



Valérie Devon

Presents

# Vincent Reynouard editorials

Gas Chambers,  
The Rumor of the Century - Part 3

Sans Concession tv  
Editorials tv

One of the psychological barriers that faces revisionism is the following objection: *"how to believe only a handful could be right against the world? Then we should assume the existence of a vast global conspiracy!"*

My answer is simple: It is precisely because the majority invokes this argument, that gossip can spread beyond all plot.

In a dossier on the rumors as social phenomenon, the authors wrote: *"Very few people verify the information they learn from other people. We believe or we deny the rumor on word. The individual based itself on the others behavior to define an attitude he should adopt regarding the rumor, and its veracity. If everyone believes it, it must be true. For it is impossible that everyone is wrong, one thinks. Thus, the group is assumed to have filtered the rumor upstream oneself."* It's this pseudo argument that enables the most false rumors to spread and persists.

That's why to people who oppose it to me, I tell them: *"But, did you check by yourself?"*

Most of them answer: *"Of course, not, because it's not my job. But there were all these postwar trials, then all the subsequent historians work."*

Very well, so let's go down to this field, and let's examine the question. We will see that, far to confirm this pseudo-argument, this study demonstrates on the contrary, that the *"gas chambers"* are a mere unproven belief.

The first big trial for war crimes, I remind you, started on September 17, 1945. Josef Kramer and his team were judged there, Kramer who from May to December 1944, managed the camp of Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Thus, was he involved in what was then said to have been *"the killing of 4 million people"*.

But, as early as February 8, 1945 the radio had announced that Auschwitz had 4 gas chambers, and twelve incinerators. Therefore, for the first time, one was going to judge some of the alleged *"murderers"* of Auschwitz, the main weapon of the crime being the *"gas chamber"*.

Consequently, the prosecution would have to prove its existence. How did it do it? Did it ask for all the necessary documentation to the Soviets who seized it? No! The first day, the prosecutor announced: *"I propose to call witnesses to prove the existence of gas chambers at Auschwitz"*.

One started to write what was going to be the official thesis with *"witnesses"*. The prosecutor summoned 25 of them, who were former deportees. The others were army members. And it's where it gets interesting. Because, on these 25 witnesses, carefully selected, only four claimed to have seen with their own eyes, gas chambers. The others were content to claim that their relatives were gassed.

On September 25, 1945, for example, the Hungarian Jew, Hellen Hammermasch stated: *"When I arrived [at Auschwitz] I do not know how many thousands we were, but there were many. Immediately after we got off the train, a selection was organized, and people were taken in vehicles to what I later learned to be crematoria."*

Three days later, Polish Jew Lidia Sunschein was asked the following question: *"Did you see for yourself what happened to people who were selected?"*

*"I couldn't see it" , she said, "they were taken away and never returned, but afterwards, I only saw the crematorium afire, the smoke coming out from the crematorium."*

I will finally mention this other young Polish Jew, who was separated from her mother at a selection. To the question: *"What happened to your mother?"* She replied: *"It is quite evident she was taken to the crematorium."*

As we see it, there were people who, at least on this subject, testifying honestly. They saw their relatives or fellow prisoners be taken away and disappear forever. Then, they saw or someone told them about the crematoria whose chimneys were smoking. In their minds, it was enough to conclude about homicidal gassings and cremations. I personally do not tax these people of dishonesty; no one can blame them for believing in it. But, one can not call them gas chambers *"witnesses"*. Because they did not see any with their own eyes. But, most of the deportees can not tell more, and they do not tell more. That's why the myriad of alleged witnesses to the *"Holocaust"* is an illusion.

Hence, the absurdity of the argument which says, *"Anyways, with you deniers, everybody lied!"* Absolutely not. If we compare with the number of people who came back from the camps, very few claimed to be genuine eyewitnesses of the *"gas chambers."* Most told more or less honest deportation ...

I have in my archives a letter posted May 10, 1945 by a deported to Dachau. He wrote: *"It was a close call! We suffered a lot and had often death hanging over our heads. We've endured everything: abuse,*

*bombings, hunger, cold, disease and especially hunger."*

For twenty years, one states: *"Upon their return, the deportees were silent."* No, they were not silent; they narrated. But, in this butchery that had been WWII, their sufferings -very real- had not been so much more extraordinary than others: the bombings, cold, hunger and disease, a lot of people out of the camps went through it too.

That being said, let's talk about these alleged *"eyewitnesses"*: At the Belsen trial, the first of them was a Polish Jew, Ada Bimko deported to Auschwitz on August 4, 1943.

**Prosecutor** - How many gas chambers were there at Auschwitz? Asked the prosecutor.

**Ada Bimko** - Five crematoria. She replied.

**Prosecutor** - In what section of the camp were the crematoria ?

**Ada Bimko** - I do remember one crematorium which was just behind the women's camp and a second which was in a part of the camp called Brzezinski, and all the others, particularly all the chimneys of these crematoria, were quiet visible from our camp [...]

**Prosecutor** - In which camps were the crematoria?

**Ada Bimko** - The crematoria were in a portion called the Birkenau.

One could note a first error in this passage: the Birkenau camp only had four crematoria, the fifth was in Auschwitz I. There is worse however: when she spoke of the crematorium behind the women's camp,

Ada Bimko evoked Krema II, which was effectively there. That of Brzezinski, it was probably the Krema IV. Others, she said, were found elsewhere in the camp and the chimneys especially were visible. It is clear that this is false: Krema III was in front of Krema II and from the women's camp, it was seen as well. Krema V was in front of Krema IV, she would have had to mention two crematoria in the section called "Brzezinski". As for the fifth, located at Auschwitz I, it was not visible from Birkenau. The testimony of Ada Bimko was not reliable, far from it. The rest was going to confirm it.

After stating that she visited a gas chamber with two other persons (a SS and a deportee), the witness was asked to describe it. She spoke of a changing room then, the "gas chamber" itself: *"I gained the impression that hundreds and hundreds of people may go into this room, as it was so large. It gave me the impression of a shower bath, because it resembled the shower baths or ablution rooms we had in the camp. There were showers on top of the ceiling."* This description is sufficient to conclude that the witness spoke of the "gas chamber" of Krema II or III.

Responding to a question, Ada Bimko explained: *"I was in the room with the sprays [the showers] and there was a small door which opened to a room which was pitch dark; it gave the impression of a corridor. I saw a few lines of rails with a small wagon, which was called a lorry, and I was told that those prisoners who were already gassed were put on these wagons, and sent directly to the crematoriums."*

But, simply refer to the diagram of Krema II or III only to find that the little black

corridor with rails did not exist. From the "gas chamber", the bodies would have been deposited on a hoist to be mounted on the ground floor, in the ovens room. But it is not finished.

The prosecutor who asked her if she had seen anything else, she said, *"Yes, I have seen another room. I was led a few steps and there, higher above this room, there was a small room with a very low ceiling, I noticed two pipes. I was told they contained the gas. Then, in a corner, I saw two huge metal containers, which, as I later was told, contained also gas."* Here again, we swam in full fantasy: this room, those pipes and these containers had never existed either. According to the official thesis, indeed, the SS poured the deadly gas as granules by four holes in the roof.

Ada Bimko was therefore an obvious false witness. The trouble is that for lack of plans and documents, the lawyers could not cross-examine her efficiently. I will come back to this issue in my actual plea.

Not surprisingly, the press of the winners put it to good use. This newspaper headline: *"4,500 Jews put into the gas chambers, a witness testifies."* Elsewhere we read: *"How the Germans gassed and burned Jew prisoners"*

Three days later, another witness, Sophia Litwinska, appeared at the witness stand. Arrived in Auschwitz in early fall 1941, this Polish Jew would have been taken out of a "gas chamber" in extremis. She, therefore, testified on the "gas chamber" of Krema I at Auschwitz I. The witness said the death room appeared to her as a shower room. *"There were towels hanging around, showers and even mirrors."* The ploy

however tricked no one because, according to Sophia Letwinska, people were experiencing extreme panic: there were tears, people were shouting at each other; people were hitting each other. But the rest is crucial, "suddenly," she said, "I saw fumes coming from a window." Asked to clarify, she said it was a "very small window on top". As for the effects of these vapors, she described them as follow: "I had to cough very violently, tears were streaming out from my eyes, and I had a sort of feeling in my throat as if I would be asphyxiated."

Here again, we found the rumor according to which the Germans would have used a product already gaseous. That's why the witness spoke of smoke or fumes that she would have seen coming out of a very small window.



↑ But, I remind that according to the accredited story, in the crematorium I, where the scene would have allegedly happened, the Germans would have introduced Zyklon B crystals by four such holes. There could be no question of fumes that would have arrived by a very small window at the top. As to runny eyes, sneezing and feeling of suffocation felt in the chest, these are not the symptoms of acute intoxication with hydrocyanic acid. The witness should have spoke of dizziness, heart rhythm disorders, and especially convulsions...

Like Ada Bimko, Sophia Litwinska was therefore a false witness. But here again, for lack of documents and knowledge, the lawyers could not conduct an effective cross-examination. And here again, the press of the winners made its first page headlines with it: "Woman returned from the dead", headlined the Ottawa Journal. "Gas chamber survivor describes horror," announced The Winnipeg Tribune. "A Polish Jew tells horror of gas chambers" stated the Dunkirk Evening Observer.

So, the belief was once and for all anchored in many minds. Because of course, all these witnesses in Justice could not lie.

It is also interesting to note that on September 29, 1945, still at this trial the prosecutor announced that the next witnesses would not be questioned as accurately than the previous ones. By way of justification, he declared to the court: "I think you will be satisfied by now that there was a gas chamber." Far from protesting, the Court allowed the debate to continue.

Thus, on October 1, 1945, at the hearing, the witness Sigsmund Bendel could tell a gassing at Krema IV in a way one can't be more vague: he was not asked to specify either the number of gas chambers that would have been set up in the building, or room dimensions or the type of gas used, or how it would have been introduced, or how he could kill in two minutes... In short, the witness could tell what he wanted without being cross-examined.

Shortly after Roman Sompolinski appeared a Polish Jew arrived at Auschwitz in the fall of 1943. At the witness stand, he claimed to have work in the Sonderkommando: "I was employed in the gas chambers to clean

*them, undress the dead bodies, and in taking the bodies away and loading them into the lorries.*" No one pointed out to him that, according to other witnesses, victims entered naked into the gas chambers. So, there was no need to undress them after. Moreover, none of the other witnesses spoke of gassed loaded into trucks... Consequently, he should have been asked, at least, in which *"gas chamber"* he claimed to have worked. But, no! Nobody asked him! What's the point? In its final interventions, the Defense itself spoke of gas chambers without challenging at all their existence.

On November 17, 1945, the headlines announced the death sentence of Josef Kramer and some of his subordinates. Unsurprisingly, they talked about *"gas chambers"*: Dr. Fritz Klein was among those sentenced to death and who had *"chosen victims for the gas chambers."* This daily qualified Josef Kramer of *"specialist in gas chamber"* and Fritz Klein, doctor who *"chose victims for Auschwitz gas chambers."*

On completion of this trial, the existence of these *"gas chambers"* was therefore regarded as evidenced by an order of *"justice"*, as if it had been demonstrated during the hearings.

Yet, nothing had been proven. No document, no expertise had been produced. As for the four witnesses who claimed to have seen these alleged local of death, none had been cross-examined efficiently.

But the worst is to come. Because, three days after the rendering of sentences in the Belsen trial, the *"great"* Nuremberg trials started. To conduct it, an International Military Tribunal had been created ex nihilo. Article 21 of the Statute of this

Tribunal allowed judges to consider as established the so-called *"common knowledge"*. It read: *"The court will not require to be reported proof of facts of common knowledge but shall take them for granted."*

But, on that date, and especially after the Belsen trial, the existence of *"gas chambers"* was taken for granted. That's also why the Court allowed as *"authentic proof"* the French act of accusation against Germany who stated about Auschwitz (TMI, blue series, vol.37,p.116): *"The destructions were carried there in several stages: A selection was taking place at disembarking trains. Were sent to the crematorium all those who didn't seem likely to provide work to the Reich, according to their physical appearance. This selection upon arrival, with the S.S. designating those entering the camp on one side, in the other, those who wouldn't, became a fact of "common knowledge"*.

Therefore, it was unnecessary to prove it in the legal sense of the term, so, the Prosecution in Nuremberg didn't produce any expertise of the murder weapon, that is to say, the *"gas chamber"* for one or two thousand people at a time.

The Soviet Prosecution, in particular, didn't brought either the plans of the Birkenau crematoria, or even chemical analyzes that had been carried out, among other things, on an air vent outlet taken in morgue 1 of one of the major Birkenau crematoria, morgue qualified as *"gas chamber."* No, it was all pointless. The existence of *"gas chambers"* was a *"common knowledge"* fact. Consequently, there would be no need to produce evidence. This is how, in 1945-1946, the general belief in the existence of

homicidal "gas chambers" of Auschwitz was introduced. On the basis of four non-audited accounts, presented at the Bergen-Belzen trial.

And thereafter, the world thought he was exempted from providing any evidence. Dozens of books were written which dealt more or less directly on the subject, but without providing any material evidence.

So much so, that in 1978, when Pr. Faurisson publicly called into question the existence of homicidal "gas chambers", 34 historians answered that their existence was *"the necessary starting point for any historical investigation"*.

A few years later, in Canada, another revisionist, Ernst Zündel was charged under a law that prohibited the dissemination of false news. If you accuse a person challenging the reality of the Holocaust to spread false news, then you must demonstrate that the news is actually false, so that the Holocaust occurred. This seems obvious. Well no. On April 8, 1985, Alan Mendelsohn wrote about the Zündel trial: *"The most bizarre aspect of this case was that the prosecution had to prove that the Holocaust actually happened in order to prove that what Zündel published was false."*

The journalist would have wanted, like in Nuremberg, the judges say: *"It is public notoriety, so we condemn you."*

In 2006, again, in his book on Auschwitz, historian Annette Wieviorka wrote: *"The idea there is to prove anything remains for me a strange idea. Until the 1970s, the materiality of the gassing and cremation could not be doubted, was it methodical."* And

also: *"Whether there were gas chambers at Birkenau [...] was obvious for everyone. And it remains so."*

Reading other historian books shows that this approach is always the same... At the trial of Ernst Zündel, the one who was then considered the expert No. 1 of the "Holocaust", Raul Hilberg, was forced to admit that he had written his book without even seeing Auschwitz. He went there only 18 years later, staying half a day in Auschwitz, and half a day at Birkenau.

A test shows this contempt of the Court historians towards the facts materiality: take any book of this kind, and browse it to find an explanatory diagram of an alleged homicidal "gas chamber", or pictures taken on the field. You will never find any.

Since the end of the war, therefore, the "Holocaust" is a simple belief seen as an obvious truth, following the 1944-1946 propaganda flood.

But the war propaganda is far from being a guarantee of truth. In 1945, it was used to blacken as much as possible National-Socialist Germany, in order to crush it on the field then, in the minds. So, why a handful of revisionists could not be right in front of the vast majority, which, since always, believe with no real evidence?

Regarding truth, the number does not matter to the case.

**The accused who have not denied at their trial: A proof of the reality of the "gas chambers"?**

I know that here you will reply, *"But how do you explain that, none of the accused didn't*

*contest at his trial?"* Another argument seen as definitive.

The historian, Joel Guedj, for example, wrote: *"In the aftermath of 1945, no person at fault for the Final Solution denies the extermination facts, whether during the trials or in written or oral testimonies, because denial, after the defeat, would have been unnecessary and ridiculous."*

However, I note that at his trial, the former head of the Reich Chancellery, -that is to say, an important figure in the state- challenged that an extermination took place **(TMI, blue series, vol.13,p.421)**. When his lawyer asked, *"You still think that no extermination program of the Jews was never implemented?"* He replied: *"Yes. I think so. At least the program never called my attention. This program could not be implemented."*

However, forget that character. When Joel Guedj wrote that *"the denial after the defeat would have been useless and ridiculous,"* he says a truth, but the reason he implies, that is the reality of the Holocaust, is false.

If any denial would have been unnecessary, it was due to the situation in which the accused were during their trial. This situation: overwhelming propaganda, no access to documents, hoping to save his head... pushed them -I would even say forced- to adopt a strategy of acquiescence and minimizing their alleged responsibilities.

Let's go back to the case of Majdanek. Either during their custody or facing their judges, have the camp guards denied the murder of 1,5 million people. The trouble is that today, we now talk about only 78,000

killed. So? Similarly, none of the guards denied the presence at Majdanek, of six gas chambers built of concrete. But, what do we read today on the website of the US Memorial Museum of the Holocaust? *"There appear to have been three gas chambers at Majdanek; at least two were shower rooms reconfigured for use of Zyklon B gas. At least one of these was used to kill human beings. Some sources report to a third gas chamber, which reportedly used carbon monoxide gas as a means of murder."*

Note the discomfort of the authors. If, indeed, there were physical or documentary evidence, they will argue categorically. But in truth, historians face a total emptiness.

So, one builds us a discourse sprinkled of conditional: *"it seems..."; "some sources..."; "at least..."*

*"At least one" ?* Excuse me, but if you tell me that two rooms have been converted so that one can use Zyklon B there, and in one of the two, there is not certainty that human beings were killed in it, then I will answer you: *"what evidence do you have that in the other, some would have been killed?"*

In short, we went from six certified gas chambers, built of concrete, to *"maybe"* three chambers. But then, how can to explain that the guards captured by the Soviets didn't enable to clarify it? How is it that on the contrary, they have all confessed the existence of *"six gas chambers"* in Majdanek? How is it possible that they said to have killed 1,5 million people?

The answer is simple. At the time, following the flood of propaganda for which I already gave a short overview, and I will come back



to it in my actual plea, the massacre of several millions of Jews was perceived as an undeniable reality.

On August 16, 1944, the Daily Republican published an article entitled: *"After the war, what?"* After a long introduction, the author wrote: *"To begin with, some three million Jews in Eastern Europe already have been disposed of. They were starved to death, asphyxiated in gas chambers, or brutally shot after being forced to dig their own graves."*

We see it, what would be qualified as *"Holocaust"* was seen as an obvious truth.

And what about this article published in August 1944? It announced that the Soviets were preparing the spectacular trial of Germans guilty in mass-extermination of Jews to be held in Lublin (read: Majdanek).

Therefore, even before their spectacular trial, the defendants were already convicted.

In this atmosphere, the accused knew it was useless to contest the charges -even the falsest- against them. It would have been suicidal. But, very few people are able to die in defense of the truth: most people cling to life and first of all, they want to save their head. Watch these poor accused: they were petty officials, even scapegoats. ↓



Therefore, they only had left total admission and minimization of responsibilities: *"I*

*followed orders, I did not gassed [those people] myself, I was somewhere else...."* This was the only way to hope for leniency from the court.

This defense, the defendants adopted it even before the start of their great trial show. Speaking to an American war correspondent who, in late August 1944, had been allowed to visit the camp of Majdanek, a daily reported: *"Lawrence inspected the hermetically sealed gas chambers in which thousands of the victims died; and five furnaces in which bodies were cremated. He talked with German officers attached to the camp, who, he said, admitted quite frankly that it was a highly systematized place for annihilation, though they denied any personal participation in the murders."*

How would they defend themselves? An article published five days later replied. A simple SS said: *"Yes, I knew children were murdered, but what could we, small people in the SS do? We couldn't protest."*

Meanwhile, the ranking officer in charge of the recovered clothing, asserted *"he never saw an execution, only corpses afterwards."*

As for the accountant of the camp, he apologized: *"I could not understand the systematic killing. I told to my wife when I went home on furlough about it and she said: "God will punish the German people for the crimes they do."*

Invoke obedience and impossibility to protest, claim that one did not kill anyone, say one did not adhere and that punishment was deserved, these poor accused only had this opportunity to defend themselves. With the exception of the one who committed suicide in his cell, all of them believed it till

the end and even signed a request for clemency. Rejected the next day, they were quickly executed, taking the true story of the Majdanek camp in their grave.

Therefore, contrary to what too many believe in, there are cases where, facing a flood of false accusations based on misleading facts, the only hope of saving his head is not in the claim of truth -that would even be counter-productive-, but in cooperation with the Prosecution.

When, as part of a Dantesque fight, a fight to death, one finds oneself overwhelmed by propaganda, when one sees oneself accused in the face of the world of the worst atrocities, including having burnt alive women and children, when one is compared to the Devil who, in his hell, torture the tormented, then there is nothing left to do other than plead guilty and hope to save his life by explaining that one didn't directly took part in the demonic Sabbath. One was their, certainly, but far from the cauldron, one was not part of the witches, one was a

poor subordinate responsible for keeping their brooms, one had to obey, even reluctantly.

Therefore, the fact that *"none of the executioners denied,"* do not impress me. The case of Majdanek is here to show us that this supposedly final argument is in truth very feeble.

It's the same with the other postwar trials: Here is how was announced by the press Josef Kramer's trial and his subordinates, who, I remind it, had managed the Bergen-Belsen and Auschwitz camps: *"Allies to Try Head of Belsen Death Camp Today."* *"Belsen Beast to Trial for Prison Atrocities."* *"Beast of Belsen Denies Horror Camp Guilt."*

As we see, these people were already judged. All they could do was try to minimize their responsibilities in the crimes for which they were charged.