

IV. The Lack of Documents on Annihilation Policy and its Consequences for the Orthodox Historians

1. “No Documents Have Survived”

That no one has ever found a written order for the physical extermination of the Jews originating with Adolf Hitler or any other leading NS politician is agreed upon by historians of all orientations. Léon Poliakov, one of the most prominent proponents of the orthodox picture of the ‘Holocaust’, stated unequivocally:⁹

“The archives of the Third Reich and the depositions and accounts of its leaders make possible a reconstruction, down to the last detail, of the origin and development of the plans for aggression, the military campaigns, and the whole array of procedures by which the Nazis intended to reshape the world to their liking. Only the campaign to exterminate the Jews, as regards its conception as well as many other essential aspects, remains shrouded in darkness. Inferences, psychological considerations, and third- or fourth-hand reports enable us to reconstruct its development with considerable accuracy. Certain details, however, must remain forever unknown. The three or four people chiefly involved in the actual drawing up of the plan for total extermination are dead and no documents have survived, perhaps none ever existed.”

Nothing needs to be changed in this statement. At a congress of historians held in Stuttgart in 1984 covering “*The Murder of the Jews in the Second World War*”, the participants reached agreement on only one point, namely that a written order for the annihilation had never been found.¹⁰

This circumstance has caused historical researchers headaches for a long time. A gigantic operation such as the deportation of several millions of Jews into ‘extermination camps’ and their murder there necessarily presupposes an organization which must have involved the participation of thousands upon thousands of persons, and such a thing does not happen

9 Léon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate*, Holocaust Library, New York 1979, p. 108.

10 Eberhard Jäckel and Jürgen Rohwer (eds.), *Der Mord an den Juden im Zweiten Weltkrieg*, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart 1985, p. 186.

without written orders—especially not in such a bureaucratically organized state as the Third Reich was. The National Socialists mostly did not destroy their documents as the war came to an end; rather, these fell in huge amounts into the hands of the victors. In his well-known book *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*,¹¹ William L. Shirer describes how this resulted in:

“[...] the capture of most of the confidential archives of the German government and all its branches, including those of the Foreign Office, the Army, the Navy, the National Socialist Party and Heinrich Himmler’s secret police. Never before, I believe, has such a vast treasure fallen into the hands of contemporary historians. [...] The swift collapse of the Third Reich in spring of 1945 resulted in the surrender not only of a vast bulk of its secret papers but of other priceless material such as private diaries, highly secret speeches, conference reports and correspondence, and even transcripts of telephone conversations of the NS leaders tapped by a special office set up by Hermann Goering in the Air Ministry. [...] 485 tons of records of the German Foreign Office, captured by the U.S. First Army in various castles and mines in the Harz Mountains just as they were about to be burned on orders from Berlin [...] Hundreds of thousands of captured documents were hurriedly assembled at Nuremberg as evidence in the trial of the major war criminals.”

In view of this mountain of NS documents, the lack of any documentary proof for a policy of annihilation of the Jews is painfully embarrassing for the proponents of the official picture of the ‘Holocaust’. The argument that at least in the ‘extermination camps’ the incriminating papers were destroyed in time is useless, especially since 1991: In that year the Soviets made available to Western researchers the documents of the Central Construction Office in Auschwitz captured by the Red Army in 1945. The Central Construction Office was an organization that was responsible for the construction of the crematories—the crematories which supposedly contained the gas chambers for the mass killing of Jews. There are no less than 88,000 pages of documents.¹² They do not contain any evidence for the construction of homicidal gas chambers. If there had been, the Communists would have announced it to the world triumphantly in 1945.

The complete lack of documentary evidence for a policy of annihilation of the Jews as well as for the construction of gas chambers for killing purposes has led to a split in the ranks of the orthodox historians, meaning those who uphold the theory of the deliberate and systematic annihilation of

11 William L. Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1960, pp. ix, x.

12 During two extended visits to Moscow in 1995 together with Italian historian Carlo Mattogno we examined 88,000 pages and made copies of 4,000 of them.

the Jews, between Intentionalists and Functionalists. In what follows we will compare the two orientations.

2. Intentionalists and Functionalists

At a colloquium on “*Nazi Germany and the Genocide of the Jews*” held at the Sorbonne in Paris in 1982, US historian Christopher Browning summarized the difference of opinion between Intentionalists and Functionalists with respect to the genesis of the policy of annihilation of the Jews as follows:¹³

“In recent years the interpretations of National Socialism have polarized more and more into two groups that Tim Mason has aptly called ‘Intentionalists’ and ‘Functionalists’. The former explain the development of Nazi Germany as a result of Hitler’s intentions, which came out of a coherent and logical ideology and were realized due to an all-powerful totalitarian dictatorship. The ‘Functionalists’ point out the anarchistic character of the Nazi state, its internal rivalries and the chaotic process of decision-making, which constantly led to improvisation and radicalization [...] These two modes of exposition of history are useful for the analysis of the strongly divergent meanings that people attribute to the Jewish policy of the Nazis in general and to the Final Solution in particular. On the one hand, Lucy Dawidowicz, a radical Intentionalist, upholds the viewpoint that already in 1919 Hitler had decided to exterminate European Jews. And not only that: He knew at what point in time his murderous plan would be realized. The Second World War was at the same time the means and opportunity to put his ‘war against the Jews’ into effect. While he waited for the anticipated moment for the realization of his ‘great plan’, naturally he tolerated a senseless and meaningless pluralism in the Jewish policies of the subordinate ranks of state and party.

Against the radical Intentionalism of Lucy Dawidowicz, which emphasizes the intentions and ‘great plan’ of Hitler, the Ultrafunctionalism of Martin Broszat constitutes a diametrically opposed view of the role of the Führer, especially with respect to the decision on the Final Solution. It is Broszat’s position that Hitler never took a definitive decision nor issued a general order for the Final Solution. The annihilation program developed in stages in conjunction with a series of isolated massacres at the end of 1941 and in 1942. These locally limited mass murders were improvised answers to an impossible situation that had developed as a result of two factors: First the ideological and political pressure for the creation of a ‘Jew-free’ Europe that stemmed from Hitler and then the military reverses on the east-

13 Christopher Browning, “*La décision concernant la solution finale*”, in: *Colloque de l’Ecole des Hautes Etudes en sciences sociales, L’Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif*, Gallimard-Le Seuil, Paris 1985, pp. 191f.

ern front that led to stoppages in railway traffic and caused the buffer zones into which the Jews were to be removed to disappear. Once the annihilation program was in progress, it gradually institutionalized itself until it was noticed that it offered the simplest solution logistically and became a program universally applied and single-mindedly pursued. From this standpoint, Hitler was a catalyst but not a decision-maker.

For Lucy Dawidowicz the Final Solution was thought out twenty years before it was put into practice; For Martin Broszat the idea developed from practice—sporadic murders of groups of Jews led to the idea to kill all Jews systematically.”

The constructions described by Browning of Lucy Dawidowicz and Martin Broszat as extreme representatives of the Intentionalists and the Functionalists are both equally untenable.

First as to the theory propounded by Lucy Dawidowicz that the extermination of the Jews was the “*great plan*” of Hitler long before his accession to power. If this were so, Hitler would never have pursued for years on end a single-minded demand for Jewish emigration. It is undisputed that NS policy during the six years of peace that the Third Reich enjoyed was directed at motivating as many Jews as possible to emigrate. To achieve this aim, as is well known, the National Socialists worked closely with Zionist forces, who were interested in the settlement of as many Jews as possible in Palestine.¹⁴ However, the number of Jews who were willing to risk an uncertain future in the Orient was limited.

Raul Hilberg has described in detail how intensively the National Socialists pushed Jewish emigration. He relates how the National Socialists exerted themselves to persuade ten thousand Polish Jews who still lived in Germany in 1938 (!) to return to Poland and how the latter refused to take back its Jewish fellow citizens (p. 413; *DEJ*, p. 394). One should take note that after five years of Hitler’s rule ten thousand Polish Jews preferred conditions in the anti-Semitic Third Reich to those of their native Poland!

At the time of Hitler’s accession to power 520,000 Jews lived in Germany. Due to emigration and an excess of deaths over births, by 1938 their number had dwindled to 350,000, but the *Anschluss* with Austria brought an additional 190,000 Austrian Jews (p. 412; *DEJ*, p. 394). In response, on 26th August 1938 Reichskommissar Bürckel—he had administrative responsibility for the reunion of Austria and the Reich—set up a “*Central Office for Jewish Emigration*”. Bürckel’s method was soon followed throughout the Reich. On 24th January 1939 Göring ordered the founding

14 On National Socialist-Zionist cooperation see, for example, Edwin Black, *The Transfer Agreement*, New York-London 1994; Francis Nicosia, *Hitler und der Zionismus*, Druffel Verlag, Leoni 1989.

of a Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration and put Reinhard Heydrich in charge (pp. 414f.; *DEJ*, p. 396).

The beginning of war did not alter the fundamental direction of National Socialist Jewish policy. Naturally, the difficulties were magnified by the fact that the number of Jews had grown by the addition of a massive number of foreign, mainly Polish, Jews. The German area of influence in Europe could now no longer be made ‘Jew-free’ (*judenrein*)—this is the National Socialist term—by individual emigration. Therefore the NS leaders turned their attention to the Madagascar Plan. On this subject Raul Hilberg comments:

“The Madagascar Project was designed to take care of millions of Jews. The authors of the plan wanted to empty the Reich-Protectorate area and all of occupied Poland of their Jewish population. [...]

But the Madagascar Plan did not materialize. It hinged on the conclusion of a peace treaty with France, and such a treaty depended on an end of hostilities with England. [...]

Even as it faded, the project was to be mentioned one more time, during early February 1941, in Hitler’s headquarters. On that occasion, the party’s labor chief, Ley, brought up the Jewish question and Hitler, answering at length, pointed out that the war was going to accelerate the solution of this problem but that he was also encountering additional difficulties. Originally he had been in a position to address himself at most to the Jews of Germany, but now the goal had to be the elimination of Jewish influence in the entire Axis power sphere [...] He was going to approach the French about Madagascar. When Bormann asked how the Jews could be transported there in the middle of the war, Hitler replied that one would have to consider that. He would be willing to make available the entire German fleet for this purpose, but he did not wish to expose his crews to the torpedoes of enemy submarines.” (pp. 416f.; *DEJ*, pp. 397f.)

Had Hitler, as Lucy Dawidowicz and other Intentionalists claim, planned for the extermination of the Jews and even foreseen that this goal could be achieved in the framework of a world war, he would never have made any efforts to encourage Jewish emigration and would have blocked any such efforts especially after the war had begun. There would never have been anything like a Madagascar Plan sponsored by the NS leadership. Emigrated Jews are not subject to extermination.

The opposing theory, that of the radical Functionalists around Broszat, stands in irreconcilable contradiction with the claims of the adherents of the theory of Jewish annihilation and also with other claims of the Functionalists themselves.

As Browning summarized in his presentation at the 1982 Paris Colloquium, Broszat believes that local massacres of Jews led to the plan to kill

all Jews; thus the idea developed from the practical situation itself. The military reverses on the eastern front had caused the buffer zones to disappear in which it was intended to remove the Jews. This contradicts the view held by the orthodox historians that the mass murders behind the eastern front began in earnest immediately after the German invasion of the Soviet Union. The largest of the claimed mass shootings, that of Babi Yar near Kiev, supposedly happened on 29th September 1941, at a time when the Wehrmacht had suffered no significant reverses. All Jews in Kiev the Germans could get their hands on, in total more than 33,000, were supposedly shot in Babi Yar. In the following months tens of thousands more Jewish victims allegedly followed them.¹⁵

One cannot exclude that there were shootings of Jews shortly after the beginning of the German-Soviet War, and we will discuss this question in the next chapter. For the most part they were reprisals for attacks of partisans against German troops. (The “*Commissar Order*” for the shooting of Jewish-Bolshevist commissars is not pertinent here, because it deals with the killing of individual persons identified by function and not the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians because of their ‘race’.) A monstrous blood-bath like that claimed for Babi Yar could never have happened without the permission of the highest authority. No local commander would have dared to undertake a measure fraught with such heavy consequences without assurance of support from higher authority. Thus, the alleged murder of *all* Jews remaining in Kiev after the Germans entered would only be conceivable as a component of a planned extermination policy. Also, if the Babi Yar story is true, such a policy must have already existed by the end of September 1941.

Let us pursue this argument further. Chełmno (Kulmhof in German) is supposed to have been opened as the first ‘extermination camp’ in December 1941 (Hilberg, p. 956; *DEJ*, p. 893). If Hilberg is right, the order to build it must have been issued some time before, because a camp does not spring up overnight. Now it is not possible that some random local German authorities decided on their own account to build an extermination camp. But here also, the existence of an order from higher authority is an absolute precondition.

This implies the bankruptcy of Broszat’s Functionalist theory, in which the Holocaust comes about as the result of the first German reverses

15 For the official description of Babi Yar see E.R. Wien, *Die Shoa von Babi Jar*, Hartung-Gorre, Constance 1991. Hilberg mentions the supposed massacre on p. 311 (*DEJ*, p. 297) and other places.

on the eastern front, and we come back to the intentionalist question: When did the order to exterminate the Jews go out?

In his presentation at the Paris Colloquium, Christopher Browning added the following to his description of the theories of Lucy Dawidowicz and Martin Broszat:¹⁶

“Between these two extreme poles there are a number of positions occupying interpretive middle ground. Eberhard Jäckel believes the idea for the killing of the Jews came to Hitler some time around 1924. Karl Dietrich Bracher emphasizes Hitler’s threatening declarations at the end of the ‘30’s and believes his intentions were already settled. Andreas Hillgruber and Klaus Hildebrand maintain that ideological factors were controlling, but do not propose any firm date. Others, and not Functionalists only, believe the decisive point was in 1941; Léon Poliakov thinks that the beginning of 1941 is the most probable point, while Robert Kempner and Helmut Krausnick hold the opinion that Hitler made the decision in the Spring, while preparations for the invasion of Russia were under way. [...] Uwe Dietrich Adam inclines to the idea that the decision was taken in the Fall, at a time when the military offensive had stalled and the ‘territorial solution’ through mass expulsion to Russia became impossible. Finally, Sebastian Haffner, who is certainly no Functionalist, defends the date of the beginning of December, when the first foreboding of a military defeat drove Hitler to strive for an irrevocable victory over the Jews.”

These observations expose with harsh clarity the chronological travesties by the orthodox ‘Holocaust’ historians, which reduce them to idle, conspiratorial speculations in cuckoo land. *All* the proposed dates lack any serious foundation, in that there is not one with any documentary support. Instead of indulging in useless speculation as to a point in time when the annihilation of the Jews was decided upon, these academics would have done better to study the question first, whether such a thing ever existed. This cardinal question was prudently avoided at the Paris historians’ congress as well as at the Stuttgart historians’ congress held two years later. At the latter as well, the question of the date when the fateful decision was made was tortured to death. The congress participants came no nearer an answer than two years before in Paris.

It is notable that none of the researchers named by Browning held to the old fairy tale that the decision for the annihilation of the Jews was taken at the Wannsee Conference in Berlin on 20th January 1942. In 1992 the Israeli ‘Holocaust’ expert Yehuda Bauer derided this tough old myth as a “*silly story*.”¹⁷

16 Christopher Browning, *op. cit.* (note 13) p. 192.

17 *Canadian Jewish News*, 30th January 1992.

3. Raul Hilberg's Errors and Confusions

a. Was There the Ominous Hitler Order or Not?

On the cardinal question, whether Hitler ever gave an express order for the physical extinction of the Jews present in his area of control, Hilberg gives different answers in the first and in the revised edition of his work. In the first edition published in 1961 he asserted that there had been two successive Hitler orders to this effect, the first regarding the killing of Russian Jews and the second regarding the annihilation of all other Jews living under German rule. He gave no documentary proof for these orders. We quote the relevant passage:¹⁸

“How was the killing phase brought about? Basically, we are dealing with two of Hitler’s decisions. One order was given in the spring of 1941, during the planning of the invasion of the USSR; it provided that small units of the SS and Police be dispatched to Soviet territory, where they were to move from town to town to kill all Jewish inhabitants on the spot. This method may be called the ‘mobile killing operations’. Shortly after the mobile operations had begun in the occupied Soviet territories, Hitler handed down his second order. That decision doomed the rest of European Jewry.”

In the second and “definitive” edition which appeared in 1985, on which the German translation we use was based, both of these phantom orders disappear without a trace. Christopher Browning, to his credit, remarked on this in an article written in 1986:¹⁹

“In the new edition, all references in the text to a Hitler decision or Hitler order for the ‘Final Solution’ [which Browning understands to mean physical extermination] have been systematically excised.”

This is a devastating blow to Hilberg's credibility! Of course, Hilberg still assumes that Hitler had initiated the annihilation of the Jews. In 1985, he wrote:

“For years, the administrative machine had taken its initiatives and engaged in its forays one step at a time. In the course of that evolution, a direction had been charted and a pattern had been established. By the middle of 1941, the dividing line had been reached, and beyond it lay a field of unprecedented actions unhindered by the limits of the past. More and more of the participants were on the verge of realizing the nature of what could happen now. Salient in this crystallization was the role of Adolf Hitler him-

18 Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Quadrangle Books, Chicago 1967, p. 177. This is an unchanged reprint of the first edition published in 1961. We thank Robert Faurisson for pointing out the mention of the supposed Hitler order as well as sending the pages involved.

19 Christopher Browning, “The Revised Hilberg”, in: *Simon Wiesenthal Center Annual*, 1986, p. 294.

self, his stance before the world and, more specifically, his wishes or expectations voiced in an inner circle.” (p. 420; *DEJ*, pp. 401f.)

Behind these turgid passages hides the presupposition that Hitler personally commanded the annihilation of the Jews. One could therefore describe Hilberg as a ‘moderate Intentionalist’. The informant upon whom he relies is Adolf Eichmann. The latter wrote in his memoirs that at the turn of the year 1941/1942 Reinhard Heydrich, chief of the RSHA, told him that the Führer had decreed the physical destruction of the Jews.²⁰ Hilberg says this in footnote 30 on pp. 420f. (*DEJ*, p. 402), and continues:

“During his interrogation by Israeli police in Jerusalem, he [Eichmann] suggested more plausibly that Hitler’s order had come two or three months after the June 22 German assault on the USSR. [...] Chronology and circumstances point to a Hitler decision before the summer ended.”

That such a crucial statement could be relegated to a footnote gives some inkling of Hilberg’s helpless perplexity! Hilberg now relies on a suggestion(!) from Eichmann, who himself relied on alleged hearsay evidence!

At the Stuttgart Congress in 1984 Hilberg again opined that Hitler had given the decision for the extermination of the Jews—naturally, only verbally!—in Summer 1941.²¹ The date given by Hilberg is after February 1941, when the Madagascar Plan was seriously considered for the last time, but before the claimed massacre of Babi Yar and the alleged beginning of operations of the ‘extermination camp’ Chełmno. By so doing, Hilberg avoided the radical impossibilities on which the theories of Lucy Dawidowicz and Martin Broszat were so weakly founded.

Just as little as Dawidowicz, Broszat and all other Intentionalist and Functionalist ‘Holocaust’ historians, Hilberg cannot produce even a single document to support his hypothesis. Moreover, he contradicts himself in that he repeatedly conjures up an “*annihilation policy*”, an “*annihilation process*” and “*annihilation machinery*” before the beginning of the German-Soviet war. In connection with the last deliberations by Hitler on the Madagascar Plan that happened in February 1941, he writes:

“While Hitler was thinking, the machinery of destruction was permeated with a feeling of uncertainty. In the Generalgouvernement, where ghettoization was viewed as a transitional measure, the unsightly Jewish quarters with their impoverished crowds were trying the patience of local German officials. These irritations and frustrations were expressed in monthly reports by the late summer of 1940. In the Lublin District the *Kreishauptmann* of Kranystaw, surfeited with his administrative tasks, [in Sep-

20 Adolf Eichmann, *Ich, Adolf Eichmann*, Druffel Verlag, Leoni 1980, p. 479.

21 E. Jäckel, J. Rohwer (eds.), *op. cit.* (note 10), p. 126.

tember 1940] insisted that Jews who had Polonized their names spell them in German—in Madagascar, he said, they could have Madagascarian names.²⁰” (p. 417; DEJ, p. 399)

If a) Hitler decided on the annihilation of the Jews in August or September 1941 and b) local German officials were predicting for the Jews a future in Madagascar in September 1940, it makes no sense to talk about a “*machinery of destruction*” existing in September 1940.

Elementary, my dear Watson!

b. “*No Special Agency ... No Special Budget*”

An annihilation policy necessarily presupposes a mechanism for its execution, and this mechanism must needs be held in the hands of a central authority invested with the requisite powers. But no, Hilberg says there was no such thing; already in the first volume he has written:

“In the final analysis, the destruction of the Jews was not so much a product of laws and commands as it was a matter of spirit, of shared comprehension, of consonance and synchronization.

Who shared in this undertaking? What kind of machinery was used for these tasks? The machine of destruction was an aggregate—no one agency was charged with the whole operation. [...]

No special agency was created and no special budget was devised to destroy the Jews of Europe. Each organization was to play a specific role in the process, and each was to find the means to carry out its task.” (pp. 58, 66; DEJ, pp. 55, 62)

Picture that: a project for a mammoth undertaking—complicated by the conditions of war—including the construction of ‘extermination camps’ and the deportation of millions of persons from every which country into the camps—and this all should be done without a responsible central authority, a special office or a special budget!

Raul Hilberg took part in the Paris Historian’s Congress in 1982; the subject of his presentation was “*The Bureaucracy of the Final Solution*”. Hilberg revealed what would have been necessary to carry out the annihilation of the Jews, namely, 1) railroads, 2) police, and especially 3) dedicated bureaucrats.²²

How sophisticated! When a state has decided to deport millions of persons from every which country by train to death factories and then to kill them there, it would in fact need railroads to carry the trains, it would certainly need policemen to guard the condemned ones, and its bureaucrats

²² Hilberg’s paper is included in *L’Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif*, *op. cit.* (note 13), pp. 219ff.

should not be too tender-hearted. One does not have to be a professor at the University of Vermont to understand this nor to have written the standard work on the ‘Holocaust’. The banalities hawked by Hilberg do not in any way replace the missing proof of an extermination policy.

c. The Myth of the Code Language

Lacking documentary proof for a German policy of annihilation of the Jews, Hilberg resorts to a dodge, one that has enjoyed great popularity among orthodox ‘Holocaust’ scholars for a long time and whose origin can be traced back to the Nuremberg Trials. The Italian researcher Carlo Mattogno characterizes it as follows:²³

“The Nuremberg inquisitors invented [...] this roundabout method of speaking, which consisted in reading into any particular document that which one wanted it to say. This method is the basis for the—arbitrary and unfounded—assumption that the high NS authorities used a form of code language even in their most secret documents, which the Nuremberg inquisitors naturally claimed they had the key to. This was the reason for the systematic twisting of the meaning of otherwise quite innocent documents for the purpose of supporting the extermination theory.”

Here is an example. Along with the Wannsee Conference, at which Hitler’s decision to annihilate the Jews was to be disclosed to an at first small circle of NS bureaucrats—this is Hilberg’s version of the purpose of this conference—supposedly,

“Gradually the news of the ‘Final Solution’ seeped through the ranks of the bureaucracy. The knowledge did not come to all officials at once. How much a man knew depended on his proximity to the destructive operations and on his insight into the nature of the destruction process. Seldom, however, was comprehension recorded on paper. When the bureaucrats had to deal with deportation matters, they kept referring to a ‘Jewish migration’. In official correspondence the Jews were still ‘wandering’. They were ‘evacuated’ (evakuiert) and ‘resettled’ (umgesiedelt, ausgesiedelt). They ‘wandered off’ (wanderten ab) and ‘disappeared’ (verschwanden). These terms were not the product of naïveté, but convenient tools of psychological repression.” (p. 425; DEJ, p. 406)

That expressions such as “resettle” (*aussiedeln*), “evacuate” (*evakuieren*) and so forth can only be code language for ‘kill’ is, of course, nothing but an allegation. Moreover, even Hilberg had to admit that even after the supposed Hitler decision to exterminate the Jews, many Jews were removed to the occupied territories in the East, which one may certainly describe as

23 Carlo Mattogno, *La soluzione finale. Problemi e polemiche*, Edizioni di Ar, Padua 1991, pp. 64f.

‘resettlement’ (*Aussiedlung*). For example, he relates the deportation of German Jews to Riga and Minsk (p. 369; *DEJ*, p. 352). Germany’s worsening circumstances in the war made the continuance of this policy impossible. If the authorities had wanted to kill these German Jews, there could have been no good reason to haul them off to Latvia and White Russia in the always urgently needed trains instead of killing them in Germany itself or sending them to one of the ‘extermination camps’ even then (November 1941) supposedly being built in Poland.

It hardly needs to be mentioned that for Hilberg the term “*final solution*” (*Endlösung*) stands as a synonym for ‘extermination’ (*Ausrottung*). For example, this is the sense in which he interprets Göring’s well-known letter to Heydrich on 31st July 1942, frequently quoted in the literature on the subject, in which the former orders the latter to submit, “*in the near future an overall plan of the organizational, functional and material measures to be taken in preparing for the implementation of the aspired final solution of the Jewish question*”.²⁴ Hilberg adds, Heydrich now held “*the reins of the destruction process in his hands*” (p. 420; *DEJ*, p. 401). Göring’s expression, that Heydrich should “*undertake, by emigration or evacuation, a solution of the Jewish question as advantageous as possible under the conditions at the time*”, Hilberg interprets the same way as his predecessors from Poliakov to Reitlinger as code language for physical annihilation. No serious historian who wrote on an era other than the Third Reich and the Second World War would be permitted to distort the statements of his original sources so capriciously.

That the National Socialists took “*final solution of the Jewish question*” (*Endlösung der Judenfrage*) to mean the expulsion (*Ausweisung*) or removal (*Abschiebung*) of all Jews from Europe, can be shown by a number of documents. For example, Franz Rademacher, official in charge of Jewish affairs in the Germany Section of the Foreign Office on 10th February 1942, and thus at a time when according to Hilberg the mass murder was allegedly in full swing, and Bełżec, following Chełmno, was close to opening as the second extermination camp, wrote a letter to a Herr Bielfeld of the Foreign Ministry in which he stated that the Führer had decided that “*the Jews should be removed not to Madagascar, but to the East*”, and added, “*Madagascar will no longer be needed for the final solution*”.²⁵ Not even the Giant Raul Hilberg has dared to claim that the Germans planned to gas the Jews in

24 PS-710.

25 NG-5770.

the jungles of Madagascar. And why does Hilberg omit such major pieces of documentary evidence?

d. Hitler Quotation as ‘Proof’ for the Mass Murder

As do other proponents of the orthodox picture of the ‘Holocaust’, Hilberg interprets statements by Adolf Hitler in which he threatens the Jews with “annihilation” (*Vernichtung*) or “extermination” (*Ausrottung*) as proof that such a thing really happened. He quotes (on p. 425; *DEJ*, p. 407) a Hitler speech of 30th September 1942 in which the Reichschancellor stated as follows:²⁶

“In my Reichstag speech of September 1, 1939, I have spoken of two things: first, that now that the war has been forced upon us, no array of weapons and no passage of time will bring us to defeat, and second, that if Jewry should plot another world war to exterminate [zur Ausrottung] the Aryan peoples of Europe, it would not be the Aryan peoples which would be exterminated, [ausgerottet] but Jewry. [...] At one time, the Jews of Germany laughed about my prophecies. I do not know whether they are still laughing or whether they have already lost all desire to laugh. But right now I can only repeat: they will stop laughing everywhere, and I shall be right also in that prophecy.”

It needs to be noted that a warlike way of speaking was characteristic of the National Socialists, who before coming to power had to prevail against their adversaries on the extreme left in countless clashes in meeting rooms and streets. It should also be remembered that wild threats against an enemy in wartime are common. But the important point is a semantic one. In present usage, *ausrotten* means only ‘to physically liquidate’, but formerly the word—whose etymology is ‘uproot’—had a broader meaning. Thus in *Mein Kampf* Adolf Hitler wrote the following on conditions in the Danube Monarchy before the First World War:²⁷

“Immense were the burdens which the German people were expected to bear, inconceivable their sacrifices in taxes and blood, and yet anyone who was not totally blind was bound to recognize that all this would be in vain. What pained us most was the fact that this entire system was morally whitewashed by the alliance with Germany, with the result that the slow extermination [Ausrottung] of Germandom in the old monarchy was in a certain sense sanctioned by Germany itself.”

Now Hitler certainly did not mean to say that old Kaiser Franz Josef planned to gas or shoot all the German Austrians, but rather that they ran the

²⁶ *Völkischer Beobachter*, 30th September 1942.

²⁷ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Franz Eher Verlag, Munich 1933, pp. 13f.

danger of losing their power to the Slavs. *Ausrotten* clearly possessed the meaning ‘deprive of power, rob of influence.’

The reader should also remember that on 1st September 1939 Hitler criticized the Jews for wanting to let loose a world war for the “*elimination of the Aryan peoples*” (*Ausrottung der arischen Völker*). It cannot be seriously contended that he meant to say the Jews intended the eradication of the entire population of Europe root and branch. Here again “*Ausrottung*” means ‘subjection’ or ‘deprivation of power’. This meaning applies to all such endlessly distorted Hitler quotations in the ‘Holocaust’ literature.

e. Two Insoluble Problems

As do all other radical or moderate Intentionalists, Hilberg faces two insuperable problems which he simply ignores:

1. If the National Socialists had decided at any time on the physical liquidation of Jews present in their area of control, from that time forward there would be no documents which spoke of deployment of Jewish labor. However, such documents exist in large numbers. We will quote from a few of them later in discussing the deportations.²⁸ The following problem is even more insoluble for the Intentionalists:

2. If there had been a systematic policy of annihilation of the Jews there would have been effectively no Jews left in the territories in the control of the Third Reich. Every Jew the Germans could have gotten their hands on would have been killed and the few survivors would have had to ascribe their survival to ‘chance’ or ‘miracle’. In reality, the majority of the Jewish population in the countries occupied by the Third Reich avoided any deportation. It is well-known that from France only slightly more than 20% of the Jews were deported, most of whom were foreigners and lacked proper identification. Jews with French passports were mostly left alone. The same applies to those with Belgian passports. Under any extermination policy there would have been effectively none who returned and we would not have on hand the uncounted ‘testimonies of Holocaust survivors’ that now fill whole libraries.²⁹

²⁸ Cf. chapter VI.2.

²⁹ According to Israeli sources, there were some 1,000,000 ‘Holocaust survivors’ still alive in 1998, which equals some 4-5 million ‘survivors’ in 1945! Cf. Gernar Rudolf, “*Holocaust Victims: A Statistical Analysis. W. Benz and W. N. Sanning—a Comparison*”; in: E. Gauss (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Capshaw, AL, 2000, p. 211ff. (online: <http://codoh.com/found/fndstats.html>)

f. “An Incredible Meeting of Minds”

In February 1983 Raul Hilberg had the effrontery to write:³⁰

“[...] what began in 1941 was a process of destruction not planned in advance, not organized centrally by any agency. There was no blueprint and there was no budget for destructive measures. They were taken step by step, one step at a time. Thus came not so much a plan being carried out, but an incredible meeting of minds, a consensus-mind reading by a far-flung bureaucracy.”

Robert Faurisson pointed out these pearls of Hilbergian interpretive art and sarcastically commented that in his own experience the last thing one could ever expect from a bureaucracy was a meeting of minds and telepathy.³¹

Difficilis est satiram non scribere—it is difficult *not* to write satire. It would be difficult to find any clearer display anywhere than these few sentences of the total bankruptcy of the orthodox historiography of the ‘Holocaust’, together with their figurehead, the Giant with feet of clay.

30 *Newsday*, Long Island/New York, 23rd February 1983, p. II/3.

31 Robert Faurisson, *Écrits révisionnistes*, *op. cit.* (note 3), p. 959.