüfstand*, Gideon Burg Verlag, Basel 1993.

20. Carlo Mattogno, *L'irritante problema delle camere a gas, ovvero: Da Cappuccetto Rosso ad ...Auschwitz. Risposta a Valentina Pisanty*, Graphos, Genoa 1998, p. 164.

21. Enrique Aynat, *Estudios sobre el "Holocausto"*, Gráficas Hurtado, Burjassot/Valencia 1994.

22. For the details see Carlo Mattogno and Franco Deana, "Die Krematoriumsöfen von Auschwitz-Birkenau," more in: Ernst Gauss (Editor), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1994, as well as the detailed Carlo Mattogno, *I forni crematori di Auschwitz. Studio storico-tecnico con la collaborazione del Dott. Ing. Franco Deana*, Edizioni di Ar, Padua, expected during 2001.

23. Léon Poliakov, *Auschwitz*, René Julliard, Paris 1964, p. 159 ff.

24. Martin Broszat (Editor), *Kommandant in Auschwitz. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen des Rudolf Höss*, dtv., Frankfurt 1981, p. 171.

25. Published by Verlag Steinhausen, Frankfurt a.M., p. complete page

26. Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoj Federatsi, 7021-108-15, p. 16.

27. Robert Faurisson, "Die Zeugen der Gaskammern von Auschwitz", in: Ernst Gauss (Editor), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1994, p. 99 ff.

28. Nuremberg Document NI-11953.

29. Rudolf Vrba, *I cannot forgive*, Bantam, Toronto 1964, p. 10 ff.

30. The transcript of the first Zündel-Trial, Toronto 1985, p. 1244 ff. I thank Prof. R. Faurisson for the friendly sending of this transcript to me.

31. Nuremberg Document NO 3868-PS.

32. Rupert Butler, *Legions of Death*, Arrow Books, 1983, p. 235 ff.

33. Pery Broads *Erinnerungen [reminiscences]* are reproduced in the book *Auschwitz in den Augen der SS*, Kattowitz 1981.

34. Concerning the Nazi Trials see/compare especially Wilhelm Stäglich, *Der Auschwitz Mythos*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1979, as well as Manfred Köhler in E. Gauss (Editor), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte (compare note 8)*.

35. Samuel Zylbersztain, "Pamiętnik Więźnia dziesięciu obozów," in: *Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego*, Nr. 68, Warsaw 1968.

36. *Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 19, Nr. 1, January/February 2000, p. 51.

37. *The Guardian*, 12 June 2000.

<http://www.russgranata.com/>
[e-mail: info@russgranata.com](mailto:info@russgranata.com)
POB 2145 PVP CA 90274 USA