

History at Gunpoint

By Germar Rudolf

Presentation given on May 23, 2026 during a gathering of the “National Organization for Vital Action” (NOVA, www.novanow.org) in Lebanon, TN.

Thank you. I need to get my instruments ready here. Now they fall apart. There was a cap to it, and somehow that fell off. I apologize for this. All right.

I have something positive to say about this country to just attach right to the speech you just heard, and that's the fact that we can do what we do right now in this country, because in many countries where our ancestors came from, we would not be able to do this. So, there's freedom of speech and freedom of assembly in this country, so, there's something good to say.

Also, what I wanted to mention is when it comes to the war against Iran, the Iranians are an Indo-European people. Their language is closer to English and German than it is to Arabic, and when we should talk about the victims that this war causes, we should talk about the thousands and thousands of Indo-Europeans of Iranian ancestry that are being murdered.

Now, my topic today, as you would probably guess, is on the Holocaust, because that's what I'm known for and that's what I'm good at.

Before I do it, I give a little bit of an introduction of who I am. I would assume most of you know, but probably not all. I am a German citizen. I grew up, born in the mid-1960s, grew up in West Germany; had a normal lower-middle-class upbringing; went to a normal public school, eventually studied chemistry, graduated, and in the process of graduating, I stumbled over that topic. A research that had been done here in the United States by an expert in execution technologies who was looking into the gas chamber question and had some chemical arguments which caught my attention, and as a chemist, I couldn't look away, and down the rabbit hole I went and never came back.

Now, the persecution that has resulted from my activity, because Germany is not a country where free speech and freedom of science, freedom of assembly [exists], has led me ultimately to this country, and there's another good thing.

The government has tried hard to keep me out. They actually arrested me. I was married to a U.S. citizen. I had a granted immigrant visa. They arrested and deported me anyhow, with the reason given, no criminal case. So, in violation of that, I ended up in Germany, and in Germany I was put on trial for the research that I had published over the past five years while in exile, and they sentenced me to 44 months in total, and I had to spend that time.

Now, I'm not a singular case, and I'm not the worst case of what's going on in Europe. Anyway, I fought my way back. I won in court. What they'd done to me was wrong. It was remedied, as much as you can remedy losing five years of your life in prison. I was reunited with my family, and I got the status of a permanent legal resident now in this country.

So, 35 years of research on that topic have, a number of years ago, raised the question to me, how do I get the message out to the masses? The first 30 years, I would say, I was looking for answers myself. I wasn't sure whether I understood everything and whether I really got this story straight. And then, at the end of the 30-year mark, I was pretty sure, and then the idea came up of how do I get the message out.

Now, one way is, of course, writing something that makes the information accessible. A lot of you actually bought it today from me, so I wrote an encyclopedia, because that's what scholars do all the time. Actually, no, they don't. But I was in the unique situation that I had this knowledge, 35 years of sitting at the helm, at the core of this skeptical, scrutinizing research, and I decided it needs to be done. And in lack of support from others, and due to a cataclysmic development in my private life, I had the time to do it, and I pulled it off.

So, we have the knowledge published. We have it concisely presented and made accessible. There is still a step of how do I get people to listen? Because we're talking about a taboo topic, and people don't want to hear it.

Most of you probably are open-minded. Some of you are, or most, many, I don't know, are convinced already that the mainstream narrative is phony, but we want to reach those who sit on the fence, or even on the other side of it. How do we do that?

And I want to give you a little bit of an instruction, by example, of the best approach. And the best approach, you already have seen, some of you coming by our book stand there, seen those signs here, and marveling over these graphics and the information that's on there.

The best approach for the normies into this topic is not talking about lies that they've made up, like Jewish soap, they all have admitted it didn't happen, or lampshades, or what, no.

What you want to talk to them about is massive violation of civil rights, is free speech, is freedom of assembly that doesn't exist over there, and make them see, in concrete examples, what that means. When we're talking about this topic here, people need to realize, every person needs to realize that every historian on this planet, to one degree or another, if he wants to write Holocaust historiography, or talk about it, or write about it, he is doing history at gunpoint.

That's the only topic in the world right now, more or less on a global scale, where historians are threatened with at least destruction of their career, if not outright prosecution and imprisonment. Scholars, not just historians, scholars, you know, you can do physics, you can do psychology, you can do any science, and you will not get in trouble if you say something that's controversial. It's only this one, this particular part in history, that gets people in trouble.

Even in this country, we have free speech, but any historian who touches that, it's a third rail topic, he will find his career ended.

This is the map of Europe. You see in red the countries that have outlawed Holocaust skepticism, that have outlawed doubt.

Doubt is the core feature of us human beings that sets us apart from animals who cannot doubt their sensual input. We can doubt what we see, we can systematically look for the truth and communicate with our fellow humans what the truth is, or what we think the truth is, and can even make it independent of ourselves by putting it down encoded so that everyone can see it. That is what sets us apart.

And a government that outlaws doubt, outlaws search for truth, outlaws communicating the truth with others, is outlawing humanity. These countries have outlawed humanity. Stalinist Russia, as bad as it was, had no laws that would prescribe the result of any scholarly research in any field by penal law.

This is the first in mankind history that we have that. The European Union forces members who have not yet passed laws in the European Union to do it, or they are threatened with sanctions. Finland just passed earlier this year, the last one, because they said we're threatened by the EU, by some kind of sanctions or measures, and that's why we introduced that law. Now, what does that mean? I've told you about my 44 months for the research; you can see that there are two books, *Chemistry for Auschwitz*, if you want to look at it, it's my original forensic research, and *Lectures on the Holocaust*. Having done what I'm doing right now here to academic audiences in Germany talking about my research in the calm and academic style led to being sentenced. There were worse cases.

I'm going to focus here on Austria. Some of you have looked through the list of all the countries, and some are not on this map actually. Of course, Canada has introduced a law north of us, and Australia uses a backdoor way of doing it, and Israel, of course, is the first country that has outlawed skepticism, and there are other countries who use other laws they twist and tweak in order to send people to prison. And in the Arabic world, unfortunately, where you should think there should be an open mind there. A lot of governments in the Arabic world are bought by Europe and America, and they prosecute dissidents on that topic with extra-legal

means. They are not democracies under the rule of law. Whatever that means, because in some aspects, we are not anymore either, but for them, it's pure arbitrariness.

So, this is a global thing, a global problem. We just had a censorship hit us, a company in China. We wanted to have merchandise produced with certain slogans on it on Holocaust skepticism, and they pulled the plug. Not even in China, they want to do it anymore.

Austria, the worst case, 20 years. You can go up to 20 years in prison. If you combine it, the skepticism, quote-unquote denial, with statements that they interpret as re-engaging in national socialist activities.

If you were, for instance, to argue that the Austrians are just one tribe of the Germans and they should live together with other Germans in Germany, which was a normal thought up to 1945. In the 17th century, 18th century, 19th century, and the 20th century, the people of Austria always felt, and they were for the longest time, the core and the center of Germany. And they got kind of pushed out with Prussia taking over in the late 19th century. And then after the collapse of Prussian Germany and Austria, the Austrian Empire after the First World War, they said, okay, we had it now. Let's get reunified. That was the idea of the Wilson 14 points for the truce, to have everyone self-determination, and the Austrians got it denied. And after the Second World War, they had special laws enacted: If you violate them, up to 20 years, denial combined with demands for self-determination.

To put a face to it, Austrian engineer Wolfgang Fröhlich was arrested in the early 2000s for a paper he had written. He's an expert for disinfection technology and disinfection gas chambers. So, he knows the technique and compared it to what was said to have been going on in German extermination camps during the war, and said, that's technical nonsense. It can't be. And he got eventually indicted and put in prison. And he was upset about what they did to him, and he kept writing letters and arguments from within prison; got more and more indictments and got sentenced over and over again. At the end of the day, he spent 16 years in prison for his engineering arguments. And he came out just around COVID, caught COVID and died shortly afterwards.

Western politicians complain about Iran or China putting dissidents for four, five, seven years in prison. At the same time, they put them for 16 years in prison. That's the worst case.

This graph here shows you the initiation of criminal investigation for thought crimes in Germany. Since 1994, some 4,000, 5,000 up to the most recent data for the year 2025 comes out maybe next month. I get a little bit of feedback here.

The blue one is right-wing thought crimes. That's what we are committing here right now. Then you have the left-wing ones. These are usually Antifa communists who make some radical statements about blowing up parliament or having a communist revolution. And then you have the green ones, foreign, religious. That usually means Muslim radicals who want to introduce Sharia law or something like that. For these two cases, you really have to make aggressive statements that are not peaceful anymore, whereas in these cases, if you're just against mass immigration, you say anything critical about the Jews, any dissent on the Holocaust, or more recently, anything critical about Israel's policy in Gaza.

This here is the Gaza escalation that you see. Germany has extended their law, they outlaw more and more, both by case law and by the actual written code. And now with this past data, we were up to 40,000, 35,000 of them, stuff that the like of people, like we do, like what we argue and talk about.

35,000 initiated criminal investigations do not result in 35,000 people sitting in prison. I want to make that clear. Most people never get caught for the slogan they have sprayed on some wall or a sticker they left somewhere. And if, for first time offenders, usually it ends up with a slab on the wrist, it may just be a summary offense with a fine that has to be paid. And for first time offenders, it rarely ends with prison. But then you have the 1 or 2% of these cases that end up actually with prison cases.

Only a minority of that is Holocaust skepticism. And I have no numbers. They don't, in their paperwork. This is a data based, actually, on what the German government releases, and they are proud of it because they call themselves a combative defense democracy. Okay? So they defend themselves in combating anyone they consider to be an enemy. That they are actually the biggest enemy of democracy – now I wouldn't even call it democracy, but a state under the rule of law that respects human rights. They never get a mirror held against them to look into it, because that's the enemy that causes this kind of persecution.

Back to history. This kind of an atmosphere that you have in Europe, in most countries, and even in this country, where historians don't go to prison, but immigrants like me, I'm currently constantly on an ejector seat, and I can get thrown out any minute if the Trump government so decides, because they don't respect the law either.

What effect does it have, actually, concretely, on historians?

Here you see the lovely face of Wacław Długoborski, Auschwitz survivor, who was put in charge, as I say, the billy goat that was put in charge of the garden. He was put in charge of the Auschwitz Museum's historical research center. And for many decades, he has been the boss, and under his auspices, the lie that 4 million people died at Auschwitz was maintained until the Soviet Union collapsed. Then it did collapse, and they suddenly reduced the number from 4 million to 1 million, and said, well, we have known it all along.

And then in an interview in 1998, this historian was asked, well, why did you lie? Why did you make that up? If you knew all along that it was wrong, why didn't you correct the number earlier, when you knew that it was wrong? And he basically said, well, there was a prohibition in place in the Eastern Bloc, in the communist countries, that historians who would not toe the party line could be facing, how he expressed it, disciplinary measures. What does that mean? You lose your job. You're getting demoted. You have to become a street sweeper or a janitor. That's what that means in these communist planned economies.

Ironically, 1998, that's when he gave the interview, that was the same year Poland, pressured by the European Union, in particular Germany, introduced a law, 1998, that made Holocaust skepticism a crime punishable with up to three years in prison.

So, from communist "disciplinary measures" to democratic "three years in prison," what's worse? I take disciplinary measures any time over a prison term. So, he said that now we can tell the truth. Back then we couldn't, because we had disciplinary measures. We have corrected. Now it's one million, because you need to believe us, because now we are only threatened with three years!

Any mainstream person who thinks everything is kosher with the Holocaust narrative that we are fed now must realize, yeah, kosher it may be, if it means the Jews like it. But it most certainly doesn't mean authentic and reliable, because historians who are threatened at gunpoint to write history cannot be trusted. He admits: "we couldn't be trusted. We have been lying. We knew we were lying. Intentionally, but we did so because we were threatened with getting demoted or losing our job." And now we should believe you when you are threatened with three years? With five years? With six years? With 20 years?

How much more do you need to teach people, to tell people to realize: you can't trust these people! History at gunpoint does not give you the truth, in no section of society.

So, once you have opened up people's mind and that they realize the dimension of persecution, of suppression, of oppression and the unique nature, the Holocaust is unique in terms of the length governments go to and societies go to, to suppress dissent, to keep complete control over the narrative. Nowhere else in society will you find it. That shows you: who is the main beneficiary usually is also the one who pushes most, and it shows you that this is for them the most important topic to keep total control over.

Once you have opened people's mind, something is fishy here. You can't trust those historians because they have admitted to have lied when they were threatened even less than they are threatened today. Then we go to the pith, the center of the story.

Now, I handed out to you guys, free of charge, a little brochure, and I want to go through a few things here that you find actually in the brochure. If this thing is too far away from you, I apologize, but you'll find some of this in this brochure. And the first one I'm going to is actually on the last page, the back cover if you wish, even though that thing, technically speaking, has no back cover.

You see a graph there, a bar chart that shows claims of death tolls for the Majdanek camp. Now, I would assume that most of you, at least most of the normal populace, have not heard about the Majdanek camp. It's not any more major player in the bigger picture of the Holocaust in terms of mass extermination. It used to be completely different.

The Majdanek camp actually was officially called the Lublin camp in central Poland, was overrun by the Red Army in July of 1944. So, it was the first major camp that the Soviets overran. And in a press conference right after the conquest of the camp – and I say conquest. The Red Army never liberated anyone, so you will not hear the word liberation when it even comes to camps, when it comes to the Red Army. So, they conquered the camp, and the press conference they claimed two million people were murdered there.

That was the first big, still during the war, propaganda campaign on extermination claims that started in August 1944. Big show. With all the world media invited, journalists from everywhere, and cameras rolling.

Now, in subsequent events, the Poles later that year, still during the war by the way, December 1944, had a show trial. They claimed 1.7 million. That's a little bit of a reduction, but we want to be generous. It's kind of the same order of magnitude. The Soviets then, during the International Military Tribunal, introduced an expert report that claimed 1.5 million. Still, again, 500,000 difference is not immaterial, but in the bigger picture, looking at it scientifically, it's kind of the same order of magnitude. We don't want to be nitpicking here.

However, the frenzy of immediate end of the war or post-war propaganda comes to an end, and things cool down a little bit, and a Polish investigative judge reduces the number down to 360,000. This is a considerable drop, down to 80%.

Now, as I just showed you, there is a rule in communist countries, you have to toe the party line, and the new party line was 360,000. They couldn't really go underneath that, even though they knew, again, they knew in that case, too, it is wrong. I think the order of number of prisoners sent to the camp was around that order of magnitude, and that assumes that every single one of them was murdered, and there's plenty of documentation showing that was absolutely not the case.

The Soviet Union collapses, and the number gets reduced again by a new historian in charge of the museum, 235,000. Not all that extreme a drop, if you compare it with Auschwitz, compared to these two, but here we have already almost down only 10%.

But that wasn't the end of it. We, Holocaust skeptics, went into the archives after the Soviet Union collapsed, in 1994, 95, 96, and researched the whole material, published an investigation on it, and it was so devastatingly demasking the propaganda of the homicidal-gas-chamber story that pressure on the Majdanek Museum became so big that eventually in 2005, a new generation, a new historian dropped the death toll to 76,000. And that is only, not even 4% of the initial 2 million claim.

And actually from the beginning, they had claimed seven homicidal gas chambers. They maintained that number until the end, but five of them were so ridiculously obviously technically impossible to have ever been used for what they claimed to have been used that, to throw propaganda blasts overboard, Tomasz Kranz, the new Polish historian, threw five of them overboard.

So, what we have is here admission that, okay, we exaggerated, we lied, we lied, we fixed, we fixed, we keep fixing, we drop more and more of these lies, and then that's what the situation is here today.

They keep shifting the goalposts, they keep reducing the claim. You see something is fishy with their attitude in general.

But now they got it right!

Really? When you're threatened with three years in prison, why would I believe you?

Now, we could say, okay, one camp, what does one camp prove? That's the most extreme downward revision by the mainstream. I haven't shown our own number that would, here in 98 we published the book, we find in the historical record 42,200 death cases and no homicidal gas chambers at all. They were all fumigation chambers.

So, I'm just showing you what the mainstream itself has admitted to have been wrong over and over again. Is it a singular case? People make mistakes.

Corrections for other camps. If you go in the brochure, if you want to go on page six, you see the table there, and I have the same table here. The major camps that played a role in Allied war as well as immediate post-war propaganda as claimed extermination camps. You see the initial death toll here on the left numbers column, and the death toll that is claimed by the mainstream. Again, I'm saying the mainstream. Holocaust skeptical numbers, what really can be documented and what is forensically possible, is an entirely different story.

So, I want to show you that if you just use their own arguments and their shifty way of moving goalposts, you should make every believer see something isn't right.

And you see it here. Mistakes stray statistically from the true value. If I make a mistake, I may under- or overestimate, but they should stray to both sides.

Here you see only one tendency, extreme exaggeration. That's not called a mistake, that's called a lie.

Truth is always the first victim of every war, and why should it be any different with the Second World War? The victors write the history, and they never write it objectively, and why should it be any different for the worst war ever fought that ended for the losing side in a major disaster that mankind has not seen all that often in history. Carthage in the Punic Wars probably had a worse fate than Germany because they were completely wiped, but other than that, Germany was in pretty bad shape after the Second World War.

So, you see here, these are lies. They have been lying systematically. They have been correcting and admitting, in Auschwitz I showed you, here in Majdanek again and again. They lied, they knew they were lying and now they are threatened even worse than they were before.

The question... So, for Majdanek, 96% of the victims were invented, 70% of the homicidal gas chambers were invented. They got it wrong repeatedly, acting under coercion, still under coercion, even worse so today: why believe them uncritically now? You wouldn't.

And it doesn't stop with numbers. If you go on the second table of the page six here, we're talking about invented murder methods. What the mainstream, again, what the mainstream has admitted. We're looking in the second column here of all the stuff that is actually has been invented, and I actually added a few more here on this on here.

You see for Auschwitz, war gases, high voltage, meaning electrocution, gas showers, gas bombs, pneumatic hammer, conveyor belt. Treblinka, you have machine guns, mobile gas chambers, stunning gas, unslaked lime, hot steam, high voltage, chlorine, ether, a death bridge, burning alive. So it goes on and on for the other camps.

Suffocation with human excrements as a mass-murder method is claimed for Belzec by one witness. It gets absurd at times, but of course all this stuff, sometimes based on only one witness, sometimes based on tens of witnesses, on all kinds of wartime reports, got dumped.

Interestingly, the stories that prevailed during the war, hot steam for Treblinka, high voltage for Belzec, chlorine gas for Sobibor, all got dumped. You won't find a word of it today

anymore, even though they were the ones that were most commonly claimed during the war, and even during the International Military Tribunal, by the way.

It's all gone.

What we have left now is this: Zyklon B and engine exhaust gases. For a long time, they even claimed there were diesel exhaust gases, which are technically impossible, because they're not toxic enough. Just recently, well not too recently, 15 years ago, a mainstream toxicologist tried to move the goalpost there again. "Okay, diesel doesn't work, why don't we say it was engine exhaust?"

So, murder methods claimed during and right after the war were highly contradictory. Even once-claimed main murder methods were all abandoned. Polish Stalinist officials streamlined the narrative against facts, and mainstream historians hide these extreme revisions and manipulations from you, because they're writing history on gunpoint.

How was it done? To give you one example, and unfortunately I don't think I have that in this brochure. You would actually have to go, because that goes a little bit more into detail for which this brochure doesn't have room. I have that detailed example in this book here, *Nazi Gas Chambers*, which you can either buy there as a hard copy or you can find it on holocausthandbooks.com free of charge as an e-book.

The one case that shows everyone, and should show every normie, that the story was faked, is the case of Sobibor. Now again, Auschwitz everyone knows, Treblinka some of you may have heard, Belzec maybe, Majdanek unlikely, Sobibor also not very often. Sobibor is one of the three so-called pure extermination camps, actually four. Chełmno is a special camp, it's a separate issue.

Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibor are the three big ones where Jews were shipped to be murdered and nothing else, that's the claim of the mainstream. Sobibor is the smallest of them. Treblinka, we have that here, started out with three million, Belzec with three million claim, and Sobibor with two million. It's down to 200,000 now, plus minus, there's always... this is kind of an average of the mainstream claims, because they can't really agree exactly on how much, but the other ones are way higher.

Sobibor is an interesting case. The same judge who, after the war, downgraded massively the death toll for Majdanek to 360,000, also investigated the Sobibor camp and the Treblinka camp, and wrote the story for it, for the Polish Commission for German War Crimes. He interrogated a number of witnesses, they are listed here by name. Right after the war.

The inmates that were alive in the summer of 1943 had a revolt in the Sobibor camp. There's actually a movie about that, not very historically accurate, but the revolt did take place, and many witnesses, survivors or inmates ran away, and they ended up testifying in front of that investigative judge, Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz. Now, the interesting thing is of what they told him. Right now, for Sobibor, they claim engine exhaust gas as murder method, and they are supposed to have been murdered in just a normal chamber, one door, they walk in, they get killed with gas, the other door on the other end opens out, and they get carried out to mass graves or pyres to be burned. That's the mainstream narrative right now.

However, if you look at what these witnesses testified, if they described the alleged murder method at all, many of them said chlorine. Nobody said engine exhaust gas. Not a single witness. What they claimed of the mechanics of the gas chamber is very interesting, because they kind of agreed, with a few exceptions of witnesses who didn't say anything about that, that the floors in those chambers were hydraulically opened up, they collapsed downward, discharged the dead victims into carts running on tracks below, in some kind of basement area, and would then be driven out to mass graves or to cremation pyres.

And they agreed on that. You will not hear a single thing about that in the mainstream narrative. What Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz did when he wrote, based on his interrogations, that's the only evidence he had. He said, well, they were killed with engine exhaust and with just a

normal gas chamber with doors. Invented, out of the blue, with no basis in fact of any of the evidence he had. He threw out all the witnesses.

Now, where did he get that narrative from? He actually copied it over. I just mentioned he had also investigated the Treblinka camp. He had copied it over from the narrative he had developed for the Treblinka camp. And if you were to go there, I don't want to go do that now, again, you can find the list of witnesses and what they said on Treblinka in here. You find in Treblinka this chaos here: electrocution, engine exhaust gas, vacuum, steam, all kinds of claims. He cleaned that up, threw everything out, kept the engine exhaust, and wrote the narrative according to that, and then he copied it over to Sobibor.

That is invented history with no basis in fact, none whatsoever in the case of Sobibor. The clearest case where you can absolutely pinpoint what happened.

So, that is what you find if you go into the historical record, which became accessible to us only after the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the archives in the East became accessible, and we could actually go to these interrogation protocols and then see what narrative they made of it.

There is an interesting question that arises: Why was that done? I mean, it's an obvious question. You want to make your enemy look as bad as possible, so whatever comes after the war you can manipulate and destroy them as much as possible. Psychological warfare is just a continuation of warfare with other means.

And, ethnically speaking, the whole Second World War broke out because the actual tinderbox that blew it up, and there were many more conflicts around the globe, was the ethnic conflicts between Poles and Germans, mainly over the city of Danzig. And after the war, as you may know, Poland gained huge territories from Germany and expelled the population. My paternal ancestry was expelled from Silesia, so they were part of the victims of that.

And Germany was not willing, after the First World War, to accept the loss of Danzig, which was a 95% German city. How would you make them expect to accept the loss of a quarter of its entire territory and the expulsion of 7 million civilians from their homeland where they had lived for centuries, and were not just a majority, in large parts there were just only Germans. All gone! How do you expect Germany to this time accept it? If you break the Germans' spine with a guilt complex, you can make them accept anything as justified punishment. And that's what the homicidal gas chambers are good for.

Now, I've looked into all of the people who have done the investigations on those camps and who have written the history. We're actually talking about only four individuals that were doing the investigations. I mentioned Zdzisław Łukaszkiewicz for Treblinka, for Majdanek and for Sobibor. Jan Sehn was the investigative judge for Auschwitz, for Belzec we have a historian. There was no trial on Bełżec. It was Eugeniusz Szrojt, and for Chełmno, which isn't even on here, it's a special case. There it is actually. It was Władysław Bednarz. So we have four Polish individuals all working for the Polish Commission for the investigation of war crimes, a Stalinist organization set up by Stalin to stick it to the Germans, and to use all kinds of fishy methods, as I just said, and with the aim of destroying Germany psychologically and make them accept all that was coming their way. And it worked beautifully, quote-unquote.

This is, if you present these things that way, I have found you can get people to understand, first of all, that it's not some lunatic idea, but that there's something profoundly wrong in a society that prescribes the writing of any scholarly field under the threat of punishment, and what that must lead to, to untruthfulness of scholars. And then showing them, yeah, they have admitted over and over again to have lied, to have shifted the goalposts, to hide facts from us, to completely change their story. And then, psychologically, very important, it's not the Jews who did it in a great conspiracy theory. That's what I'm getting at here.

I'm not saying I want to win the Jews over seeing how they were duped, they were. But, you know, all those witnesses, at the end of it, most of them were Jews. They had an axe to

grind. I can't blame them. They were treated horribly. And in the frenzy of post-war propaganda, they were making stuff up. And this is completely made-up stuff here. And they even coordinated, these witnesses coordinated, as they couldn't have come up all with the same story. But the investigative judge couldn't do anything with it. In other cases, they were so contradictory, they weren't coordinating anything, these witnesses, they were just inventing whatever came [to mind]. And in the complete frenzy of post-war anti-German hysteria, you can understand where they're coming from.

It would have been the judge's job to say, this is all nonsense, we can't make head or tail out of it, and therefore we need to say that. They didn't do that. These judges were put in by the new Stalinist government. It was a Stalinist agenda. I couldn't find any Jewish backgrounds in any of those four individuals. I don't know the chain of command. They did what they did on orders. Nothing of that kind of propagandistic political nature was left to chance, so you can bet that there were orders coming from Warsaw and from Moscow. What type they were, this is the kind of investigation we have yet to do.

Whether in that chain of command Jews were sitting, I don't know, but they are not needed. You can see here the Stalinist will to completely destroy psychological Germany and to pit Poland against Germany. That is an important point.

Hitler had tried until 1939, until the very last moment, to win the Poles over for an anti-communist pact against Stalinist Russia. And Stalinist Russia tried to conquer all of Europe. That was the declared concept of world revolution from 1918 onward. It wasn't a secret. And Hitler tried to make a bulwark, a European fortress against Stalin's plan to conquer all of Europe. Poland refused and went their way of poking the German eagle to the point where they lashed out, and the rest is history.

Pitting Poland against Germany. Any other normal nation... If you imagine Mexico in a world war that breaks out between Russia, China, and the United States. The United States loses, and then Mexico gets everything that they used to own and more. You name the states of Texas, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, California, give everything to the Mexicans and drive out every white Americans. Would America put up with it if they gained strength again?

How do you get the Germans to accept that kind of calamity? It worked. What did not work, and I want to make that sure, even though my parents were expelled, my parental ancestors were expelled from that region – that today Germany and Poland are not pitted against each other anymore.

I've gone with my father to our Poles who had expelled him and his family. In the 1980s and 90s, German expellees went back to Poland to party with our Poles in the house that used to belong to my grandfather. There's no frontier, no border between Germany and Poland anymore. If I wanted, the German government not sticking me in prison for other reasons, I could go back and settle where my parental ancestors came from. That story's over. In Europe, we don't kill each other, we don't kill white people over territory. That should be the case. Unfortunately, the Russians and the Ukrainians have yet to learn that lesson.

That is over. Stalin did not succeed in pitting us against each other. We work together now.

I am saying these things in order to make you understand where this came from, how it was done, who did it, why they did it. Not in order to say, give Germany its territories back. They can't even populate their current territory, neither can the Poles. The real biggest challenge for all of us in Europe is population collapse, which is something I will talk about tonight, by the way, and how this ties in to all these issues that I've been talking about historically.

So, now we are not talking territories here. We're talking about historical understanding. And to make the Jews understand, and the Zionists, we're not coming after you. We're not blaming you for having constructed this narrative in order to whatever. Sure, they took advantage of it, particularly since 1961 when the gravy train was already running with the Eichmann trial. They, big-time and ever since, have been profited from that. But if you look in

the first decades of the State of Israel and of the Jewish community, particularly in this country, they were not riding the Holocaust train. It wasn't even called that way back then.

The partial identity between Soviet spies in the United States and a religious Jewish background was a troublesome truth for the Jewish community. They kept their heads low in the early years of the Cold War and were not rocking the boat.

So, this way you can make even the Jews see we're not out for revenge for what you did to us psychologically. The story came from a different angle.

And I think that is because, you know, people assume we are spreading these Holocaust denial theories, as they call them, in order to get at the Jews, in order to say the Jews have made this big conspiracy in order to get us and destroy us.

Yeah, it's being used now as such. What happens now with them manipulating us with this and saying in order to prevent anything like that happening again, we must allow and support them to preemptively kill everyone that even looks askance at them, which is what's happening in Gaza, and what the conflict with many of these nations in the Middle East with Israel is about. That's a separate story where we are today.

Historically seen as it started differently, and it has taken on its own life. And we need to break that vicious circle we are in using this presumed genocide.

And I say, what happened to the Jews as we define genocide by the United Nations and in law, actually it was a genocide. You don't need gas chambers to commit genocide. If you separate people so that they can't reproduce, it's already called genocide. And that's what the National Socialists did in the camps, separating genders and putting them under living conditions that inevitably had to lead to many of them dying of disease and so forth. So, technically speaking, legally speaking, how it is defined today, it was genocide. Now, that law didn't exist back then, that's a legal fine print.

So this genocide, in its downgraded fashion without homicidal gas chambers, which didn't exist, but the homicidal gas chambers being the foremost psychological weapon to traumatize the Jews, young Jews of a new generation today, and every one of us. We have gone through this education and know how shocking it is to see these bulldozers shoving corpses into mass graves at Bergen-Belsen and being told that's what the Germans did to the Jews. That was *force majeure* of epidemics breaking out in camps that the Germans had no control over, they didn't plan that, but you're not being told that.

And the effect of it is that America, for the most part, is willing to go along, and Europe, to go along with what the Jews and Zionists do in the Middle East. To break that vicious circle, get a correct understanding. We can learn the correct lessons of history only if we get first to the facts straight. And no matter what the facts are, morally speaking, you are never allowed to use past catastrophes of whatever nature to justify or foment current and future catastrophes. And that's what's happening.

In order to prevent a new holocaust, Israel is committing genocide. So in order to prevent genocide, they commit genocide. There's something wrong with this.

And to see how we are manipulated with historical accounts being exaggerated and invented, to see it in this old example, the most extreme example, makes us see: that happens all the time.

What was it? October 7th, 2023, what happened there? Israel has a law outlawing, as I just mentioned, it was the first one outlawing holocaust skepticism, and they have now introduced a law outlawing Gaza skepticism, in terms of just what happened on the 7th of October. And they are probably in the process of making it a crime to accuse Israel of genocide.

All right. I'm having, as I mentioned, a second presentation tonight. We're talking about demographic collapse and where that leaves us, which options we have, and what the various drivers are, which Holocaust propaganda actually is one of them, and I'll explain that tonight. I hope I'll get a chance to talk to you and maybe even discuss that with you guys. If you want

to look into this book, if you don't have it yet, about how this core of the Holocaust, the homicidal gas chamber story was created, as I mentioned there, you can have it, the encyclopedia also. I still have six copies floating around.

Please keep the brochure. It is a short description and summary of Holocaust revisionist arguments with reference of all the books. You can find them all free of charge at holocausthandbooks.com, but you can also buy them from us on these websites, and you'll find links to purchase them.

If you don't want to keep it, leave it on the table, and we'll collect it later, because this is advertisement for our products, for our knowledge, for our insight, and we'd like it to get it spread. So, thank you for your attention.

* * *

If you want to learn more, here are a few suggested websites. At our [Holocaust Encyclopedia](#), you can find concise information on almost 600 related topics, with references to further reading. The results of 35 years of archival and forensic research into the Holocaust can be accessed free of charge at our [Holocaust Handbooks](#) website, where you can also access several documentaries as well as our mini-series *Holocaust Pocketbooks*, which give easy-to-read introductions into various topics.

Printed copies of these and many other books can be purchased on our websites armreg.us and armreg.co.uk. At our [Holocaust Academy](#), we teach the ropes of skeptical Holocaust research. It also features our growing podcast series named HoloCast. At the [Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust](#), we lobby for free speech where it is threatened the most, most prominently with our periodical [Inconvenient History](#).

And last but not least, [Germar Rudolf's personal website](#), where you can learn more about him.