

JP Jew Problem Conference Speaker Germar Rudolf, June 30, 2024

All right, so for our next speaker, we have Germar Rudolf, who is an incredible historian, author, has amazing books. If we can get a shot at that book right there, the Holocaust Encyclopedia. And the title of his talk is going to be “Tackling Zionism and Judaism's Sword and Shield.”

Give it up, please. Thank you.

All right, I'll try to keep that close to my mouth while I'm looking at my own animation here.

And we can start right away. So, a short word, first of all, why that title? I don't just want to talk about Judaism, but also Zionism. And I always start by saying there are more Christian Zionists in this country than there are Jewish Zionists.

And within the context of what I'm going to present, they are a problem, too. So that needs to be kept in mind. So we start out, next one, please.

Throughout this presentation, I will quote from a text of an acquaintance of mine. And I start out here with:

“The Holocaust became the new Western religion. Unfortunately, it is the most sinister religion known to man.”

Now, why is it a religion in the first place? You can actually make a lot of comparisons of, when we're talking about the big Holy H, the Holocaust, that it has many features of a secular religion. It misses God, but all the rest of features, when you're looking at a religion, is actually there. And the one thing that is peculiar to it is that this is the only one that gets you in legal trouble.

When you deny the virginity of Mary or the divinity of Jesus, particularly in the Western world, or you don't think positively about the Quran, you're not going to get in trouble. However, and we'll get to that later, when you're contesting the mainstream narrative on the Holocaust, you actually get yourself in trouble. So what used to be the case hundreds of years ago when you doubted any tenet of Christian religion getting you in trouble, applies now to the Holocaust narrative.

So the next sentence is what gets us to where we are here today:

“It is a license to kill, to flatten, to nuke, to wipe out, to rape, to loot, and to ethnically cleanse.”

Not for every one of us, but only for one particular tribe.

Next one, please. And ever since that is exactly what they have been doing and keep doing in Gaza, the whole world sees it. And they hear it, Israelis and Jews all over the world, and Zionists, quoting the Holocaust as a justification: because some Palestinians are allegedly out to mass murder Jews again in Israel, they have the license to do anything to prevent that: flatten, nuke, murder, kill, rape, ethnically cleanse. The world sees it now.

Next one. Oh yeah, could you put that to the right? Yeah, thank you. Holocaust religion robs humanity of its humanism.

Now, let's step back a little bit. Showing horror movies, fictitious horror movies to minors is illegal in many countries. And there's a reason for this, because the traumatization children go through when you show them absolute horror movies can do massive psychological damage to them, so we want to protect them from this. And this is fine. It is illegal in many countries, and I think that's good. So it's reserved for adults to do that.

However, when it comes to horror movies that allegedly depict reality, that is to say, what allegedly happened in the Holocaust, then it becomes compulsory to show it to children. Now, imagine when children are not accidentally or systematically exposed to horror movies that they are being told, “Oh, it's all made up. It's not real.” Still, it's illegal because it would traumatize them. What does it do to children when they'll be told, “That is true, that is real, it really happened”? And particularly when some of those children are being told, “It can happen again, and it can happen to you.” What will happen psychologically to these children? Next.

Here are the states listed in the United States with the year when it was enacted that Holocaust education is compulsory. That doesn't mean that the states that are not listed there don't teach it. Pretty much every state has it on the curriculum in several topics, in English and history and social studies.

But these are the ones that have made it compulsory so far, and the list is growing at any time. I don't even know whether it's the updated one. So this education is compulsory, it's done to our children all the time with stories, with movies, with malcaptioned movies.

Sometimes it's really a fictitious movie, like Schindler's List or similar stuff, is shown to them. It's being told that it's a representation of reality, kind of like reality, or they're not even told that it's complete fiction. Or they are, of course, footages from when the Western Allies liberated some of the camps in Germany with mountains of corpses shown.

The complete disaster that reigned all over Germany when every city was a mountain of corpses, when millions were dying in Germany, not just in the camps. There is no proper context given. And there is no point even, because if the proper context were given, war is a complete disaster for particularly those who lose that war. Everyone dies, particularly those populations in camps die in masses. Why would you even expose children to that? That is an anti-war education. It should be, maybe, but only at the older age. Young children shouldn't be exposed to that. But it is compulsory.

So what does that do? Let me go to the next one. That is an indoctrination, not just in this country. It's, of course, going on all over the globe.

The United Nations has several resolutions that say that education should be worldwide. Every country should abide to this to get people to know about this event. So what does that do? It's a traumatizing effect.

Next one. Primarily of German children, instilling self-hatred and geno-suicidal wishes.

That's where we have the German people today. Geno-suicidal means they want, as a nation, as an ethnic entity, they give up, they don't want to exist anymore. There's a lot of talk going on, has been for decades in Germany: after Auschwitz, the only thing you deserve to do for the world now is step down and disappear. That's the German attitude now.

The second group that is primarily traumatized by this are the Jewish children. That's what I just mentioned. If you are told as a child, "It happened really, it can happen again, it can happen to you if you don't watch." What kind of children are you raising when you do that to them? You instill persecution paranoia into them. So Holocaust religion robs Jews of their humanism.

Next. And that is what we're doing there, traumatizing these children in Israel, raising monsters. You instill in them paranoia of being in constant danger of persecution, of murder, of ethnically being cleansed.

You raise them to be sociopaths, unable to feel compassion and empathy for non-Jews because for you, all non-Jews are potentially people who want to wipe you out and murder you, and you just emotionally harden up completely. Next one. Then comes the Samson option, which we have heard before.

Before we let anyone kill us, we are going to kill everyone else. So if we have to go, we destroy the world. We get all the nukes we can get, and if push comes to shove, we get encircled by Arabs, they invade us, we are about to collapse, we shoot nukes all over the place, even into Europe if need be.

So, and it is of course used to manipulate and exploit German and in extension European and Gentile guilt complex, which then can be used to be instrumentalized for Jewish or Zionist interests. Next one. And it creates a sense of entitlement of the Jews thinking the world owes us; owes us eternal protection and support no matter what we do in order to protect ourselves from what our paranoia thinks is going to happen. The world has to support us, and we see that now with what they are doing, genocide in Gaza, European governments and the American government has to support, has to pay any penny, every dollar, billions and billions so that we can continue on our rampage of genocide. In other words, the traumatization of the Jews with their own Holocaust propaganda creates genocidal maniacs, and that's what we're having.

"For the sake of peace and future generations, the Holocaust must be stripped of its exceptional status immediately."

What is the exceptional status? Next one. Here's the map of Europe as we have it today. All the red countries have outlawed challenging the orthodox Holocaust narrative.

The gray ones do it conditionally. Yeah, that's good. Here you have listed by the year when every country made it illegal.

No, go back please. Yeah, leave it there.

I want to highlight here only two of them, that is Austria has the most extreme punishment, up to 20 years imprisonment if it comes together with reinvigorating National-Socialist ideology activities.

One of them is considered if the Austrians want to think about joining Germany again because ethnically speaking they're German, that is considered National-Socialist activity even though it's just self-determination if they decide they want to join something. If you combine this, I'm an Austrian, I want to be seen as a German, I want the German as a bigger Germany, and you can challenge the Holocaust narrative, is up to 20 years imprisonment. The other one interesting case is Canada down there, most recent victim, well actually the most recent is Sweden, but they are just about to enact a new law that increases the old one from 2022, increases the maximum penalty from two to five years, and they are about to create what they call peace bonds.

That means they can preventively incarcerate people up to one year who they think are in danger of challenging the Holocaust narrative. So they don't have to have done anything yet. There will be no crime committed or claim to have been committed, there will be no trial.

But if somebody has a track record, as I for instance do, of a long time of challenging the narrative, then the authorities can issue preventive custody. They call it peace bond, there's Orwellian new speech of saying basically the opposite of what, it's not peace, it's war of the government on free citizens. And what that means is protective custody to protect society from your thoughts that we think you might voice in the future to prevent you from doing that, in order to protect society from you, we put you away preventively.

That's what the National Socialists did in their concentration camps, and that's what Canada now is going to have on their books again. So they're on the very same track as Nazi Germany. Okay, next one.

Here is the maximum terms of imprisonment that people have faced over the years that I know of. It's not a complete list, just a quick rundown. I'm in the middle there.

So if people say I've suffered a lot because I've been 44 months in prison in Germany, look at the top of the list. Wolfgang Fröhlich was an Austrian engineer and he wrote a brief engineering report, not dissimilar to my more thorough chemical and architectural report. And he was imprisoned for a total of 16 years.

Initially, it was only a smaller amount, but from prison, he didn't stop writing letters, writing his opinion about this in letters and in pamphlets that he was sending out of prison and that got him in trouble over and over again. He gets sentenced again and again and again and eventually after 16 years, next one, he comes out of prison and he gets actually awarded a revisionist award for his martyrdom in 2021, shortly after he got out of prison and he died a little after that due to complications connected with COVID. He was a specialist for disinfection technology. So he realized when he looked into the Holocaust narrative that the claimed circumstances of mass gassings using disinfection agents, Zyklon B is a disinfectant, is an insecticide, that this cannot be true and for a number of technical reasons, he said this wouldn't work. I have so many decades of historical experience in that field that what is being told, it just can't be right. And that's basically all that got him in trouble. Very similar to mine.

Now, if you remember how the West is screaming if China puts a dissident away for seven years or if some Arabic country puts a dissident away for five years, look at Austria, the Western world with 16 years. We have a German fellow, Horst Mahler, was totally for 14 years in prison.

So when it comes to this topic, the Western world, liberal democracies, the free world, quote unquote, is no better than any other totalitarian regime in the world. Continue. [Interjection from audience on revisionist martyr Ursula Haverbeck] Ursula Haverbeck is, I don't know right now. She's got sentence again, yes. She's probably one I should put on there, too. But as I said, it's not complete. I had to cut something out, so.

“The Holocaust narrative must be subjected to thorough historical scrutiny. Truth and truth-seeking is an elementary human experience. It must prevail.”

I want to get a little deeper here to make you understand also why I and a lot of my fellow revisionists do what we're doing. There is a lot of suspicion going on for some ideological reason, but at the end of it, suffering the intensity that we do for some ideological reason. That's not, no, it's a motive that goes much deeper.

Profound human features. What sets us apart from animals? A lot of things that we do, you find equivalence in the animal sphere, but when it comes to a series of things that we do that the animals don't do, you see the core of humanity.

We are able to doubt our sensory impressions. We can imagine that what we see may not, or what we hear may not be true. We know about lies and truth. We have complex language, complex social structure, and we can lie, and we can know that somebody might lie. So we have to have the ability to doubt. And then comes the next one, the search for truth. That is absolutely crucial for our social survival, to figure out what is true and what is not. And the next one, too: share what we have found on our search of truth with others, and make our findings also independent from us. So even if we're taken out of the picture, we can encrypt our things, whether it's runic symbols cut in stones, or it is a video stored on the internet, it's all the same. It's encrypted and independent of us. It will survive.

I have published my books. If I get killed tomorrow, they will be there forever, somewhere in the nooks and crannies of the internet. This is essential.

Whoever denies us these inalienable rights of doubt, of truth-seeking, and communicating what we have found denies us the core of our humanity, and therefore, as a result, deserves our stiffest resistance. And I've said that this is, down at the bottom, my motivation. The governments out there step on my human dignity, on the very core of my human being when they deny me to communicate what I think I have found out in my research, and I will not let it happen.

The orthodox Holocaust narrative is Jews' and Zionism's sword to destroy us, and themselves, unfortunately, too, in the process, and their shield to deflect any kind of criticism. It gives them a moral high ground, an apparent moral high ground, because they are the ultimate victims, the ultimate sufferers, and that gives them the right to get away with anything, and to attack and destroy everyone who doubts any of this narrative. Next.

It is, so to say, the German term from the Second World War, their *Wunderwaffe*, the wonder, miracle weapon, but it's also the Achilles's heel. It is in need of protection by the most draconian and widespread censorship laws since the Holy Inquisition, because that's what we have. There's never been a period in mankind history where so many countries, spreading so much territory on this globe, have prescribed the writing of history on that particular topic by penal law. It's completely unique in the mankind history. We've never had that, but we have it now. If truth can stand by its own and were convincing, that would not be necessary.

And I have been a long way, gotten involved in this in 1991 and 92, and was one of the main causes why the law in Germany was tightened, and then after that, more and more countries pressured by Germany, because a lot of the activities that have unfolded with my publishing activities had ripple effects in many other countries, and then people have been tightening down the law in these countries. All right, next one.

This is called Free Liberal Democratic West. It's a joke.

Now, when I was putting together my presentation, I was asked, I should mention at least 20 Jews by names who were involved in all this, and said, well, are you joking? Well, I won't have a problem with that. Next one, you see two books that I actually took the information from that you can see in here.

These are, no, one back, yeah. These are the names of some of the people who, behind the scenes of the Nuremberg trials, both the International Military Tribunal as well as the Nuremberg Military Tribunals later on, were involved in organizing and running the show, and they didn't have religious identifiers on them, but by the sheer names, their last names, you can figure out what group they probably belonged to. In one case, that's particularly striking.

We know for sure that he was a Jew. That is David Marcus. You get the next one, we have a nice picture of him.

David Marcus is the one who was in charge of organizing the US-conducted Nuremberg Military Tribunals that came after the IMT, and where actually the main evidence for the Holocaust narrative as it has come down on us, was created in trials against a number of institutional organizations of the Third Reich. He organized it, no, go back, leave it there. He organized it, one more back, back, yeah.

He organized that, and once he was done organizing it, he never appeared in public, but he chose the prosecutors, the judges, and the staff, and the procedure of how witnesses and evidence was selected. So he was the absolute key person. He was done in 47, I think.

In 48, he became the first general of Israel. After having rigged the trial to prove that the Germans committed genocide against the Jews during the Second World War, he became the first general of Israel in the 1948 genocidal war of Israel against the Palestinians. So after trying to prove the genocide that the Germans committed, he went out and committed one.

That's how we know that he was a Jew. He was killed in that same year because one of his sentries shot him because there was some confusion about his identity. So, next one.

That was the birth of the legend and who was involved in that, so we have plenty of names there. Next, we come to some names of when the ultimate dogmatic casting of this event happened in 1990 by the *Encyclopedia of the Holocaust* where all the claims that had been made in 40 years prior were cast into a kind of a Bible. Published by Yad Vashem, four volumes. You see two there, they're bound together for a library edition. 1,900 pages, 900 entries. However, I've analyzed that thing when I sat down to write my own one to know how have they done theirs and what is actually the content of it to make sure that I cover all the bases. I wanted to know which base did they cover.

I found out that not even a third of all the entries in this encyclopedia address the Holocaust as such, meaning the planned and implemented mass extermination of the Jews. That's what I understand as the Holocaust. You can broaden the definition, include all persecutorial measures, but the Holocaust means complete consumption by fire. There is a destruction, so when I speak of Holocaust, I'm talking about the planned and implemented extermination of the Jewish people by the National Socialists during the Second World War. Only, not even a third of all entries actually address that.

Almost a third is what I call hagiolatry. That's the veneration of saints. The entries address Jewish heroes, martyrs, resistance fighters, celebrities in that period of time, Gentile martyrs and resistance fighters, those who came to the help and rescue of Jews, so what they list then as righteous Gentiles. So that's a third of the entries. And Gentile bashing, people who have, during that period of time, had some supportive association or involvement in National Socialist Germany, even though they have no connection to the Holocaust as such at all, they're still mentioned and displayed as some evil people. This is what... the most important thing, however, if you go through that, you find zero entries on evidence.

One thing you would expect an encyclopedia of the Holocaust to teach you about is what is the evidence for all these claims? There's nothing in it. Not a single witness account gets taught. If you look at the imprint, you can go step by step through those images, highlighted in yellow are all the Jews that are on the board.

You keep going. And we have six Gentiles in there. All yellow are Jews and six Gentiles on the board that are not Jews, or at least I assume, three of them are already dead by the time, were already dead by the time that was published.

So you see, it was published by Yad Vashem, and to no surprise, the editorial board consists of almost, to a large degree, of Jews, only a few, what they call the Shabbos goy, and half of them are already dead. So it shows you the dominance there, no surprise, because it's a Yad Vashem project supported and conducted basically by an Israeli government agency. Next.

Now, the Holocaust is a very complex topic. And when people ask me, do you deny the Holocaust? I say there's no such thing as the Holocaust. The Holocaust consists of so many events stretching over such a long period of time and covering so many countries that you cannot pinpoint one thing as "the Holocaust."

We have to talk about every single event and every single place and aspects of it, which one did happen, which one did not, which way did it happen, was it exaggerated, distorted, and so forth. So to talk about the Holocaust as something that can be denied makes no sense. The one way, if any of you ever get involved in discussing the topic, because my experience is when we go into discussing the Jewish problem, you will be confronted sooner or later either with provocative questions to get you to make statements that can get you in trouble, or you yourself make statements to some end that opens up the floor and you will be confronted with the issues, then comes with this dumb question: Do you deny the Holocaust or some other aspect of it?

How do you argue that? Now, I have one point that I've found I can shut down every single journalist out there and show them that they, first of all, are pretty ignorant, don't know what they're talking about, and show them I don't have to use my own arguments to show that this is a major fraud, that something is completely fishy about the story. Next one, this one chart, you don't need more. It's

about the concentration camp Majdanek that is said to have been one of the major extermination camps.

What you see here is the development of the claimed death toll of that camp over the years, claimed by mainstream scholars, consenting with each other. Right after the war, when the camp was liberated, the Soviets claimed two million killed in seven homicidal gas chambers. The number went down just a little after that when the Poles had a short trial against some of the former guards of the camp, and they concluded 1.7 million.

Then the IMT saw a document, by the Soviets submitted: 1.5 million. Now, these are all in the same order of magnitude, so there's not much of a disagreement about that. I would say, well, 500,000 would be a lot, you would still think, but as a scientist, I think in orders of magnitudes, and that is still kind of in the same range.

However, hardly was the post-war frenzy of show trials over, did a Polish judge sit down and wrote the first official history of the camp. Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz in 1948 said it's only 300 and what, it's kind of, I can't see, is it 360,000? 360,000, so he reduced it down to a fraction. That was in 1948.

Then the Iron Curtain came down. There was more willingness to challenge their own narrative, and the next historian of the Auschwitz, no, the Majdanek Museum, Czesław Rajca, reduced it to 235,000, still maintaining all seven homicidal gas chamber claims. However, a new Polish historian from a new generation came in, and he had to face a difficult situation because revisionists by then had made thorough critique of the official narrative, a devastating critique, with plenty of documents that were found in the museum's archives themselves.

So using the material that is in the archives to show that their narrative is wrong. We published that book in 1998, and it says, well, they're all in all documented 42,200 victims. That's what's documented. There may, at the end of the war, with lack of documentation, because when things break down, things don't get documented anymore, there is a little bit room to increase that, but that's what's documented, and there's zero trace of any homicidal gas chambers anywhere ever having been in action in that camp.

So the new director of the Auschwitz [recte: Majdanek] Museum comes in, Tomasz Kranz, and he rewrote the history again, and he reduced it from 235,000 down to 78,000. So, pretty close to what we came to conclude, and he ditches five of the gas chambers. We have now left only two homicidal gas chambers. So he admits, compared to what we had initially, from two million down to 78,000, and that's what do we have left. It's a tiny fraction of the original number that we have left, and we have also ditched the majority of the homicidal gas chamber claims.

So, just looking at the mainstream narratives, you admit that you have been exaggerating, inventing, and lying. And the Poles did that right after the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s. "We could not, in those years, post-war years, write an accurate history", when they were confronted, "Why do you change the narrative now about this camp and about other camps like Auschwitz, too? Why did you change the storyline now? Why did you reduce the death toll claim?" "Well, we couldn't talk freely about it. We would have faced disciplinary actions by the government had we challenged the narrative."

Disciplinary actions.

Today, Poland has made Holocaust denial a crime. They're not facing just disciplinary action. They're facing jail time as they do that. So, for them, they have more incentive to lie now than they had under the Soviet time because punishment for that kind of stuff has gotten worse. So, they would have been easier off in the Soviet times. So, as you see from that, you can't believe them.

And if you wave that chart with that storyline in a journalist's face, they have been maintaining that story, the journalists have been supporting that. You can show that you have been part of this lie. And why should we trust the Poles now that they are threatened with imprisonment, that they got the story right, now? As a matter of fact, you cannot trust any historian who toes the party line because if they don't, they get punished.

So, the baseline here needs to be anyone who toes the party line probably does because he knows otherwise he gets punished. And we have heard that in backroom discussions because we have been in touch with mainstream historians that tell one story in the public. And when we're together, we're sitting with them at the bar or in some restaurant, they tell a completely different story.

They know, they're afraid, they have no backbone, they have no courage, and they tell lies because they are afraid. I've been involved in that kind of research now for the better part of 30 plus years. What you see here is a long row of books that I have published as a lead editor, the so-called Holocaust Handbooks, hard-hitting studies, a total of 18,000 pages. So much detail, as a matter of fact, that it is very difficult for anyone to wrap their heads around it. As a matter of fact, I have my own difficulties of keeping track. I have published all these. I think nine books of them have me as an author, co-author or lead editor on it. The rest are from different authors. I've translated them from different languages into English and German, published several editions of them.

So I kind of know the territory pretty well, but I cannot expect any one of you or anyone out there to actually gather, understand and retain all the knowledge in those books. It's too much, it's a complete overkill. If you're halfway through reading this series in theory after several months, if not years, you probably have forgotten already half if not more of what you read initially.

So there's just no way of retaining it. It's a solid foundation to show how far we have come as revisionists. That knocks out of the ballpark any mainstream research by dimensions.

The intensity, the thoroughness, the breadth, the scope and scale of what we have done is unparalleled in the world. And yet we are getting completely silenced. You will never in any quote unquote refutation hear references to it anywhere. They are afraid of it.

Because it is so difficult to retain all this massive amount of detailed information, I got contacted over the years repeatedly by candidates running for office for House of Representatives or Senate, mostly on the Republican ticket. They wanted to know which book to read so that they can get a concise understanding of what the revisionist position is.

And I was frankly struggling giving them anything because I said there are a number of books that summarize it, but if you're in a situation where you have to face hostile journalists, what you would like to have is a book where you can look up a buzzword, find the information and then respond. Maybe not in a live interview, but in preparation of a written or prepared interview where we're being told what's going to be happening the next few hours or so. And we didn't have that.

What is really needed, understood, was actually suggested to me by the Israeli government in 2021 when they wrote in a report of anti-Semitism, section Holocaust denial, that my publishing company back then is the only revisionist publishing outlet left in the world that produces new and relevant material. And among other things, they claimed that I had published an encyclopedia of Holocaust denial, which at that point I had not. I was thinking maybe if you go back, they were referring to this massive amount of research that we had done that it's not really an encyclopedia, but all the knowledge in that would be encyclopedic.

Or they referred to a book of mine that's called *Lectures on the Holocaust*, which kind of covers most of the bases in a more summarized way. But anyway, the politics of Israel and of any government, Western government, when they talk about revisionist publications, is not to mention names, not to mention the correct titles of anything, because that would be advertisement, enables people to find the stuff, and they don't want that. So they mislabeled it, and I got angry initially, but then I thought, hmm, that's actually what we need, for people to be able to use that knowledge, to prepare themselves, to be in a position to tackle that issue if they get confronted with it, because it's going to come.

If you get into the public sphere and want to tackle the Jewish problem, this will be one of the clubs that they will hit you with, and you need to be prepared. So I sat down January last year, and in June I was done. So it took me five months to write this thing, an encyclopedia, it's online completely.

Next one, what this encyclopedia is, it's just one volume, 634 pages letter size, so I have it here with me, and it has not quite 600 entries, 95% is really, it is about the Holocaust, I focused completely on that, and no bullshit, excuse me. I have a few other topics, I talk about it, for instance, about things like censorship, the things revisionist skeptics face, about propaganda, and about motives, all the parties involved, of creating it. Now I've talked only of course of the Jewish contributions. There are other contributors, pretty much every winning country in the Second World War had an interest in pushing the story. The biggest one were of course the Jews for a number of reasons. Another big party is the Poles, who after the war annexed huge parts of German territory and needed to break German self-confidence to make sure they'll never make any territorial claims, and that's a mission the Poles were on. But we're not talking about that here, and I don't want to be divisive in this regarding the

Poles, so I'm not out to single them out. They have similar problems like we all do. So next one, this book is about evidence.

Technical, forensic, documentary evidence, all the essential parts are being addressed, they're being explained, and we have a massive number of witness accounts, which is the stuff that people rely on to say, well, but all these former inmates have told the story, or even German quote-unquote perpetrators who are said to have confessed, they are all in there. It is explained what they have stated, and it is then analyzed whether or not we can trust it. And here is your list of 20 names. As a matter of fact, I've taken all the witnesses that we have, the 272, and picked out those where we can be certain that they are Jews.

Now, there were, of course, four camps where a large part of the mass murder is said to have happened, it's Belzec, Chelmno, Sobibor, and Treblinka, and they were camps where almost exclusively, or I can say exclusively Jews were shipped to. So when it comes to the witness [victim] side, you have only Jewish witnesses. So the narrative that has come down to us is almost exclusively for the first years based on Jewish witnesses. There are a few perpetrators who were in Allied custody who went through pretty horrible treatment and came up with confessions, but for the most part, here are the people who have defined what the narrative is.

And I want to not address every single one of them. We would sit here for several days, but I'll highlight a few. If you go to the next one, this will show some faces, Szlama Dragon. They are all that come now about Auschwitz, which was a mixed camp. Stop here on this one.

Miklos Nyiszli, he's the one who's popularized the Auschwitz narrative as we know it, the most important witness. His name is not well-known, but he has written a narrative that has had massive influence and has been plagiarized later by other quote-unquote witnesses. And he told a story that we can see as proof that the claim of mass murder at Auschwitz with Zyklon B is a lie.

He was in the crematorium where hundreds of thousands of people, while he was there, are said to have been killed in there with Zyklon B. And he tells the story in a way that we can show he cannot have witnessed it because every single detail about the gassing, about the agent, about Zyklon B that he tells is wrong, is completely wrong, and proves he did not know what Zyklon B is. He did not know how it operated. He did not know how gassing would have worked and how it would have looked like. He had no clue about any of these things. He invented a scenario that's completely off the wall. So we know he didn't experience it. He made it up. It's completely made up. Next one.

That's the biggest plagiarizer. Next Auschwitz witness who had the most influence, apart maybe from Rudolf Höss, a perpetrator was tortured three days before he confessed.

Filip Müller, former inmate. And he plagiarized Nyiszli. He retold the same story.

Completely impossible. He copied it from Nyiszli.

Next one, he [Henryk Tauber] had massive influence.

He was presented by the Soviets with blueprints of the crematoria. So he described the crematoria fairly well because he had blueprints there. And then he put in a story of gasings that is so outrageous and over the top that we know he's a preposterous liar.

That is the one who claims to have written a report that made the Auschwitz story public. It was published by the U.S. government as the so-called War Refugee Board Report. He, together with others, but he is the main author and the main proponent of it, who later went on record in several trials and media appearances, Rudolf Vrba.

And the last one, I'm not going to talk about him. You know him. He was probably the most influential witness and also the biggest liar. Chances are high that Elie Wiesel was never in Auschwitz. The stuff he tells about it, even the mainstream today accepts never happened. Flames shooting out of chimneys, people being burned alive in pits right at the train ramp where people arrived. It is clear it never happened. We have evidence from air photos and from other circumstances, it never happened. He never mentions gas chambers.

All right. Concluding thoughts. In a complex society as we have, we have to rely on division of labor. None of you can be expert at what I'm talking about on the Holocaust. I've said, it took me more than 30 years to gather all this knowledge, and nobody can expect to make the study of this topic their life's mission, which it has become mine. You need to rely on getting others to do this work for you reliably, and to present the result in a way that you can make use of it.

And I have prepared it for you. I want you to be safe, to make the right arguments, to come up with the right storyline so that you're not being caught by journalists or by mainstream historians showing

that you are telling nonsense, will expose you as ignoramuses, as fools who don't know what they're talking about. That can so badly backfire on yourself, on your own career, but also on whatever cause you are actually following.

In order to prevent, the next one, from this happening, that you end up with egg on your face, I have produced this encyclopedia for everyone to be able to look it up. Any buzzword on the Holocaust that you may come up with, we try to include as long as it is relevant actually to the core of it, to mass extermination claims. My understanding of elites, as I have learned it in my young student years, go back one, is elites have special abilities and they are primarily there to serve.

I want to serve with this. So what I've done with the Holocaust Handbook series is completely accessible for free online on holocausthandbooks.com. The same with this one. We have the entire encyclopedia under holocaustencyclopedia.com, freely accessible, interactive with audio. So if you want to listen to an entry rather than read it, you can do that. And interlinked, so a reference to other entries, you hop there right away. You can also download an interactive form of the online version completely down on your gadget. You can post it anywhere else on the web to share and distribute. It's completely free.

I want it to spread. I want it to be used. I want everyone of you to get access to that kind of information, to smarten up, to have that weapon of defense when the attacks are coming, and they will be coming. Of course, we have also this massive printed edition.

And I have to tell you, if you are trying to convince a neighbor, a friend who is not on the same page, and you say, well, go to the website, it's all there. The website, you always only see one page, one screen at a time, and you don't know the massive amount of information and effort that has been put in it. But if you slam that thing on the table, here it is. There's no way for anyone to say, this is just babbling, superficial stuff. If a movement like ours can come up with a massive encyclopedia like this, we need to know to some degree what we're talking about, and I think we do.

Next one. Right now, still, the book, in its printed form and also in e-book form, is still available everywhere where books can be had. Shouting it out to the world as I'm doing now, that may, maybe, be the end of it being available everywhere. It is also available on the website that I just mentioned, holocausthandbooks.com [recte: HolocaustEncyclopedia.com]. We have a shortcut domain name that's called nukebook.org. Nuke like the nukes, book.org, and it got a nickname from people who were actually working with me on doing this book. It nukes the mainstream Holocaust narrative into oblivion, replaces it with something that is more accurate, that is uncensored and unconstrained by politically correct expectations. It goes in all the taboo areas and tells what the findings are.

Spread the word, make use of it, get a hold of it.

I did it with a lot of suffering and with a lot of sacrifice, and I'm not out to become a millionaire, which will never happen anyhow, so I'm not in it for the money. I am in it for getting the word out, getting everyone the information they need, making sure that everyone knows where they can access it, and then be prepared if the artillery zooms in on you. Thank you.

I got to have everybody stand up and give him a round of applause, please.

One final thought. I have that copy here, and I would like Dr. Jones to have a copy. Do you have a copy? He needs one. He needs to have this carapace of knowledge to defend himself, and we all do. Thank you.

Yes. Stay right there, because I have some questions. I'm sure they have some as well, if you don't mind. If you want to sit, you can sit also, no problem.

No, I can stand. Yeah.

First and foremost, thank you. Thank you so much for doing this for all of humanity. This is a subject that, as I was watching and listening, it was boiling my blood, and I couldn't, I really, it's very difficult to understand that so. Battery's out.

So many people have suffered, and are still suffering in prison, including a 95-year-old, probably great-grandmother, Ursula Haverbeck. I have many other questions. I'm sure the crowd does as well, but my first question is, how did you maintain sanity and poise and strength and resolve being imprisoned for something that you know was righteous and part of your beliefs and your thoughts?

I have learned recently that I was damaged through that time. It's not something that you can shake off. You can pretend after you come out of prison that you're normal. What does help is if you have a supportive community. When you're in prison, you are at a place where the scum of society is

gathered, and you're considered part of them. What sets you apart at that moment is if you get tens and hundreds of letters from supporters that confirm that you're not normal.

When even the prison authorities start treating you differently, first of all, they don't give you any easing of conditions because you are a criminal of conviction. You don't change your mind. Therefore, we are not giving you any release. So that just makes you more angry. Every drug dealer gets some relief of prison regimen if they behave themselves. Not revisionists. There's nothing in them for them. But then you see that other prisoners' lives collapse. They lose family. Marriages fall apart. They lose their property, their jobs, everything. In my situation, it wasn't quite that.

Everybody stuck around, supported me. Even financial support was big enough to support my family and not to lose anything out. So, it makes it easier, but it's not easy at all.

I realized later when I had another episode when I thought they're going after me again just not too long ago that I had a *déjà vu* experience and post-traumatic stress syndromes up the yin-yang. It leaves traces in the psyche. But I read just months before I was released from prison a *New York Times* article talking about a Egyptian dissident who had been fighting for civil rights in Egypt against the government there, and who was incarcerated for several years. He had come out of prison and went straight back to what he had been doing before, fighting for civil rights, democratic rights, and so forth against the Egyptian government. And so this *New York Times* reporter asked him, why do you go straight back if it has done so much harm to your life and everything? You have it coming again if you keep going. Why do you do that? And he said, and that's exactly the same way I feel:

"I've sacrificed so much of my life so far. If I were to give up now and concede to the government that they win, nothing has made sense in my life. Nothing makes sense from here now anymore. I wouldn't be able to look into the mirror. I couldn't get up in the morning. There is just no way right now with so many bridges burned behind me by the government that I can go back. No, impossible. I have to move forward just to be able to look in the mirror and get up in the morning. There's just no other way."

So I've got about 100 questions. I figured somebody in the crowd might, and I don't want to be selfish. So let me hand the mic over.

You're going to go so viral after this. Like the Gropers, and I think this was probably just for me listening to all of it and all the information is probably one of the biggest J pills I've ever consumed. And so thank you.

Yeah, just later, later. What I want to say is JP pills. If you look at the encyclopedia at the front, it has a little red pill on it. At the back, it has a little red pill on it. You know what a red pill is, right? Yes.

Yeah, it's the movie *Matrix*. And we put it on there for a purpose because I have given that book, just when we had gotten it out, to various people and they couldn't put it down. We had a secretary who had no knowledge about that topic at all. Secretary in a different company, had nothing to do with revisionism. And we had a damaged copy and she was just curious. She took it home and then she got sick and she was in bed for 10 days. And she read it almost cover to cover. She said she got 80% through by the time she got out of bed again. A relatively low educated blue-collar gal from the South in Texas, no pre-education on the topic at all, but was so riveted by what she was reading that she was reading an encyclopedia cover to cover. They're not meant to be read cover to cover.

They're not meant to be written in five months by just one person either. So there are a lot of things unusual with this. It is cast in one piece by one author, completely coherent, consistent and logically built. And it is so much exciting information in there. So much revelation, so much, yeah, moments of epiphany in there, even for people who think you know a lot. But I mean, I've done 35 years of research on it. So, and I started connecting dots because truth told, I needed it myself. I couldn't wrap my head around all the stuff that I'd published. It was just too much.

When I was looking for an information, I wanted to quote it. Where in these 52 volumes is it? We're up to the 53rd now, coming up soon. I couldn't find it. I was spending sometimes half an hour finding it. And finally, I got sick of it. I need to organize it. So it all fell into place. I could organize my own thoughts. And then I was seeing lines connecting certain things that I'd never seen before. I started seeing patterns that I'd never seen before. And I could actually put them in there of how this narrative was created and how it was pushed upon us. Something that I never saw that clearly, but putting it all together, I finally realized, wow.

And other people reading it too. So it is actually more than just an investment into a reference book that you want to have in your shelf. You may end up find yourself reading the damn thing and think it's great literature.

Okay. Yeah, I enjoy it myself. Sometimes I use it myself because it's just for me to go to when I want to look up something, I don't have to go to the 53 volumes anymore. No, I have it in there. And if I want to know where it is referenced there and I know, oh, it's in that volume, this page, okay. So we all need it. I need it too. So I'm having a short-term memory that's not all that great. And even my mid and long-term memory can't comprehend 53 volumes of research. It's just too much.

It's amazing. You are a legend, sir. Okay, so we'll take the questions we have...

Thank you for your presentation. Europe maintains these death camps that you can still tour today almost 80 years later. And they go through the same scenarios of here's the crematorium. Here's where they burned the bodies, things like that. And now we continually have Holocaust museums springing up which seems around the country. And with your presentation, I'm wondering if we can change the mindset of enough people to walk into those museums, maybe carrying your book, maybe asking a few questions that don't correspond to the pictures on the wall, to the Holocaust museum narrative that are 80-year-old lies that you've proven. Maybe that will be turned against the Jews who continue to build these and open these facilities. I thank you very much.

Yes, a little bit of a caution. If you have visited the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum in D.C. on the Mall, I would say that the majority, 80% of the museum are about persecution, not Holocaust in terms of complete destruction. That is at the very end of the tour when you're let into a replica gas chamber and see some wooden doors that are said to have been gas chamber doors. So there's very little about the actual mass murder. There's a lot of persecution. Now, the persecution is not what is being challenged. So there has been victimization of Jews in National Socialism. And this is not going to go away.

But the ultimate pinnacle, you see that with all the memorial sites in Germany. Nobody would visit the Dachau Museum if it weren't for the one building where the ultimate prize of the tour is, the visit into the gas chamber. If you take that out of the equation, the main tourist attraction of that attraction goes away and that collapses a tourist industry for the whole town and it collapses a moral, pseudo-moral mainstay of German commemorative culture. But it doesn't take the fact away, yeah, Jews were targeted and persecuted during this.

So we need to distinguish between, that's what I'm saying, I'm focusing on the extermination claim, not going to the territory of persecution. There has been persecution. That may have been exaggerated, skewed, and most importantly, the reasons for why things happen are never being talked about. Actually, I have an entry in there about motives, not about just motives why the Allies and Jewish Zionist groups pushed the Holocaust narrative, but also the motives of why the National Socialists did what they did, whatever that was, to the Jews. Their own justification, which is glossed over. They had a justification. I would say they had a narrative which they used as a justification. Some of it can be rationalized. There's something in it, critique of Jewish religion, of Jewish religious law, from Talmud to Shulchan Aruch and similar things.

And then there's, of course, the other part where it's about racial claims of Jews being genetically inferior or different, whatever the case may be, that's a completely different kettle or fish. And we're not going in there because that's still, that's a matter of genetics, and I'm neither expert on it nor do I think is that case settled whether there's really a particular Jewish gene that may or may not be the case. We'll find out maybe in decades to come with artificial intelligence that there is a pattern relationship between certain gene sets and certain societal or individual behavior.

As I said, any kid from childhood on being traumatized as they have been now for generations and it's repeating itself, it's a vicious circle of self-traumatization that's going on, would end up showing behavioral patterns that no matter your biological, genetic basis, would end up being pretty nasty.

Who's next? Lucas.

Thank you for your presentation. So I want to make a comment, then a question. It's even worse, these Holocaust denial laws, because if you think about it philosophically, you can't choose to believe or disbelieve something. If I told someone like Khan, Khan, I want you to stop believing God right now, he can't. So someone who doesn't believe the Holocaust, they're not convinced, they're not choosing not to believe it. So in other words, people are going to jail based on something they can't control. You're either convinced of it happening or not convinced. It's one or the other. Now, I

remember in fourth grade, we were taught, we went to the Holocaust Museum in New York, and I was a fourth grader. I'm like, oh my God, this is terrible.

It was only years later when I first saw that documentary made by a Jew, which is named Cole, Benjamin... David Cole. That was the first time I actually looked into it. But anyway, so there's a lot of discrepancies in the story. And you mentioned Eli Wiesel, I'm going to call him a weasel. Now, is it true that Eli Wiesel, he doesn't have a tattoo, correct?

I have not seen high resolution images large enough for me to make a definite determination on that. But we don't actually need that. Apart from his narrative telling a story that has nothing to do with truth, that even is acknowledged by the mainstream. We have documents showing exactly who was admitted to the camp in that time and who was not. There were two Wiesel's by the name of Lazar and Abraham, I think, admitted during the time he claims to have [been] admitted.

The problem is they don't have his age. They are older than him, considerably older. And there is no boy of, I think he claims to have been 15, that was admitted to the camp ever.

And then we have the same records, they were evacuated at the end of the war to Buchenwald. We have again records there, and the same picture there. There is no 16 years, at that time, year old Eli Wiesel on record. It just doesn't exist.

And if you look at those records, you know that he probably used the identity of an uncle of his who may have died, and impersonated him. And we have another witness actually who knew Eli Wiesel. And he met him after the war thinking it's the one person he thought he knows. And he realized that's a completely different person. So he was in Auschwitz, knew that Lazar Wiesel and said, no, you're not it. You're somebody else. So there's a lot of other evidence than him possibly not having a tattoo.

There was a website, I think, like where's Elie's tattoo?

Eliewieseltattoo.com. Yes, it has a lot of evidence in there. Now, the photos are low resolution and not decisive for my taste. It may or may not be. I'm not sure about that.

What about the fact that no tattoo goes above six digits? So there's no like one million seven thousand, you know what I mean? The argument is, I've heard people say, well, they didn't tattoo everyone. Is that true? Did all the camps not tattoo? Because I get the counter argument.

If you were properly admitted to the camp, you would have had one. There are a lot of Jews who were not properly admitted. They went through what they call the transit camps. So they were housed there for days, weeks, months, depending, and then were shipped somewhere else. They were never properly recorded and didn't receive one. But according to his own narrative, he was properly admitted and in the camp, so he should have one.

We have one from the chat from John. John 222 loves you, man. Question for Germar: Does he see Holocaust denial laws eminent in the U.S.?

No. I see them with all the white spots we still have in Europe coming there sooner or later. I know Iceland tried. That got shelved because they ran into the end of the legislative period. The same happened in Ireland. Had it not been for the bill being introduced too late, we probably had those two countries already fallen. These all will come. Here in the United States. It takes some more degradation of the First Amendment by other precedents for this to be able to become something anyone would try. I would say it is possible that this can happen. But it takes several steps to, I mean, they have rigged, any president can rig the Supreme Court to the point that they throw out old precedent. We have just seen that now with the Chevron decision, a 50-year-old or so standing precedent case was completely thrown out. That can happen with the old clear-and-present-danger decision of the Supreme Court too when it comes to the First Amendment. But I'd say it takes probably some 9-11-style false flag operation that is blamed on Holocaust denial, some mass bombings of synagogues with swastikas smeared here and there, and Holocaust denial writings, graffiti, then they may be pushing for it. And enough of these events happening with the courts being rigged, it can happen. But I would say the United States, with the tradition we have and the laws with the First Amendment, is probably the last one to fall, if at all.

And I hope it is because that's my last stronghold to remain a free man. That's why I'm in the country. I came for the First Amendment and nothing else. I'm an immigrant to this country, not because of economic prospects or anything else. Had I stuck to my German career as a PhD scientist, I would have fared much better in Germany than with the career I'm pursuing now, which keeps me a pauper pretty much and gets me in a lot of social trouble. So I came for the First Amendment to enjoy

that. That is my primary purpose. And I think, knocking on wood, fingers crossed, it's going to hold up. We all need to fight for it, not just critics and skeptics of the Holocaust story, but anyone in this country. It is civil rights that we all depend on to be able to form our opinions and to voice them and to have any kind of influence, political, social, whatever. It's a cornerstone of this society. And I think everyone understands it.

And if the Supreme Court or anyone would try, it will meet stiff resistance from all quarters, even those who are normally our enemies, the SPLC, the ACLU. I think those will all be on board to strike that down. And therefore, you don't have anything like it, like these relatively powerful civil rights organizations in any other country. And when it comes to this, I think it will hold.

One question from GSDMom70: Do you think that Germany will try to go after you, the authorities, again?

They do constantly. They issue arrest warrants. They right now have, I found out, I wanted to get a new passport. I couldn't get one because I had 14 arrest warrants on record. Twelve of them have in the meantime expired. Two are still on the record, and one hasn't been extended to encompass all of Europe. So I can't travel to Europe. I can't travel right now anywhere because I don't have a passport, but I don't need one. This country is a country to get stuck in that's big enough for you to never, ever feel anything about that you're actually boxed in. So they are constantly trying. But the United States government, because of the First Amendment, does not cooperate. Whatever I do is not an extraditable offense. Therefore, nothing happens.

And then just, you want to go ahead?

I just want to say that this is the kind of immigrant that I think we all want here in America.

Absolutely. 100%. More of these immigrants, 100%. Last question, and this is just, I guess, for me. The Anne Frank diary with the whole ballpoint pen, is it true? Or have you looked into that? Can we just confirm or deny it?

Yes, we have, of course, an entry on that in there. The ballpoint pen issues, I think, is a red herring to distract you from the real issue. The ballpoint pen corrections were made afterwards. That doesn't distract from the fact that the original manuscript is not written in ballpoint. So somebody made a few corrections or annotations on it later, and we can argue who that was. Evidently not Anne Frank. Probably her father. But that has nothing to do with the core of the text itself. So that's a different issue. There are a number of issues with it.

In general, I suggest people to stay away from it. The fate of Anne Frank confirms revisionism. She was not murdered in Auschwitz. She was sent to Bergen-Belsen and died there of typhus because infrastructure in Germany had completely collapsed. Nobody in Germany who wasn't a farmer could get any food. There was no medical supplies. There was no heating supplies. There was no fresh water. Everything collapsed in Germany, and people in Germany were dying like flies everywhere. Included, and most importantly, in the camps because they're at the bottom of the pecking order in a society, and they're always dealt the worst blows when a society collapses. That's the context where she died of typhus, probably. We don't even know that because she was never identified. We just know that she got to Bergen-Belsen. The record is there, and that's the end of the story. And most likely she died of typhus. That's all we know. It confirms the Holocaust narrative as it is told by revisionists, not by the mainstream. She was not killed at Auschwitz, and neither was anyone else of her family. They died, but all documented, some of them actually, one of her sisters, I think, and her mother died. The father survived, and a stepsister is a different story, but her father of the core family is the only one who survived that. But we know how all the others died. No gas chamber in the picture, and that's good enough.

That this was then used as a massive propaganda vehicle to push the Holocaust narrative in general is a different story altogether. That girl suffered a tragedy, and I'm not opposed to have the father have literary success with her daughter's diary that he may or may not have rewritten or contributed to.

If I were to lose one of my daughters in a tragedy like that, and I could get some consolation of having her fate recorded and told to the public and the public appreciate it, I would take it, and I would blame no father for doing this. What the mainstream has done with it, then using that narrative that does not confirm the gassing and mass murder story to indirectly confirm it is where the opposition comes in. That's not right. It's abusing a real victim's fate to tell a story that's not supported by that fate, and that's not right.

Thank you.

I have one last question before we let you go. I know you've been standing there for a while, and thank you again. Besides, oh yeah, and then Dave has one as well. Besides Majdanek, what other quick three points would you say are supportive in that conversation, like you mentioned, to not have egg on your face, and that are quick hitters? Like, for example, one of the ones that's very popular amongst people who study this is the census of the number of Jews prior to the war and the number of Jews after the war. So, what would you say are three quick points besides Majdanek that you would encourage people to learn and use in this conversation?

That's a tough one. I think another one would be to look at what the mainstream has told about the main camps, what kind of murder methods were used in those camps. During the war and right after the war, for all these camps, the claims were very diverse.

For instance, you look at Treblinka, Sobibor, and Belzec. There were vacuum chambers, there were chlorine as gas used, there were unslaked lime used in trains to kill people, there were electrocution chambers, there were engine exhaust chambers. There's all kinds of things that we're told, and we look then at what of it was trimmed away and what was left standing. We see with all these camps, the narrations were so contradictory that you can say basically anything was acceptable during the war and after the war, and anything was claimed. And they had to agree on something at the end, and the historians, the mainstream historians, agreed on it by just sweeping it under the carpet, all the evidence. Oh, that was just rumor, and there was just, they got it wrong. But how do we know they didn't get the stuff wrong that they claim today? There is just no difference, qualitatively speaking.

So it's a general, and you can do that with all camps, but you can basically summarize it, and I have a table published somewhere. I don't know whether it's in the encyclopedia. I was looking at it, and I couldn't find it, and I said, if it's not in there, I should put it in there.

Another one is, I would not go into demographics, because demographics in a war where massive population changes have happened, where mass expulsions of the Germans and people that were supportive of them happened, where Jews have been deported hither and yon, and were then mass migrating in an uncontrolled fashion all over the world, of course Israel and the United States being the main targets. There is no way, all this was completely uncontrolled, to document it properly. So anyone's telling me they have exact figures of where they went and where they ended up, it's just not truthful.

So that's a very risky territory to tread on. You really need to know, and it's a long study to wrap your head around these data that are available. What I would say, one very important case is, I would say, apart from Majdanek, is the Sobibor camp, and that is probably not on everybody's radar, but the Sobibor camp has a special history.

After the war, the investigative judge of the Sobibor camp happens to be the same as the one that did the Majdanek story, Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz. He wrote a summary of what is said to have happened in Sobibor right after he wrote his assessment of what happened in Belzec, and basically he copied it over from Belzec. However, if you look at the interrogation records that he created when he was interrogating all the witnesses from the Sobibor camp, and there were quite a few, they had a mass escape in the summer, late summer of 1943 or summer 1943, and so where hundreds of people managed to get away, hundreds of inmates, and a lot of them testified, and they told a consistent story of, the majority of them, of chlorine having been used in a chamber that had collapsible floors. So after the gassing, the floors dropped open to the ground, so the whole floor was a big trap door that opened to the bottom.

There was a big cavity underneath, and the victims fell into carts, and the carts then were ferried away to cremation furnaces. It's a complete imaginative, invented story, has nothing to do with engineering, I would say, options if you were to create something. That makes such a massively complicated system where you have a two-story thing with massive floors collapsing, and this is a hydraulic challenge, that is no small feat, nobody would do that. He ignored all the eyewitness accounts, threw them all out, and replaced them with a story he had told for Belzec.

That's how consistency and coherence of that story was created, by a Polish judge throwing out all the evidence because it was inconvenient nonsense, obvious nonsense, and replacing it with something that has been told for a different camp. This is easy to show, and it's also in the Encyclopedia, and there you can see how it was engineered by one Polish judge. That's what I mentioned earlier, there's a big Polish portion in it.

You can show similar, a little bit more complex, but similar stories for the Belzec and the Treblinka camp too. But the Sobibor is really the most apparent, striking example of the Polish judiciary completely rigging the case, and then it was cast in stone, and everything from there on later on was just repeating the story that had been created. This is probably what I would focus on.

Another thing is, if we are talking about Auschwitz, Auschwitz is a big one, where we have most documentation, most witnesses, and that's where the things come in, the things most people don't realize. Some 240,000 Auschwitz inmates during the last year of 1944 and the first month in 1945 were evacuated or transferred from Auschwitz to Western camps. 240,000 eyewitnesses, the Germans didn't kill them, they sent them west to other camps when the Soviets were approaching to keep them alive and working for them in forced labor situations.

And what is the probability that among 240,000 survivors, potential witnesses, you find grandiloquent liars that just make up stuff? One percent? That would give you 2,400 witnesses who would tell stories, and the other 230,000 or so don't tell any stories? Statistically, that's maybe something you can work with, and that's how you can explain why we have hundreds of Auschwitz witnesses tell us certain stories, but we have hundreds of thousands who don't or didn't. And then you look at the documents. Auschwitz is the best documented case because almost all the documents survived. The Germans didn't destroy it.

Thousands and thousands of pages of medical treatment of sick prisoners, blood samples taken from thousands and thousands of typhus afflicted patients in Auschwitz who were hospitalized and cared and cured and had repeatedly blood samples taken and tested for remnants of the pathogen. We have records of x-rays taken and surgeries done in all kinds of treatment for thousands upon thousands of cases.

Sometimes you have tuberculosis patients who were terminally ill, they couldn't be rescued anymore. They cured, they cared for them until the last day for months and months on end. At the same time, we are told as soon as you get sick, you end up in the gas chamber. We have the records. It did not happen. We have records of hospitals they were planning and building, accommodating tens of thousands of inmates, spending millions of today's dollars, tens of millions of dollars, building a massive hospital complex in Birkenau.

We have records of the most advanced delousing facility being built, a microwave delousing device. If you go to Wikipedia and you look up microwave, they will tell you that in the 1950s, microwave ovens were invented in the United States. And we have the records that the Germans were using them at the Auschwitz camp to delouse inmate clothes in order to save inmates' lives.

These devices were originally planned to be used at the front, the Eastern Front, where typhus was endemic in those years in Russia and in general in Eastern Europe, to disinfest soldiers, German soldiers' clothes to protect them from typhus. There was a change of policy in 1943. They had a massive typhus problem at the Auschwitz camp, which was a labor pool for the local chemical industry, very important for the German armament factory for producing methanol, and ultimately they wanted to produce rubber there, artificial rubber, never came to that. But anyway, it was very important for them to have this labor pool productive. They had a massive typhus epidemic, well documented, and that's where the origin of that story comes from, of mass extermination. It was a mass dying of people. In some months, up to 5,000 and more people were dying every month. They wanted to put a stop to it. With Zyklon B, it wasn't working. They couldn't get enough of Zyklon B to do that, and Zyklon B was not efficient enough to kill the lice. So they found out this new method of killing bugs with microwave. Instead of sending it to the front to save their soldiers' lives, they sent it to Auschwitz to save their Auschwitz inmates' lives. That's how important it was. It was more important to save Auschwitz inmates than to save German soldiers. How do you square that with gas chambers where people are killed? And so it goes on.

It's all documented nice in there. It doesn't fly. If you look at the documents, they tell you the exact opposite story of what the mainstream tell you happened.

There's no way of overcoming this contradiction, but if you look at the eyewitness accounts, I said 272 of the most important and often quoted eyewitnesses are in there, summarized the testimony and nicely analyzed, and you see a pattern of the same lies repeated over and over again. You see how this was seeded, how this was orchestrated to a large degree in Poland, but also in Allied trials after the war.

And by the lies they're telling of technical impossibilities and all kinds of things, you can tell that can't be true.

Last question. Fish swim, birds fly, Jews lie. I just thought about it. My question is this. Can you identify the year that the Holocaust was created?

You mean the mainstream narrative? It has been a step-by-step process. I would say the very first attempts by the Poles to depict the Germans as mass murderers, maniacs in 1941, and at that point they were telling the story that the Germans were testing new war gases on Russian POWs and Polish sick inmates. Jews were nowhere in the picture. So, what this was tapping in is the toxic gas, the war gas hysteria that the world was still remembering from the First World War. As we all know, chemical gases of all kinds were massively used at the Western front during the First World War. And there was a hysteria, a general anxiety that this might happen again during the Second World War. And to use that as a propaganda theme, to use that hysteria, this anxiety, this feeling of hatred that you can stir up against the person using that. This story was invented, but it didn't really fly.

And the Poles, after a while, realized if they put Jews in there, then they get the attention of the world. The world started the Second World War over Poland, but at the end of it, nobody cared about Poland. The Russians and the Germans were both cutting up Poland. Nobody was declaring war on Russia. And at the end of the war, the Poles ended up in the occupied Soviet area of Poland. There was no liberation of the Poles. Nobody cared. Nobody cared in those early years about Poles being victims or Russian POWs.

When was the year that pretty much the Holocaust developed? In other words, it does have a history in that, but was the year that, you know, like in the 1960s, Holocaust wasn't in encyclopedia.

Oh, you mean that the story itself took off as a societal issue?

Conventionally accepted.

Yeah. Well, the first start was, of course, the International Military Tribunal. It wasn't named that way, but the extermination of the Jews was pretty much a topic, but it died down with those being over. The Cold War, the Germans needed to be recruited, so the propaganda kind of leveled off. And then it took a big increase again, 1961, with the Eichmann trial in Israel. A massive show trial that was aired live on TV in Israel, where the entire Israel population was exposed to these stories and were traumatized and re-traumatized. And the whole thing became a topic. Up to then, it wasn't even all that big of a topic in Israel, but from that point onward, it was.

And if you do a Google search on time-relevant number of mentioning with the publications by year, how often the Holocaust is mentioned, or the six million victims, for instance, you see this massive spike in 1961, and it has never receded, really. It's been going up since. There's another spike in 1978 with the mini-series *Holocaust*, where the name became popular, became a household name. Also, Zyklon B ever since has been this word that everybody connects with Auschwitz and mass murder. That was in 1978. And from there on, we have a nice bar chart in there. The number of movies created over the years has gone up, up, up. So the Holocaust propaganda in mainstream media has increased until, I would say, 2010. It has since flattened off a little. Not receded, necessarily, but similar with book appearances. I think we have a number in there. If I'm not mistaken, on average, last time I checked, every day, four books about the Holocaust are being published. Every day. Wow. There's no topic in the world where a propaganda campaign that massive, that they're covering the entire globe, being completely one-sided, carried through all media, kinds of media, books, films, getting then into having Holocaust memorial museums everywhere.

There are many more museums of that type, in terms of numbers, number of visitors, and so forth, about the Holocaust, which was not an American event, than any other event of American or world history. So the Holocaust in this country, historically, is more important if you go by publications, by museums, by memorial sites, and so forth, than anything else. And that is pretty much the same more and more in any other country, too.

We could understand it if that were the case in Israel and Germany, but not necessarily for the rest, but everyone's catching up. And I've spoken about the indoctrination, that everyone gets brainwashed with this one-sided story, traumatized, and becomes paranoid, has this Pavlovian reflex, when somebody comes up and challenges some narrative, like we do. There is no rational thinking. This is just deeply ingrained and trained Pavlovian reflex. And it is religious in nature. It is so important for people to have the comfort of this being true, because if not, what else is untrue? Who can you still

trust? Good and evil gets flipped. Black and white turns into white and black. Nothing makes sense anymore. So many things depend on it.

For me, I had massive moral problems when I first challenged it, because I grew up with the idea, people who challenge that must be Nazis, right-wing extremists, anti-Semites and all the stuff you do not want to be associated with. But I had my doubts. First thing on my list: I wanted to have the right to have my doubts, because they were just there, by accidentally reading a text that put doubts in my head. And then I felt guilty because I had been raised in a society to feel guilty just for having doubts. And that upset me. But we are trained from children on to take that narrative at face value and to stigmatize anyone who doesn't toe the party line. And that's what we're facing and have to face. There is a lot of psychological issues that people struggle with. All of us. I mean, we all had our moment of conversion. We were all raised with that to one degree or another, most of us. There are probably very few who had parents who were keeping them off that. Most of us believed it up to some point, and then had some event that flipped us. And it is good to remember how we felt. The moral struggle we went through ourselves, to realize that all the people who aren't there yet, we need to lend them a helping hand. We can't call them ignoramuses, morons or whatever, just because they're not on the same page. We need to understand that they have been captivated by this massive propaganda campaign that is unavoidable, and we need to help. It is a mission of helping these people to understand what has happened to them.

Thank you, thank you so much. You helped us all today. Thank you.