II. General Remarks

Three points are noteworthy on a first reading of Hilberg’s work:

1. Consistent Ignoring of Opposing Theses

Whoever undertook to read Hilberg’s standard work without further knowledge of the problems in the study of the ‘Holocaust’ would never suspect that the version of events offered there is in dispute. Hilberg does not utter the least suggestion that there is a school of researchers who dispute not only the existence of a policy of extermination of the Jews in the Third Reich but also the existence of ‘extermination camps’ and homicidal gas chambers. Other advocates of the orthodox version of the ‘Holocaust’ at least mention the existence of such deviant ideas, usually only to malign them without studying them. Hilberg, however, pretends he has never heard of the Revisionists. He pretends he has never heard of the studies of such respected and serious scholars as Arthur Butz, Wilhelm Stäglich or Robert Faurisson. Hilberg does not make mention of a single Revisionist book or a single Revisionist journal, and he does not even peripherally discuss any Revisionist objection to the annihilation thesis.

When Hilberg published the first edition of The Destruction of the European Jews in 1961, he could perhaps have justified ignoring viewpoints which threw doubt on the accepted version of the fate of Jews in the Third Reich; the few Revisionist works of the time were fairly modest. In 1985 such a position was no longer tenable. (It is worth noting that Revisionist research has made great progress since that year while the propo-

---

5 In the introduction to the collection Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas (Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt 1986), edited by Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl and others, the editors thunder against the “apologists for Nazi theory and practice” who “deny” the events of the past, from which in any case the reader can see that there are some who dispute the accepted version of the ‘Holocaust’. Of course, neither authors nor titles are named.

6 One example is Paul Rassinier’s remarkable book Le Mensonge d’Ulysse, which had appeared as early as 1950 (reprinted by La Vieille Taupe, Paris 1980; online: http://aaargh.vho.org/fran/archRassi/prmu/prmu.html). However, this is a report of personal experience—necessarily colored by subjective impressions—and not a work of scholarly rigor.
nents of the extermination thesis have been marching in place and, with the sole exception of Jean-Claude Pressac, have nothing new to offer.)

Because ignoring or suppressing counter-arguments is a telltale sign of unscholarly method, considerable doubt must be cast on the credibility of Hilberg’s scholarship.

2. No Photos, No Description of the Homicidal Gas Chambers and Gas Vans

Hilberg’s gigantic three-volume work, running to 1,351 pages, contains exactly three photographs, namely those on the title pages of the three volumes. (*Destruction of the European Jews*, hereafter called *DEJ*, runs to 1,232 pages; there are no photographs.) In the text itself there is not one photograph, which must be considered unusual for so extensive a work. Likewise, he offers his reader no description of a gas chamber or a gas van, although this would seem to be important in view of the novelty and the monstrousness of the use of such killing machines. There is no illustration or sketch which might give inquisitive readeres insight into how these gruesome instruments of murder allegedly functioned.

Hilberg’s aversion to encounter the physical reality of the concentration camps and the so-called ‘extermination camps’ can also be seen in the fact that he has never personally undertaken an investigation at the locations of the camps. Before 1985, this man who had begun his studies on the ‘Holocaust’ back in 1948 had spent exactly one day in Treblinka and another half day in Auschwitz I and Auschwitz-Birkenau—and in all three cases this was only to participate in memorial ceremonies. He has never visited any of the other concentration camps at any time. 7 This has a very odd appearance. In contrast to Hilberg, Revisionists such as Dietlieb Felterer, Robert Faurisson, Carlo Mattogno, Germar Rudolf and the writer of these lines, and also the non-Revisionist Jean-Claude Pressac, have made thorough examinations of the buildings where the witnesses say the mass murders took place and have studied the applicable construction drawings. Such on-site research is absolutely necessary for solving this controversy.

3. Discrepancy Between the Title and the Contents of the Work

There is no doubt that the larger part of the material Hilberg presents rests on reliable sources. This applies particularly to the four hundred pages

---

in which he describes the persecution of the Jews (Judenverfolgung), the anti-Jewish laws and measures taken by Germany and her allies. However, the work is not entitled The Persecution of the European Jews (Die Verfolgung der europäischen Juden), but The Destruction of the European Jews (Die Vernichtung der europäischen Juden), and his title is not suitable for the work taken as a whole. Someone who has struggled through the 283 pages of the first volume has not yet encountered the subject for which Hilberg has named his work. The first 123 pages of the second volume, namely pages 287 to 410 (DEJ, v. 1, pages 271-390), are devoted to the “Mobile Killing Operations”; this concerns the mass killings behind the eastern front. No fewer than 515 pages (pp. 411 to 926; DEJ, v. 2, pages 391-860) deal with the deportations of Jews from areas controlled by Germany or her allies. With respect to the deportations, the facts are largely undisputed.

That which makes the ‘Holocaust’ so spectacular and bestial in the popular imagination, namely the industrialized slaughter in extermination camps, first shows its face on page 927; this is the beginning of the chapter on “Killing Center Operations” (DEJ, v. 3, pages 861-990). Yet the reader must persevere for another hundred pages until the subject finally comes around to the “Killing Operations”; in the previous five subchapters “Origins”, “Organisation, Personnel and Maintenance”, “Labor Utilization”, “Medical Experiments” and finally “Confiscations” in the “Annihilation Centers” were discussed. Remarkably, the subchapter “Killing Operations” is only nineteen (!!!) pages long (DEJ: 18); on page 1046 (DEJ, p. 979), the subject has already moved on to “Liquidation of the Killing Centers and the End of the Destruction Process”.

The third volume of 290 pages is devoted entirely to “Consequences”, “Reflections”, “Aftereffects” and “Further Developments” before the Appendix closes the work; the latter contains Hilberg’s data on Jewish population losses. (In DEJ, volume 3 contains the chapter on “Killing Center Operations”)

I summarize:

– 123 pages of the 1,351 page “standard work on the Holocaust” (DEJ, 120 pages of 1232 pages) deal with the killings behind the eastern front, which has received less attention both in the scholarly and in the popular literature, and which, if we are to go by Hilberg’s victim counts, are also numerically less significant than the claimed mass killings in extermination camps.

– A total of 19 pages out of 1,351 (DEJ, 18 pages of 1232) are devoted to the central fixture of the ‘Holocaust’, the practical course of the claimed mass killings in gas chambers (plus there are eleven more pages on the related question of the “Liquidation of the Killing Centers”).
– The entire first and the greater part of the second volume (in particular, the 515 pages on the deportations; in DEJ, most of the first volume and all the second volume containing 470 pages on deportations) have no direct bearing on the subject for which Hilberg has named his work, namely *The Destruction of the European Jews*. In the third volume, only the population statistics are applicable to our subject.

Already at this point it can be seen that the Hilberg work does not contain what the title promises. Of course, this makes the work of the critic easier in that it permits him to concentrate on a relatively small part of this large work and dispense with the rest with a few comments.