

In arguing for the holocaust my opponent will have several structural advantages. He will be tapping in to your previous exposure to traumatic and violent propaganda about the holocaust, usually experienced during childhood. He will have the upper hand of social proof and institutional support for the myth, which enjoys billions in private and public sector funding every year. He will be telling the same story told in award winning, high budget films by famous Jewish directors, in decades of TV specials and in countless articles in the mainstream press, most of which is owned and controlled by wealthy and powerful Jews. It's true, Jews run the media. He will have the backing of dozens of Jewish activist groups like the ADL and its leader Jonathan Greenblatt, the arbiter of what content is and is not allowed on all major internet platforms, not to mention government offices occupied by Jews like Deborah Lipstadt that are dedicated to promoting the holocaust story and policing public opinion. He will also have the advantage of the social and economic prohibition in the US and the legal prohibition in many European countries on refuting or even questioning the myth. He will have these advantages even if he does not wish them. They nonetheless exist and are in operation.

Nevertheless, I urge all members of the audience to put aside any biases planted into your head by the massive flood of mainstream propaganda you have doubtless experienced throughout your life, and to actually look, possibly for the first time, at what is actually said about this myth.

Most holocaust denier activity is simply informing "normies" of what the allegations actually are. Typically this results in the normie themselves taking on the role of holocaust denier and saying that such stories are impossible and stupid, and that I must clearly be lying to them. For example, several years ago, I made a 9gag post in which I simply showed a picture from Germar Rudolf's book, included among my opponent's document dump, "The Chemistry of Auschwitz" showing a real gas chamber in a US

prison side by side with the purported gas chamber at Auschwitz Camp 1, with a subheading saying how American engineering was clearly superior to German. This resulted in hundreds of comments in which every holocaust believer morphed into a holocaust denier, claiming that the second picture was not in fact a gas chamber and no one would ever be so stupid as to claim it was. I dutifully informed all users from Europe to be cautious of breaking local laws.

When it comes to actually arguing for the so-called holocaust, my opponent's method will be no different than that of any other conspiracy theorist, no matter what particular conspiracy theory they may promote. He will say that documents do not mean what they say, but have some hidden meaning. He will say that absence of evidence is itself a form of evidence. He will twist words and meanings to fit a predefined narrative. He will cherry pick small items from a large mass of documents to try to contradict the overall picture painted by the mass. He will demand very specific interpretations of ambiguous statements. He will engage in a classic "connect the dots" style of conspiracy theorizing, where small tidbits of individual documents or fragments of statements, often amounting to only one sentence or even one word, are selected and connected with other fragments and statements. These items are often unrelated to one another, separated by long periods of time or both.

Overall his evidence will be threadbare and absurd given the magnitude of the allegations he is making.

Ironically, the better known the particular aspect of the holocaust myth is, the fewer items of evidence my opponent presents for it. For the purported homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz, by far the most famous aspect of the holocaust myth, he offers merely half a dozen or so items. These items ignore the vast majority of actual documentary evidence

about Auschwitz, of which there is a great deal. But you would never know that from listening to a holocaust fabulist. This is the very definition of cherry picking.

On pages 55 and 56 of Germar Rudolf's "The Chemistry of Auschwitz" Rudolf states

Only in the very early 1990s, i.e., since the collapse of the Communist regime in Eastern Europe, did the files of those agencies of the Third Reich become freely accessible for a certain period of time which allow a reliable history of the Auschwitz Camp to be written. Especially important in this regard are the files of the Zentralbauleitung der Waffen SS und Polizei Auschwitz (Central Construction Office of the Waffen SS and Police at Auschwitz), which are located in Moscow, the files of the Kriegsarchiv der Waffen SS (War Archives of the Waffen SS) in the Military-Historical Archives in Prague, and the files of Auschwitz Concentration Camp, located at the Auschwitz Museum. Since there are more than one hundred thousand documents in these archives, it will be necessary to wait for several years for the appearance of a seriously documented work on the topic. It must be considered certain that such research, which is only just beginning, will lead to a further massive revision of our image of the Auschwitz concentration camp.

This not only puts the lie to a classic holocaust fabulist claim that the Nazis destroyed all documents, but it makes my opponent's presentation look feeble. Out of all these potential documents from which he could draw to tell the story of the Auschwitz camp, he presents fewer than 10, and these few rely on you interpreting them only in the specific way he instructs you to. He will tell you that the many blueprints and official documents in these archives, in which rooms he claims are gas chambers are in fact clearly labeled as "corpse cellars," are all part of an elaborate ruse. He will tell you that a man who clearly says he witnessed the use of Zyklon B to kill lice was actually attending mass executions.

My opponent will use another inventive technique in his presentation, one I like to call "choose your own holocaust." This is a method that lesser known fabulists engage in where they try to use novelty takes on established parts of the narrative or little used documents ignored by mainstream fabulists. A major feature of "choose your own

holocaust” is the idea that if you can prove that in some crazy version the universe a particular claim is theoretically possible, then it definitely happened that way, regardless of whether this matches up with the mainstream fabulist narrative.

In doing so, my opponent shoots himself in the foot. In his effort to provide novel arguments he neglects the classics. He eschews providing any of the “survivor” eyewitness testimonies on which the mainstream Auschwitz story relies. Perhaps because he knows how absurd such testimonies are when looked at in their entirety, rather than just the few selected phrases which match up with other phrases in other testimonies, forming the famous “convergence of evidence” which is really no more than a convergence of rumor. Thus, even in alleging the vast cover up in these documents he has handicapped himself. What is being covered up? For that we would need to refer to eyewitness accounts of supposed survivors, but he has provided none. He provides a faulty study claiming there are holes in the roof of the morgue of Krema 2, but fails to provide anything that indicates what those holes were supposedly for. Oops.

On the topic of “convergence of evidence” as a method of history, historian J. Arch Getty had this to say in response to Robert Conquest, a conservative historian of the USSR who is now universally recognized, even by Conquest himself, as having exaggerated the number of gulag and purge victims of the Stalinist regime. From “Origins of the Great Purge”

For no other period or topic have historians been so eager to write and accept history-by-anecdote. Grand analytical generalizations have come from secondhand bits of corridor gossip. Prison camp stories (“My friend met Bukharin’s wife in camp and she said...”) have become primary sources on central political decision making. The need to generalize from isolated and unverified particulars has transformed rumors into sources and has equated repetition of stories with confirmation. Indeed, the leading expert on the great purges has written that “truth can thus only percolate in the form of hearsay” and that “basically the best, though not infallible, source is rumor.”

In a footnote to this passage, Getty says:

Such statements would be astonishing in any other field of history. Of course, historians do not accept hearsay and rumor as evidence. Conquest goes on to say that the best way to check rumors is to compare them with one another. This procedure would be sound only if rumors were not repeated and if memoirists did not read each other's works.

Getty can say this because he is speaking in the context of Stalinist Purges, and there is no prohibition on revising the record on them, though the argument applies to the holocaust as well.

While my opponent has not provided any survivor testimony, the "convergence of rumor" from such testimony is the main source for all mainstream accounts of the holocaust and particularly the gas chamber myth. I could go further, but there's no point since it won't be an issue in this debate. My opponent has effectively already conceded the most important aspect of the entire fabulist account. By conceding on gas chambers, he has lost right out of the gate, because for most people, the holocaust and gas chambers are identical.

Now, My opponent will no doubt reply that gas chambers are only one aspect of the holocaust. And by far the bulk of the items he provided relate not to gas chambers, but to the relatively new concept of the "holocaust by bullets." That is the claim that the Nazis killed millions of Jewish civilians in mass shootings in the occupied Eastern Territories, and this, not Auschwitz, is the most important part of the holocaust. While I do not dispute a policy of shooting some Jews in the East, there is no evidence, nor does my opponent provide any, that there was a policy of mass extermination of Jews. He does provide ample evidence to the contrary however.

I do not dispute the shootings of Jewish partisans and political officers in the occupied territories as a part of Nazi policy. In fact, this openly stated policy in the famous Commissar Order from the Nazi high command in June 1941 explains the language he will cite in all of the documents related to shootings in the occupied east that he provides, as well as some of the diary entries and memoirs he includes elsewhere.

My opponent will make the argument that documents which clearly describe in plain language specific prohibitions on shooting “working Jews or their families” or that contain direct orders to punish men that shoot Jews for “sadistic or sexual” purposes actually prove a mass extermination policy. He will argue that an SS man getting sentenced to death for sadistically murdering Jewish civilians is actually evidence of an official policy ordering the killing of Jewish civilians. While such excesses occurred, documents showing that the Nazis meted out the highest penalty for such behavior directly undermine his case. They do not prove it. The fact that he thinks they do is an indication of how far gone he is in his own head canon.

So what happened to all the dead bodies? My opponent will claim that there are a number of documented mass graves. As evidence for this he will point to the work of Father Patrick Desbois, a French priest, who uses the “convergence of rumor” method for documenting them, and has not to my knowledge actually located a single real grave. Desbois’s method is simple. Go to Eastern Europe, ask old people in villages if there was a Nazi massacre in the area. If they say yes, and he can get someone else to also say yes, mark it down as confirmed. By Desbois’s own words the sites of these massacres often contain nothing. As he stated in an Oct 2002 interview with Al Jazeera “*In many cases, the witnesses bring us to places where Jews were killed, and in many cases, there’s nothing there.*”

The cover story the holocaust fabulists use for the lack of any bodies is the unfalsifiable tale of Action 1005, a purported secret Nazi commando group, who went around in 1943 and 1944 digging up, burning, and grinding the bones of millions of corpses in the middle of an active war zone. No such bone grinding machine or remains of these ground up bones or mass cremations have ever been found. In the notorious case of Babi Yar, we are told that 33,000 people were dug up and burned on pyres by this totally secret commando force for which there is no evidence. Allied aerial photographs of the area from a few days after this massive pit was dug and an equally massive pyre of dead bodies was erected show no disturbance of the ground at the site.

Additionally, my opponent has provided among his documents a 900 page book containing transcriptions of the Einsatzgruppen reports. While these documents do have mentions of shootings of Jewish partisans, they are very explicit about it and do not use any coded language. Nor were they destroyed. So if the Nazis took the crazy step of Aktion 1005, why did they not take the much easier step of simply destroying these reports as they are alleged, with no evidence, to have done elsewhere?

So what is the correct method for investigating mass graves? The standard was set by the Nazis in their report on the Katyn forest massacre committed by the Soviets against Polish Army officers, intelligentsia, civil servants, priests, police officers and numerous other people. My opponent says this report is “spergy and lie filled” which is a completely normal way for a serious historian to talk. In fact, it was a thorough investigation carried out by forensic experts from 11 different countries. The report was convincing enough to the Western allies that they prevented the Soviets from bringing charges related to Katyn at Nuremberg. My opponent will attempt to use these facts in a completely backwards and counterintuitive fashion. He will claim that Nuremberg was not a show trial because the Nazis were not charged with a crime that they had decisively

documented was committed by the Soviets! Inclusion of this charge would have been so absurd as to further discredit the already suspect show trial. While My opponent says the Nazi report is “spergy and lie filled,” he does not deny that it is accepted by all historians today that the massacre was in fact committed by the Soviets. So what are these supposed lies?

Additionally, claiming that Nuremberg was not a show trial because the Soviets attempted to charge the Nazis with a crime they knew they had committed makes no sense at all. Leveling accusations you KNOW are false is a defining factor of a show trial. Just because they didn’t get away with it in this instance there is no reason to think there were not instances in which they did. Clearly the willingness to lie and frame was there.

Speaking of Nuremberg, one of the folders my opponent provided to me is labeled “non coerced confessions of the holocaust.” It contains about 8 names. By including such a folder, he is conceding that all other confessions were coerced, including all confessions at the Nuremberg show trials. He seems to concede here that Nuremberg were show trials by categorizing confessions obtained at these trials as coerced. OK, fair enough.

My opponent will argue be that there are large numbers of missing Jews, and there is no explanation of where they went, so we must therefore conclude that his conspiracy theory is true. No other explanation is possible. This is like saying that my tooth disappeared from under my pillow as a child because the tooth fairy is real and no other explanation is possible. Or like saying that the approximately 840,000 children reported missing to the FBI every year are being trafficked inside furniture delivered to Tom Hanks’s house or that Hillary Clinton and John Podesta are eating them for lunch in the basement of Comet Pizza. No other explanation is possible, and you if you can’t tell me where they went, then you must defer to my theory.

The Yad Veshem archive lists some 4 million missing Jews in its database. Yet there is no actual quality control or fact-checking used in compiling it. It is built like all holocaust evidence, on hearsay, simply Jews self reporting that so and so died. There are numerous duplications, and many people listed in it survived for years after 1945. There are numerous media reports of Jewish families who reported their relatives dead in the database later finding each other and having tearful reunions on the evening news. It is not at all clear if such records are subsequently purged. In a 2020 National Justice article, Striker documented the fact that several well known holocaust survivors and fabulists like Yitzak Arad, formerly Isaac Rudnicki of Poland, were listed, often multiple times in the database. I know that my opponent knows about this article because he emailed me and Striker when it came out complimenting Striker on his research. While there are no doubt some unaccounted for Jews, the numbers are by no means reliable.

So where did these Jews go? I don't know. Some probably died. Many definitely survived. Where else would all these survivors bilking the German people for billions be coming from? Surely none of them would be faking it!

The Commissar order, the only actual order in existence commanding the killing of Jews by the Nazis, it could be argued was a criminal order. But far more criminal orders were issued and on a routine basis by the allies. If the justification for the allied war crimes is that they worked to lower enemy morale, the same justification can be given for the Commissar order. The Germans believed that the USSR was a Jewish Bolshevik terror state, and that morale was maintained by Jewish Commissars in the ranks of the soldiers. Their plan to lower enemy morale was to kill Jewish Commissars. It clearly worked since about 3 million Soviet soldiers surrendered to the Germans by the end of 1941, more than

they could properly handle. This is a much more humane way to break morale than the policy chosen by the allies.

Speaking of the allies, let's ask the question, what would documents, quotations and diary entries from top government and military officials that were actually engaged in a conspiracy to commit mass killings of civilians look like? As it turns out, we don't have to look far. We can simply look at the record from the allied side. They openly discussed plans to murder mass numbers of civilians, discussed carrying out the murders, and issued documents assessing the effectiveness of the murders after the fact. The evidence here is so voluminous that I could not possibly include it all, so I will select only a few items. However, unlike my opponent, my selections will be exemplary of the vast body of evidence and will require no deliberately malicious or mendacious interpretation. Nor are these documents, quotations or mass killings disputed by any historians, or anyone at all.

In a July 8, 1940 letter to Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Aircraft Production, Winston Churchill said:

“When I look round to see how we can win the war, I see that there is only one sure path. We have no continental ally which can defeat the German military power.... Should [Hitler] be repulsed here or not try invasion, he will recoil eastward, and we have nothing to stop him. But there is one thing that will bring him back and bring him down, and that is an absolutely devastating, exterminating attack by very heavy bombers from this country upon the Nazi homeland.”

Based on arguments my opponent will make concerning certain phrases in Goebbels' diary, he must also assert that there was definitely a plan to kill literally all the Germans by Winston Churchill in July of 1940. If he does not assert this, it will be interesting to hear his explanation as to why not. Perhaps because there is no evidence of such a program? Maybe because one statement does not prove the existence of such a program? Maybe even because no matter what Churchill said in one letter, the actual plan was to

kill civilians to force a surrender, not to kill literally every single German? Perhaps he will even go so far as to state that we need only look at other statements by Churchill to demonstrate this? Those would be interesting arguments indeed!

Sir Arthur “Bomber” Harris said in a 1982 interview referencing this quote, that while he is often credited with idea of targeting German civilians to break morale, the idea really came from Churchill. *“It was the origin of the idea of bombing the enemy out of the war. I should have been proud of it. But it originated with Winston.”* Interestingly, Harris seems to interpret the word “*exterminating*” to mean “*bombing the enemy out of the war*” and not killing literally every single one of them including women and children. Perhaps my opponent could give him a lecture in what words really mean if he were still alive.

Churchill’s words are sharply contrasted with Hermann Goring’s directive to the Luftwaffe on June 30, 1940.

The war against England is to be restricted to destructive attacks against industry and air force targets which have weak defensive forces. ... The most thorough study of the target concerned, that is vital points of the target, is a pre-requisite for success. It is also stressed that every effort should be made to avoid unnecessary loss of life amongst the civilian population.

The targeting of German civilians is often justified as retaliation to the German air campaign. This argument is challenged by Sir Basil Collier, an official historian for the British Government who wrote of the German blitz campaign in 1957:

detailed records of the raids made during the autumn and the winter of 1940–41 does not suggest that indiscriminate bombing of the civilians was intended. The points of aim selected were largely factories and docks. Other objectives specifically allotted to bomber-crews included the City of London and the governmental quarter round Whitehall.

The “City of London” here refers to the government district, not to the entire city. So the Nazis restricted their bombings of Britain to military and command and control targets.

On Feb 14, 1941 the Royal Air Force issued General Directive Number 5, the so called Area Bombing directive. It stated *“You are accordingly authorised to employ your forces without restriction.”* To remove any ambiguity, Chief of Staff Charles Portal issued a clarification on Feb 15, stating *“ref the new bombing directive: I suppose it is clear the aiming points will be the built up areas, and not, for instance, the dockyards or aircraft factories where these are mentioned in Appendix A. This must be made quite clear if it is not already understood.”*

On March 30, 1942 the British Cabinet sent a memo to Winston Churchill that has since become known as the “dehousing paper.” Dehousing, not delousing. The Nazis were the ones talking about delousing. This paper contained an official recommendation, accepted by Churchill, to target German civilian homes and create a refugee crisis. The memo stated:

In 1938 over 22 million Germans lived in fifty-eight towns of over 100,000 inhabitants, which, with modern equipment, should be easy to find and hit. Our forecast output of heavy bombers (including Wellingtons) between now and the middle of 1943 is about 10,000. If even half the total load of 10,000 bombers were dropped on the built-up areas of these fifty-eight German towns the great majority of their inhabitants (about one-third of the German population) would be turned out of house and home.

Investigation seems to show that having one's home demolished is most damaging to morale. People seem to mind it more than having their friends or even relatives killed.

Bombing German civilians was the official policy of the British. In October 1943 Sir Arthur “Bomber” Harris, Commander in Chief of the RAF, wrote a letter to Winston

Churchill urging him to be publicly honest about the goals of the Combined Bomber Offensive.

"the aim of the Combined Bomber Offensive...should be unambiguously and publicly stated. That aim is the destruction of German cities, the killing of German workers, and the disruption of civilized life throughout Germany.

It should be emphasized that the destruction of houses, public utilities, transport and lives, the creation of a refugee problem on an unprecedented scale, and the breakdown of morale both at home and at the battle fronts by fear of extended and intensified bombing, are accepted and intended aims of our bombing policy. They are not by-products of attempts to hit factories."

The policy was not in question. Harris simply thought the public should be told the truth about it.

The October 1944 Standard Operating Procedure issued to the Allied Eighth Air Force stated:

1. No towns or cities in Germany will be attacked as secondary or last resort targets, targets of opportunity, or otherwise, unless such towns contain or have immediately adjacent to them, one (1) or more military objectives. Military objectives include railway lines; junctions; marshalling yards; railway or road bridges, or other communications networks; any industrial plant; and such obvious military objectives as oil storage tanks, military camps and barracks, troop concentrations, motor transport or AFV parks, ordnance or supply depots, ammunition depots; airfields; etc.
2. Combat crews will be briefed before each mission to insure that no targets other than military objectives in Germany are attacked.
3. It has been determined that towns and cities large enough to produce an identifiable return on the H2X [radar] scope generally contain a large proportion of the military objectives listed above. These centers, therefore, may be attacked as secondary or last-resort targets by through-the-overcast bombing technique.

This is saying that any town large enough to be picked up on the radar scope, is large enough to contain some kind of valid target, therefore it can be bombed. The effect of this

policy was to open up every city in Germany with over 50,000 people and many cities with fewer, to aerial bombardment.

One week later US General Nathan Twining said this in a memo:

1. The present war situation demands that every effort be made to bomb military targets in GERMANY.
2. Any military installation, communication line, or industrial plant, no matter how small, adds to the German war strength, and almost any one of the numerous GERMAN towns contains such a target.

The euphemism “military target” is used here, but it is obvious that the definition is so broad as to include literally any town.

American James Doolittle, the commander of the Eighth Air Force, objected to the targeting of German civilians, but nonetheless he just followed orders and did it anyway. His objections confirm that terror bombing of civilians was the policy. Regarding the Eighth’s most famous mission over Berlin in 1945 he said:

“There are no basically important strictly military targets in the designated area... the chances of terrorizing into submission, by merely an increased concentration of bombing, a people who have been subjected to intense bombing for four years is extremely remote... we will, in what may be one of our last and best-remembered operations regardless of its effectiveness, violate the basic American principle of precision bombing of targets of strictly military significance for which our tactics were designed and our crews trained and indoctrinated.”

The supposed “American principle of precision bombing” never made a comeback, as shown in Korea, Vietnam and Iraq.

In his 1945 account of the activities of the strategic bomber command, Arthur Harris recounted the objectives of the 1941 Area Bombing Directive:

The main task, therefore, laid upon the Command by the Air Ministry directive letter numbered 5.46368/D.C.A.S., of 14th February, 1941, was “to focus attacks on the morale of the enemy civil population, and, in particular, of the industrial workers.” This was to be achieved by destroying, mainly by incendiary attacks, first, four large cities in the Ruhr area and, then, as opportunity offered, fourteen other industrial cities in Northern, Central and Southern Germany. The aim of the attacks on town areas had already been defined in an Air Staff paper (dated 23rd September, 1941) as follows:-

“The ultimate aim of the attack on a town area is to break the morale of the population which occupies it. To ensure this we must achieve two things: first, we must make the town physically uninhabitable and, secondly, we must make the people conscious of constant personal danger. The immediate aim, is therefore, twofold, namely, to produce (i) destruction, and (ii) the fear of death.”

This is just a smattering of the huge amount of available documentation on this topic. The resulting firebombing of Dresden and Hamburg, among other German cities is well known. That these policies were set and carried out to deliberately kill civilians is not in question. There is no documentary evidence remotely comparable to this for the holocaust. Ironically, the book Hellstorm contains many survivor testimonies of the bombings that document deliberate killing and strafing of civilians from allied bombers as well as the sheer terror of a city going up in flames around you. This book is challenged by many historians. But why? It contains the same sort of evidence that is constantly used by fabulists to prove the gas chamber myth. Not all survivor testimonies are created equal apparently.

Estimates of civilian deaths from the strategic bombing campaign range from the low end of 300,000 to the high end of 500,000. The reason that the exact number of murders are so hard to confirm, is that incendiary bombs, unlike mortuary crematoria, actually completely incinerate human bodies without a trace for those caught in the center of the conflagration.

Injuries from these bombings were well over a million and the number of people rendered homeless was 7.5 million according to the British government. The total German civilian deaths as a result of crimes against humanity is claimed to be between 1.5 and 3 million. Most of these are due to the flight, expulsion and mistreatment of German civilians after the war. These numbers would seem horrific if they did not feel paltry compared to the imaginary figure of 6 million. The wide range indicates that the estimates fluctuate and are argued about by historians, unlike the mystical 6 million, which remains the same no matter how many changes are made to the official fabulist narrative or how many unproven body counts are reduced. My opponent will also freely admit that the Soviets inflated body counts of Auschwitz victims for political purposes.

The terror bombings of German civilians were extensively documented by Donald L Miller in his book “Masters of the Air” which is currently being made into a streaming series for Apple TV by Stephen Spielberg. Spielberg has cast his own son as one of the war criminals that just followed orders and intentionally bombed German women and children. Miller’s book is quite frank and open about the nature of the bombing operations and I used it as a source for many of these quotes.

When it comes to Japan the record is no better for the allies. Terror bombings of Japanese cities were the norm, aggressively promoted by American General Curtis “Bombs Away” LeMay. Some of LeMay’s most famous quotes are:

There are no innocent civilians. It is their government and you are fighting a people, you are not trying to fight an armed force anymore. So it doesn't bother me so much to be killing the so-called innocent bystanders.

Killing Japanese didn't bother me very much at that time... I suppose if I had lost the war, I would have been tried as a war criminal.

We went over there and fought the war and eventually burned down every town in North Korea anyway, someday or another, and some in South Korea too....

Over a period of three years or so, we killed off — what — twenty percent of the population of Korea as direct casualties of war, or from starvation and exposure?

These quotes make bombastic rhetoric from Hitler, Himmler and Goebbels seem tame by comparison, and unlike Nazi hyperbole, there is a clear and unambiguous historical record proving that these quotes reflect official policy and killings that were actually carried out. LeMay's comment about Korea also seems to acknowledge that mass aerial bombardment leads to the starvation and exposure of potentially millions of people. This is a topic about which he would have firsthand personal knowledge, and bolsters the denier explanation for the emaciated dead and living found at the Buchenwald and Dachau prison camps when they were occupied by the allies.

The firebombing of Tokyo on March 10, 1945 was the deadliest air raid in human history, commanded by LeMay and unambiguously targeting civilians with incendiary bombs over the center of a populated city. LeMay ordered the city burned to the ground with napalm, killing an estimated 150,000 civilians. The purpose, like in the bombings of Germany, was to kill as many people as possible to break morale and force a Japanese surrender.

The nukes dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki had the same intention. This fact is not controversial.

A May 10, 1945 document proposing various targets for the nuke said this about Hiroshima.

Hiroshima—This is an important army depot and port of embarkation in the middle of an urban industrial area. It is a good radar target and it is such a size that a large part of the city could be extensively damaged. There are adjacent hills which are likely to produce a focusing effect which would considerably increase the blast damage.

A May 31st meeting of the Interim Committee effectively decided to bomb the center of a civilian city. The committee was a joint group that included civilians, most notably Jewish scientist Robert Oppenheimer. Oppenheimer is currently the subject of a major motion picture celebrating his achievement of massacring hundreds of thousands of innocent people while ushering in a bold new era of nuclear terror to the entire world. Matt Damon plays General Leslie Groves, who was also a member of the committee and who endorsed bombing the center of Hiroshima. In the trailer for the film Damon and the actor playing Oppenheimer exchange witty banter about a weapon capable of murdering millions of people. The May 31st meeting minutes say this:

the Secretary [*Stimson*] expressed the conclusion, on which there was general agreement, that we could not give the Japanese any warning; that we could not concentrate on a civilian area; but that we should seek to make a profound psychological impression on as many of the inhabitants as possible. At the suggestion of Dr. Conant the Secretary agreed that the most desirable target would be a vital war plant employing a large number of workers and closely surrounded by workers' houses."

This is euphemistic language for dropping the bomb in the center of a populated area, and they knew it. US Secretary of War Henry Stimson in his June 6, 1945 diary entry recounts a conversation with President Truman about the issue of what the target for the nuke ought to be.

I told him that I was busy considering our conduct of the war against Japan and I told him how I was trying to hold the Air Force down to precision bombing but that with the Japanese method of scattering its manufacture it was rather difficult to prevent area bombing.

...I was a little fearful that before we could get ready the Air Force might have Japan so thoroughly bombed out that the new weapon would not have a fair background to show its strength. He laughed and said he understood.

Clearly it was always understood that the bomb would target the center of a city. Stimson's reference to "area bombing" proves this. And he of course was well aware that

Tokyo and other cities had already been centrally targeted as a matter of policy to maximize civilian deaths.

The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki together killed around 200,000 civilians. In this case, again it was the allies and not the Germans who were incinerating bodies without a trace. The gruesome results of these self-admitted terror bombings can be read about in the US Strategic After Action Summaries. Overall about 1 million Japanese civilians were murdered in WWII, most from incendiary or nuclear bombs. These are the worst war crimes in history, but they are deliberately made to appear as mere trivialities and sometimes even as justified by the myth of the gas chambers and the 6 million.

In his announcement to the nation about the first nuke, President Truman said that Hiroshima was a military target. This was a lie, and it was known to be a lie. Here the words “military target” are clearly a euphemism for terror bombing of civilians. Just as in previous documents “military target” was used to describe literally any target. If we were to use my opponent’s argument regarding the term “special action” here, we would have to conclude that literally every time the word “military target” appears in an allied document, it is in fact referring to terrorist killings of civilians and there is no possibility it could ever be referring to an actual military target. He is welcome to make that claim if he wishes.

The holocaust is the quintessential example history as written by the victor. In this case the victor is clearly rewriting history in order to wash his own hands of blood. The holocaust myth absolutely serves Zionist political ends in justifying their seizure of Palestine and Jewish racial ends by acting as the lynchpin behind their control of political and social discourse, but it also served the ends of the allied governments in justifying, minimizing and making excuses for their own stated policies of committing atrocities

against civilians. Atrocities which are far more well documented and explicit than anything presented for the so called holocaust.