



Jakob Munck:

EUROTRASH AND HOLOCAUST - MYTHOLOGY

- Lies, self-delusion and mind control



*"Do not take care of the Jewish myths and
People who turn away from the truth "*

(Titus 1; 14)



Eurotrash and Holocaust-mythology

The book consists of separate articles that illustrate the relationship between pro Judean mythology, Holocaust mythology and European culture. The European NATO members are to intervene, bomb and destroy foreign countries that they do not like. But how are democracy, humanity and freedom of speech doing in European countries? The topic is not discussed, because the Europeans live in self illusion. It is embarrassing, but it is reality. Fortunately, it's also the reality that all dreams come to an end. And the European dream is still getting closer to its end.



*Jakob Munck (b. 1948) is a cultural sociologist and has written 30 books,
about history, mythology, culture, religion and psychology.*

See: www.jamu.dk

Index

- 1. INTRODUCTION 3**
- 2. THE POWER OF THE HEBREW WORD 4**
- 3. POPE PIUS AND HOLOCAUST 7**
- 4. NAZISM AND ZIONISM, HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE? 11**
- 5. HOLOCAUST MYTHOLOGY AND ITS CONSEQUENCES 17**
- 6. WHAT IS RACISM 22**
- 7. THE GERMAN DISEASE 26**
- 8. WHAT IS THE HOLOCAUST CULTURE 33**
- 9. WHO WON 2nd WORLD WAR 43**
- 10. THE EUROPEAN PSYCHOLOGY 47**
- 11. EUROPEAN DISSIDENTS - AUTHORS IN PRISON 65**
- 12. GLOSSARY 66**
- 13. LITERATURE 69**

1. INTRODUCTION

Thus, I present you a collection of texts that I have written in the years 2000 - 2011. Common to them all is that they are political incorrect if the concept of "incorrect" refers to what is in good taste at the ideological rulers of the so-called "free and democratic" Western world. But what is a lie and what is truth, will depends on from which angle you look from. I do not claim that I with present texts get near the final truth about anything, but I allow myself to question some of the lies and self-delusion, on which the Western world's politicians and voters are based.

People claim - e.g. - to live in a culture that is based on the freedom of speech, but the reality is that this expression does not exist when it comes to the essentials. There is freedom to advertise all kinds of music, fashion, art, politics and sexuality, and there is freedom to criticize and ridicule Christianity and Islam. But freedom has its limits, because there is one religion which it is not allowed to criticize, and there is a one kind of mythology, one is not allowed to doubt about. And it is this religion and related mythology, which I am concerned about in these texts.

But please do not worry. I am not trying to start a revolution. It has been a long time ago I abandoned such an idea. I only want to provide a little inspiration to the few brave and intelligent readers who dare to be critical, and who understand that "history is the lie that the ruling has chosen us to believe in" (Napoleon). Those, who understand that the history and society, in a given time in a particular place, one is taught in school and is given through the media, not necessarily is identical to what you believe in other places and in other times. And is way beyond from being the truth.

Mythology is used to control the people, because nobody can live without having something to believe in. Our soldiers cannot fight in Iraq and Afghanistan, where the western neocolonialism apply if they do not have a belief that they represent something that is morally superior and more true than what the humans which they kill believe in. And it is better to believe in something that anyone can think of is a lie, than not to believe in anything. Without faith the human being does not get very far.

The reader is also invited to take a critical position. Do not believe what I write, but go even to the literature and search the Internet. Don't let yourself be indoctrinated, form your own opinion.

Jakob Munck
28 / 12-2014

2. THE POWER OF THE HEBREW WORD

In 2001 a fascinating book that should have made an impression on the Western world historians and the public in general was published. But it did not happen. The author is Benjamin Blech, and he is Jewish rabbi and professor of Talmudic studies at the Yeshiva University in New York. The book's title is "The secret of the Hebrew words" and in it the academic professor shows a number of examples of the relationship between the Hebrew language, as the Torah texts written in, and the Jewish theology and understanding of history. The book is perhaps mainly written to orthodox Jews, but others can be read it to get a better insight into the relationship between Hebrew number mysticism and the Jewish religion. For Jews, the Hebrew language is namely sacred and each character corresponds to a number, which means - in some sense – that it can deduce prophetic predictions of the Torah, at least if you believe that God himself has written texts and that he has coded them full of secrets that people in the future can use their time on to interpret.

Some Christian theologians perceive this as number magic and as an expression of superstition, but others take it very seriously. Best known in this context is probably Jehovah's Witnesses and various Adventist sects, which have repeatedly predicted the end of the world from such a text / numeric analysis. So far, this has proven not to be true.

When Benjamin Blech's book is so interesting is because it ends with a review of the Torah Leviticus 25:10, which correspond to what of the Danish Bible is called the third book of Genesis, chapter 25, verse 10. The Hebrew text unfortunately, I cannot reproduce here, since I do not have the Hebrew character set on my computer, but in the newest Danish Bible translation it is stated this way:

"And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants."

The interesting aspect of this verse is, acc. Benjamin Blech, that it predicts Israel's formation and the number of dead at the Nazi Holocaust. Blech shows that the Hebrew word for "we shall come back" is misspelled in the original text. A letter is missing, namely what corresponds to the Latin "v" which in Hebrew numerical code is identical to the number 6. The absence of this letter show - in Blech's interpretation - that 6 million Jews will pass away before the Jewish state can be restored. Blech also believe that the year of this event (1948) is predicted in the same text passage. It all fits so perfectly. The precondition for Israel's creation was the fate of the Jews during World War 2, and in the traditional historiography and in countless Hollywood movies and TV shows we have learned that it all actually happened as the holy book foretold 2,500 years ago. There were 6 million Jews who died as a result of it, which since the late 60s has been called the "Holocaust". The prophecy was obviously true, and Hitler was really just a tool for the advancement of the heavenly prophecy, which - according to the wise rabbi - came true during the war.

Taking this into account that the original Hebrew of the Torah (= Old Testament) is written over two thousand years ago, it is rather remarkable that it so exactly has predicted the number of Jews killed during World War 2, and the most notable is that a number of Jewish writers have come to exactly the same numbers through what, they claim, has been a "thorough scientific study" of the static information, which are available from the war time. Thus the former chairman of the Mosaic Religious

Community in Denmark - Jacques Blum – used so much space in his book on "False paths" to prove that the figure 6 million is still absolutely true, even if the number of Jews killed at Auschwitz for some years ago was written down from 4 million to 1.5 million. This write-down of 2.5 million would one think would get researchers to reduce the total number of dead from Holocaust from 6 million to 4.5 million, but it did not happen. Blum and the other researchers discovered at the same time - all by coincidence - that there were 1.5 million deaths, which one previously had forgotten to reckon with. The number 6 million was therefore still absolutely true, and the 2,500 years old prophecy was reconciled - thankfully - accordingly to modern research.

There is really prophetic power of the Hebrew word. It is said that the founder of Zionism Theodor Hertzl wrote in his diaries of the late 1800s that 6 million Jews would die so the Jewish state could be restored. I have not even been able to check this information, as these diaries are unavailable to the public. But reading the Encyclopedia Britannica, 1902, it is stated in the article about "Anti-Semitism" that in Russia there are *"six million of Jews who are being systematically degraded"* (p. 482). Here we see, then, that the old prophecy has already been fulfilled. And the same thing happens immediately after the First World War, when New York's Jewish mayor Martin H. Glynn writes in "The American Hebrew" (31 / 10-1919), the war has led to Six million men and women are dying in the threatened Holocaust". The same equivalent information may also be found in a number of other Jewish and non-Jewish publications, which were published all the way up to the Second World War's start.

Thus there is not - as many imagine - only one Holocaust, but three. All are foretold in the Torah and all are repeated in for the time being the most objective sources for information, and each time 6 million Jews have been slaughtered. The first went on in Russia in the late 1800s, the second time in First World War and the third time under the Hitler regime. Three times God's chosen people had to suffer so the Hebrew prophecy could come true so they could get their own state. Altogether there were 18 million victims, which approximately correspond to the number of Jews in the world.

Here it is hard not to be a little moral. As we now know that it all has been predicted, and thus can be seen as an expression of a plan that Jehovah came from his own devising at the beginning of time, I think that you can afford to voice criticism against this God. For if it has to be necessary to kill 6 million of his chosen children so Israel can be restored, could he not be content to let this happen once? But entirely three times, is it not a bit too much?

At the same time we must of course compliment Jacque Blum and the other talented "scientists" who through great scientific works have concluded that 6 million people died during each of these Holocausts. And how amazing is it that the figure is consistent with the old prophecy. Yes, the Torah is truly a divine book. It is full of mystery and divine predictions. It is at least as brilliant as the Koran in which Muslim fundamentalists teaches us that incandescent invention and various other events in modern world are predicted.

My own view, however, is that Jehovah, Allah and the other gods must have problems with morale. Why do millions of people die so a prophecy can come true? And why should historical figures as Adolf Hitler be liable for the event, which the omnipotent deity has decided to happen for thousands of years ago? I find it hard to understand. Was it really necessary for $3 \times 6 = 18$ million Jews should die to be able to have state constituted? And, what is equally noticeable is the fact that we never have

heard about the first two Holocausts, while the third is poured into the minds of all of us through television, newspapers, books, museums and memorial days? In several European countries it is even forbidden and leads to imprisonment not to believe in the holy figures, 6 million.

I am not sure, but one thing I am aware about, however is: There is an enormous power in the Hebrew word, and very few people dare to contradict it. If you try, it often goes really wrong. But why is it like this?

3. POPE PIUS AND THE HOLOCAUST

If one follows the Vatican magazine L'Osservatore Romano and the debate between the Vatican and the Israeli state, you will find out that the question of Pope Pius XII (1876-1958) compared to the so-called Holocaust is a very hot topic. It is about something very central, not only for the state of Israel, but also for the Vatican, because there is a process underway to saints Pius XII, and if the critics of this Pope is correct in that he remained silent and ignored what for many in our time counts for being Adolf Hitler's greatest crime, then Pius XII no saint, but a criminal.

Pope Pius XII

For both Israel and the Vatican it is all about credibility, and nothing indicates that both parties may be right, neither materially nor morally. If the debate and the - launched by the Vatican - examination of Pope Pius XII's relationship with Hitler and his misdeeds are brought further, then there is much to suggest that there will be a clarification that one of the parties will not like. Apparently there are only two possibilities: Either the Vatican will admit that the pope, which they are in the process of giving a saint title, was what we today call "a Holocaust denier", or this must be called into serious question in the writing of history books, which since 1970 has given this event an iconic and unquestionable status.

There is no doubt about that Pius XII was against Nazism and its human point of view and it is recognized by most that he did many things to protect persecuted Jews in Italy by allowing them to seek shelter in the Vatican and in various monasteries, as the Catholic order of society predisposed. This is emphasized again and again by the pope's apologists, and no serious debaters will contradict them. The problem is that it is not what the debate is about, when viewed from the other side, namely Israel. This is about whether Pius XII objected to the alleged mass extermination of 6 million Jews in gas chambers at Auschwitz, Treblinka, Majdanek and Chelmno, and there is - so far - nothing that indicates that he did. It is claimed by the dominant in the West extremism history writers that Hitler's Holocaust started after holding the Wannsee Conference in January 1942, when Hitler's leaders came up with what they thought was going to be the solution to the "Jewish problem". He hereafter started gassing, which continued until shortly before the Russians overtook the camps in 1945.

No one can seriously claim that Pope Pius XII did not know what happened in the Polish concentration camps. Poland is a Catholic country, there were many Catholic priests in the camps and a large part of the German staff in the camps were Catholics, including camp leader Rudolf Hoess, who was frequent a visitor to the town's Catholic church. In a Catholic country like Poland, nothing can be concealed from the Catholic Church, and thus for the Pope, and beyond the intelligence that the pope got through the churchy canals, the surroundings also received lots of information via multiple other credible sources.

Red Cross visited several times Auschwitz and other concentration camps, where they talked with the prisoners and during none of these visits they were informed about the mass execution in gas chambers. The Allies effectuated weekly screening-flights over Auschwitz, which took aerial photos of the camp. But again they apparently saw no gas chambers, just as they did not get such notifications by tapping the camp's encrypted electronic communication, whose codes the British had broken. If they had overheard credible reports on mass executions with gas, they supposedly would have bombed the

gas chambers, which would have been a simple matter, since the German air force was defeated.

Moreover, it is not only Pius XII, who - apparently - did not bother to do anything to save the Jews from Hitler's gas chambers. So did President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, in their speeches and books one searches in vain for any mentioning of the gas chambers, mass extermination and the Holocaust. On the whole, it was probably the most common perception during and after the war that Hitler had little interest in executing concentration prisoners when his goal was to force prisoners to work in the civil and war-regarded production. And the idea that he had a plan to "exterminate all Jews of the world", encounter the fact that Hitler never controlled land areas where more than 1/3 of the world's Jews lived. This must be added another fact, namely that Hitler and the Nazi during the period 1933-1940 eagerly cooperated with the Stern Gang and the other Zionists in Palestine, with the aim of getting the German Jews to go to Palestine, where they should form the heart of the future state of Israel.

As you understand, there is no particular reason to criticize Pius XII for not protested against gassing and mass extermination of the Jews, because nobody else did it. Neither the Red Cross, the Polish priests and bishops, the US President or the Prime Minister of England protested, and when they did not, then it was probably because they knew nothing about such a mass execution, or - if they had heard of it - then they did not believe it.

Among the arguments that the Vatican has made to clean Pius XII for the moral co-responsibility in the alleged mass extermination of 6 million Jews, is that everything just would have been much worse if the Pope had protested. When using this argument, it is therefore implicitly admitting that he had knowledge of systematic mass extermination, but he chose to keep quiet, not to provoke the offender to do something even more horrifying.

But this argument does not stand. Firstly, it is difficult to see how a crime may be greater than what it is claimed that Hitler committed and which since the 70s has achieved iconic status and what in movies and history books is known as the Holocaust (with the first letter in capital). And if the Pope was in favor of a moral principle not to protest against evil "not to make it worse," so it's hard to understand why he several times - before and after the war - protested against Communist oppression of the Catholic Church in the Russian controlled countries. In that case he also should have kept quiet about this, not to "provoke the oppressors". But he did not. Moreover, it has never been Catholic morality not to protest against the evils of "doing the worse", so that intention can hardly apply to Pius XII, especially since his silence on the alleged extermination continued after the end of the war until his death in 1958.

Nowadays this what Pius XII did is called "Holocaust deny" the only plausible explanation for his silence is that he simply did not believe the stories that today have become historical dogma, which is not tolerate to debate or contradiction. Although the postulated mass extinction was the basis for judgments at the Nuremberg trial, there was no one who took them quite seriously. It is always war winners who write history and the purpose of this trial was to print the losers as being immoral. It succeeded. Since Hollywood in the early 70s produced a television series entitled Holocaust, this notion has become a central theme in all discussion of WW2. There is hardly a major US or European city that does not have a Holocaust museum, and we can daily watch TV shows where we are taught that the Holocaust was the central and moral defining event

in WW2. It is because of the Holocaust, that today Hitler is accounted for as a psychopath and war criminal, while his opponents are idealized and regarded as heroes.

The concept of the Holocaust has today taken an iconic status, and there are reasons why the former Catholic (now Muslim) Roger Garaudy calls one of his books for "The foundational myth of Israel". Garaudy takes no position on the historical reality of the Holocaust story, but just note that this story has achieved a religious status, and today serves as the basic ideological collection's item for the state of Israel, and to some extent for the entire Western world. It is therefore in all so-called democratic Western countries allowed to ridicule and violate both Jesus and Muhammad, and - of course - to raise doubts about their historical existence. But at the same time example in Germany and France one will be imprisoned if you indicate that you do not believe in the historical reality of the so-called mass extermination in Hitler's alleged gas chambers. It is therefore correct to describe the Western post-Christian culture as being a Holocaust culture, since in this concept - and not in Christianity - has the untouchable core of what the citizens of the United States and Europe believe. To deny the historical realities behind the Holocaust, leads to the same kind of sanctions that were once triggered, if you expressed doubts about the Trinity or - like Galilei - the Sun's assumed rotation around Earth.

Freedom of speech stops when there is a particular religion which is violated. The others can be divided equally. Just as the Muslims cannot tolerate violations of the Prophet, the Western Judaic human does not tolerate doubt about the Holocaust. And the Catholic Church follow suit. Certainly one asserts that one advocates for freedom of speech, but when Catholics are imprisoned in Germany and France for denying the Holocaust, then the church is silent.

Israel's occupation

Israel has the US and Denmark's full support. Racism and colonialism is something abhorrent when it takes place in South Africa, but when in Palestine it is quite alright. The logic is simple: There is the Holocaust survivors exercising this terror, and they are subject to specific moral rules. When there is war between the Jews and the Palestines, it is the Jews who are the "victims", even if they are the ones who have occupied the Palestinian land.

I think that Israel is going to win the debate with the Vatican on Pius XII. Not because they are right, but because they control the media in the United States which obviously supports Israel. In the spring of 2007 the Vatican's ambassador threatened in Israel to boycott a memorial in the Israeli Holocaust museum, Yad Vashem and the reason was that they could not tolerate the Israeli interference in the process of sainting Pius XII. But the Vatican is to blame for its problems, to the extent they signify faith in the Hollywood promoted version of the Holocaust, there is no excuse that rescues the Pius XII from being morally complicit in the mass extermination of Jews.

One understands Vatican frustrations, about all explain away about the pope did not protest against the Holocaust "due to a risk of making the suppression worse" or because he "did not know what happened" is naturally false. The Pope knew better than anyone what happened in Poland. It was his own subjects who performed the operations in the camps, regardless of what this work so consisted in.

So there are only two possibilities: Either the extermination of 6 million Jews in the Polish gas chambers is a historical reality, and then Pius XII knew of it. A gigantic crime could not possibly be hidden from him and the pope was therefore - through his silence - morally co-responsible for 6 million deaths.

Otherwise we must recognize that the historical reality of the history of the Holocaust is not quite what they produce in the western historiography. The conclusion is then just that either Pius XII was a Holocaust denier and a morally decaying individual. Or the reality is that he did not believe the stories of gassings or mass extinction in the German concentration camps. Therefore he did not protest. But if the pope knew about the mass extermination of millions of Jews, despite the fact that he had better information than any other person in the world, then how could they take place?

There is no doubt that they had their own answer to this question in both Israel and the Vatican. It's about honor. Either building Israel happened ideology of historical falsehood and mythology or Pius XII was a Holocaust denier and morally criminal. Israel and the Vatican cannot both be right.

4. NAZISM AND ZIONISM, HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE?

Many people believe that Nazism and Zionism are opposing ideologies, but the reality is that they are largely identical. They are both founded on nationalism and racism. Hitler admired the Zionists and tried to lead the German Jews to Palestine in the 30s. In this context Eichman collaborated with the Zionist Stern Group in the British occupation area of Palestine. Unfortunately, this cooperation succeeded and the result was the German Jewish persecution and the Holocaust.

Historic cooperation

In fact, the similarity between the two ideologies are so great that in most part of the time Hitler came to power in 1933 and Germany's collapse in 1945, existed excellent cooperation between Zionism and Nazism leaders. The reason was simply that both parties were of the view that the Jews belonged to a single race and that race fit so poorly in European culture that the Jews should have their own place, their own nation. From the Zionist's point of view it was a question, of course, to create a place where people were free from persecution. Seen from the Nazi vision's angle it was about to liberate Europe from the people who - after German opinion - was the cause of what they had lost the First World War and which for centuries had created problems in European societies. The grounds were so different, but the goal was the same.

The Zionist-Nazi cooperation was reflected in Haàvarah Agreement in 1933 (1), where senior representatives of Zionism in Palestine and Nazism in Germany agreed to jointly do what they could to promote the emigration of German Jews to Palestine. This Agreement confirmed Hitler, as late as 1938, where he underlined that it should be respected. In this way, he hoped to empty Germany for Jews via a move to Palestine; the same goal as the Zionists.

The collaboration between Nazis and Zionists also continued during the war itself, but now under new forms. Hitler used, namely the one elected by Jews the council ("Judenrat") (2) as a partner to gather the Jews before they were transported to concentration camps. The members of these councils thought probably that these camps were merely collecting points, from where they were to be sent into permanent exile, and precisely this was also Hitler's original desire. The fact that, for a large part of them, did not go as they thought was caused by the development of the war and in that the resulting conditions, which resulted in that Hitler could not achieve his objective. Many of the Jews had to be sent to concentration camps, where they died of disease and starvation.

Based on ancient religions

Both Nazism and Zionism are based on ancient religions. It is well known that Zionism is based on the Jewish religion, but truth is that even Nazism and its view on humanity has gathered inspiration from an old religion, namely Brahmanism, which today is also called Hinduism. It was no accident that Hitler chose the Hindu symbol for Sun as its logo and a landmark for European Brahmins, also called the "Aryan race".

In Sanskrit, the word "Arya" to a people is "civilized" and Hitler theorists believed, like many of today's orientalists that this breed was once emigrated from the Russian steppes to Europe and to India (3), where they are now represented the highest caste (Brahman). These people, believed Hitler, should also in Europe represent the highest

caste. It had actually done for centuries, but now this superiority should entirely be worshipped, and the competing breeds eliminated. All this can be read in Mein Kampf.

Even though Nazism took inspiration from Hinduism, does not however mean that Nazism can be called a religion in the usual sense, because it was primarily a German national ideology. Race doctrine apparently had certain features in common with the faith that underlies the Indian caste system, but Hitler fetched not its ideology exclusively from Brahmanism, but also from contemporary racial and National Romantic writers such as Frenchman Arthur de Gobineau and the Englishman Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who both wrote great books on the white supremacist.

Racism and Supremacism

A strong similarity between Nazism and Zionism is found in the humanity in the two ideologies. Both are based on the notion that there is one people or race that rises above the rest of the planet population in moral quality. Hitler felt that it was the Aryan and the religious Zionists believed that it was the Jews.

It was the belief in this superiority, that there was justification for Nuremberg laws in 1935, which cut off all non-Aryans their rights and prohibited any form of genetic miscegenation between Jews and non-Jews. Hitler wanted Jews emigrated from Germany and moved to Palestine, and he collaborated with the early Zionist movement to get the Jews out of Germany.

Israel is in fact the Jews modern ghetto. The purpose of the medieval ghetto system was - from the Jewish side - to ensure that Jews would not assimilate and marry goys (non-Jews) (4) and the purpose of the Zionist state is largely the same. God's chosen people cannot remain selected if they freely marry and have children with the inferior races, so that's why intermarriage is the greatest sin a Jew can commit according to rabbinical teachings.

This fear of assimilation is also the reason that most Jews in Israel oppose the only realistic solution to their conflict with the indigenous people in the area that today is called Israel, namely the Palestinians. This solution is of course that all settle in Israel and in the Israeli-occupied territories, forms a common state, where there is democracy, where you also ensure members of both two major religions of their own sovereign rights. This solution would have the majority of the Palestinians and the Arab countries' support to happen, but the Jews are afraid. They will not be a small figure in "our own state", as they say. But the alternative to this is not existing it may not be possible to establish a sovereign Palestinian state that can live in the shadow of Israel.

Victim mythology

Both Zionism and Nazism are based on victim mythologies. To Hitler it was the First World War and the Treaty of Versailles (1919) that was the reasons for taking his understanding of Germany as being a historically victim. He believed that the Jews had betrayed the Germans by helping the British to get the United States involved in the war, which had led to the German defeat and the loss of the German peripheral areas. Therefore, it was the confrontation with the Versailles Treaty and its provisions on German war reparations and limits on German military and merchant fleet, which was Hitler's main concern. He believed that resorting researchers had been victims of an

international conspiracy and that this justified a German rearmament to get justice "restored". Germany should do away with its victimhood.

For Israelis, it is also the confrontation with the role of victim, which is the fundamental driving force. It is believed that the Jews have been persecuted for 2,000 years, and that this persecution culminated in the so-called "Holocaust" during WW2. In the Israeli state's first year, the Zionists believed that European Jews had not done sufficient resistance against the persecution, and they therefore did not want to remember the events during World War 2, as you almost ashamed. But after the war in 1967, when Hollywood redefined the Holocaust mythology, Zionists also began to reinterpret these events and instead began to sacralize Holocaust, which was now portrayed as the universally unique event that would unite all the Jews in the world and all the world's peoples, regardless of cultural and religious attitudes.

As Hollywood produced a number of films and television series, which produced the Jewish version of persecution during World War 2, the concept of "Holocaust" now became the central concept in the modern history of WW2 and any refusal to believing in this mythology was in the countries where the Jews dominated the press, made into a criminal act or identical to social exclusion.

Therefore, no one could challenge the correctness of the Jews' understanding of this event without being immediately met with the accusation of being Anti- or Holocaust denier, which - by Jewish rhetoric standard - is among the worst names a person can get attached to.

As the only religion in the world Judaism and its understanding of history was now made unassailable. Anyone can freely deny Jesus' existence or tell that the Virgin Mary was a whore. One can also argue that Muhammad was a terrorist, without this punishment of judicial court consequences. But if one asserts that the figure 6 million is a propagandistic exaggeration, then one can be prosecuted in a number of European countries. And if it is up to the international Jewish interest groups (ADL, JDL, etc.), these laws would apply worldwide. Criticism of the Jews must be prohibited.

Democracy for the chosen

When it comes to the perception of what democracy is we find big similarities between Zionism, Israel and Nazi Germany.

When Hitler came to power in 1933 he forbade the Social Democrats and the Communist Party, and shortly hereafter he passed a law that gave him - all alone - the right to issue future laws, without the need for approval by the political parties in parliament. Hereafter several parliamentary elections were not held.

Likewise, one does not - contrary to what the Western Israel apologists claim - no democracy in Israel. Certainly there will be periodic elections, but there are race specific limits to which political decisions are legal (5). The Israeli lawmakers have namely made sure to move a number of sharing decisions, which in other states would imply to the given law authority, out of the parliament. This functionality is performed by Jewish organizations such as the Jewish Agency and the Jewish National Fund, thereby ensuring e.g. more than 90% of the land can only be owned by Jews, which are making Arab citizens of Israel (approximately 750,000) are not able to have the opportunity to support themselves otherwise than as wage laborers in the Jewish

businesses. The legislation gives freedom and economic opportunities for the Jews, but not for the Arabic population living in Israel, and not the Palestines in the occupied territories, which - because of the blockade and Israeli terror - not even have the opportunity to build sustainable livelihoods, and are therefore dependent on being able to work in the occupying power's businesses and agriculture.

Relationship with the world's community

Neither the Nazis nor Zionists like the international co-operation. In connection with the Treaty of Versailles it was decided to create a League that would unite all the nations of the world and make any future wars impossible by calling for negotiation and arbitration in connection with any national conflicts. When Hitler came to power in 1933, he reported, however, Germany out of the League of Nations, and the world's society therefore had limited means to restrain Germany and prevent the conflicts that led to WW2.

The same attitude to the world community, Israel has shown since the war in 1967. It did not resign from the UN, but in return it was clearly shown that it did not respect the decisions taken in this organization. After the 1967 war, the UN Security Council therefore endorsed Resolution no. 242, which requires Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories, but even today - 45 years later – it has not abided by this. It has neither abided by more than 50 other UN resolutions and statements, made on the occupation of the Palestinian territories, and on Israel's treatment of the Palestinians and the Palestinian prisoners of war. Of course one have neither signed the international agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, while one continuously complain about the great danger, which is thought to be found in the fact that in Iran (which has signed this Agreement) nuclear power plants are built.

Love of animals

So everything does not stand out too negative, it is here relevant to highlight a similarity between Zionism and Nazism, which the two ideologies are individually very proud of. It is about the relationship with animals.

The Nazis were very much in favor of animal protection. Hitler was a vegetarian, a decision he took due to his love for animals was so great that he could not bear to eat them. For the same reason it was one of the first laws that the Nazis introduced, when they had come to power, a law on animal protection, including a ban on animal testing, a ban on hunting with dogs, and a ban on cooking live lobsters for eating.

The corresponding love of animals, we also find in Zionism's religion, Judaism (6). Israel is one of the countries in the world where there is stringent punishment for animal cruelty (3 years in prison) and where the public interest in the protection of animals is strongest.

Closure

I have cited some points which make it possible to compare Nazism and Zionism, not only in terms of human nature, but also in terms of actual policy that the two ideologies supporters follow. Naturally these two ideologies unfold during different historical conditions, and therefore there is a difference between the way in which they express themselves and the way the international community responds. The main difference

between the two ideologies is probably the degree of control and influence that their followers have over the international press and media industry. The Nazis would very much like to keep the peace with England and the United States, but they did not have any necessary means to influence public opinion in these countries.

Zionism has not this corresponding problem today. Never has the international news media been so concentrated on one country, and never has a single religion (Judaism) and a single nation (Israel) had an impact on the world's greatest power the United States, as is the case today. The role of Zionism's supporters play in the center of international media, is of such a magnitude (7), that you can question whether or not there at all exists a free debate in the US and in the so-called "free world". The Western media coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is so one-sided that one cannot wonder that frustration and fanaticism that are spreading in the Arab and Muslim world. Democratic debate cannot happen, when one party in the conflict owns and dominates the media where this debate should take place. And without free debate, we will never hear the truth. The Western world's political democracies have long ago lost their moral legitimacy.

There is therefore no reason to wonder that the Islamic world feels frustrated. If one should wonder, it should rather be about the US and the Neo-Christen world have in a low degree have been able to see themselves through the lenses, the Palestinians and other gathered tribes must view Western societies and their "freedom" through.

Democracy just does not work. It is sad to note, but like the international community could not control Nazism, it can and it will not control Zionism. Nazism led to WW2, and the Zionists have long expressed a desire to start the third world war with a bombardment of Iran. Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya have already been bombed; the countries are destroyed and a few million people have died. But Israel is not satisfied. Just as Hitler was seized by hubris when he unstoppable occupied Austria, Poland and France, the right extreme Jews in Israel had the same optimism. The enemy is Arab and Muslim countries and all countries that do not follow the American's will, which is expressed in the controlled press. Denmark is of course expected to be available in this game and the Danish politicians have shown that they are willing to do it. They claim indeed to be supporters of democracy and the freedom of speech, and officially they have banned racism and torture. But when it comes down to serving the American-Israeli men, then all these reservations are totally irrelevant. And then the dog wags its tail and follows his master commands.

Notes:

- 1) Matzen, p. 52
- 2) Matzen, d. 103ff
- 3) Rasmus Reinvang: What exactly is an Indian arias? (Time Recorders f tet TABU, 01/09/99)
- 4) Shahak, p. 21 and 43.
- 5) Rosenberg, Görab: Ethnocracy or democracy? (Information on April 20, 2002)

6) Jewish Values, p. 188 ("Cruelty to animals")

7) See Weber (bibliography). There are a variety of other American publications that illuminate the Jewish domination of the American-international press, but this information is not produced in European media, and certainly not in the Danish.

5. HOLOCAUST MYTHOLOGY AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

Holocaust is not needed to be discussed here. It is discussed other places, and the prerequisite for understanding the present text is not a belief in one or the other position in this discussion. Whatever you believe, it is a fact that just the story of the Holocaust is the only history that a people living in the western world cannot make dubious of, without it having serious personally consequences for them. One can doubt the existence of Jesus, think Earth is flat, that Elvis is alive, that people are robots and the moon is made of green cheese. All this belongs to the category "point of views". If one expresses one of these points of views, one can perhaps expect to be greeted with criticism, but no one will deny the right to think as you want, and no one would dream of suggesting that they should be put in prison for expressing this point of view.

The situation is different with the Holocaust. Just to imply a critic about the policy of the historical reality behind the phenomenon, to the express a desire of scientific study of the so-called gas chambers or of the alleged burial sites is sufficient for a person to be barred. And it has consequences. In many European countries, which claim to have freedom of speech, they put you in jail for believing this way. In other such as Denmark, you lose your job, his social reputation and its ability to receive public grants and financial support for your work, if you are a writer. You become so demonized and deprived of your livelihood, and therefore it is also only a few people who have the courage - and the desire - to get more into the facts that the historical revisionism supports. Those who do, is distinctly individualistic and it's usually people with a good academic education and with considerable personal courage. They know the consequences, and yet seek the truth.

But there are also those who earn money to get involved in the Holocaust and mysteries in this respect. They are the ones who have made it their task to "disprove" Holocaust deniers. There are lots of money and good positions in this, and you can be sure of fame and social honor, at least if you live in Europe, Israel or the United States. Priests have always a good pay, even when the gospel as preached is secular, since it is the secular beliefs which are the contemporary key religion. Whether you are Christian, Muslim or Buddhist does not matter, for it is only a question of when and how to pray and how to look at metaphysical questions as the unity of God and eternal life. There is no other who can worry about, because it is an entirely private matter, which in no way affects others.

But what to think about its own history, not least on Hitler's hatred against the Jews, it is absolutely essential. For the faith of the Holocaust is the same thing as faith in Americans' moral superiority and Jewish eternal sufferings of injustice that has given them such a moral-capital that they can afford to do pretty much as they please in the nuclear-armed Israel, where it is claimed that they have sought refuge.

The myth of the Holocaust is today the moral basis, on which the United States unfolds its power. Without the Holocaust there had been no occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq and without this it would perhaps a coming war against Iraq would not have been possible. For these operations, and numerous others that the United States has implemented in the last 20 years, have all served to protect the good, namely "freedom and democracy", that is, as those terms are interpreted by American politicians. And these politicians agree that the United States is the defender of freedom and representative of all true good. At the same time, you are called by higher powers to

fight evil in a chaotic world, simply because it is the only nation that has the military means to do this.

The proof that the United States has such ideal motives behind its behavior one will find in the Americans' interpretation of their own history, most recently as it has developed in the fight against the two forms of evil, which is thought to have defeated, namely Nazism and Communism. Both of these authoritarian powers were overcome by the Americans, they believe themselves, but in their own way. Hitler was defeated because the Americans chose to enter the war, and Communism was defeated (peacefully) by demonstrating to the oppressed Eastern Europeans that one could live much better and become much richer under a capitalist regime.

But the important thing in this process is not just that the Americans have won. The interesting thing is who they overcame. And it is a common perception in the US and the rest of the Judeo-Christian world that the greatest evil as history has demonstrated was Hitlerism, and the reason for this evil was greater than all the others, was the so-called Holocaust. The Communists were ridiculous, as leaders in any authoritarian society usually are, but they exterminated not innocent Jews by the millions, just because of their ethnic incapacity. Therefore, it is not so many moral plus points to have cleared out Communism. On the other hand, the Americans assign themselves abundantly for having defeated Hitler. That is actually what the Russians, who provided the major contribution (90% of fatalities) in this regard, the Americans know nothing about. But what matters in this context is the image that the Americans have of Hitler. He was the "most evil of all", it is believed, because of the history about the mass murder of innocent Jews was due to him. Therefore, those who defeated evil are, of course, the greatest of all. It's pure logic. The Americans see themselves as the world's saviors and defenders of freedom. Certainly, they have occupied and defeated numerous democratically elected regimes in the past 50 years, but it does not count. What matters is that they - as they see it - stopped the Holocaust. That's what gives them the moral superiority and sense of Supremacism.

It is based on a simple drama model. Hitler was the persecutor, the Jews were the victims and the Americans were rescuers. Persecutor, victim and rescuer is the model that most cinematic entertainment is based on, and the American world view - the view of the global theater - has the same structure.

If not Hitler - as alleged - had exterminated 6 million Jews in the gas chambers, he had in fact not been bad. Then he had just been a state leader who tried to unite the German peoples and to find a place for the German nation in an English dominated world. It was the same thing that we fought for in World War 1, and after that war there was no one who claimed that the Germans were evil. They had lost, and they had to pay because it was believed that it was them who had started the war, but the Germans were not - morally - worse than all the others.

Things were different in the Second World War. Here, the Allies agreed that Germany should be dishonored and was to be held down for a long time to come. That is why they made the Nuremberg Trials and therefore sentenced Germany's leaders of racial genocide. Less could not do it when you had set a target to disgrace a nation, and ensure that this nation did not grow strong again for years to come. Nevertheless, there were also other proposals about how the problem could be solved at least if you read the American press. Some argued that Germany should be abolished as a state, others that Germans should be castrated and others again that they all should be killed. It was

discussed in London and Washington, and newspaper articles and books were written, where the advantages of this and the other suggestion were compared. But one chose, to follow the strategy as recommended by mass bombardments (mass murder) on the civilian population, and when the war was finally over, they decided to hold the international Nuremberg trial, with the aim of compromising Hitler, Hitlerism and the German ideology all.

Both managed extremely well. The Germans have not been the same since 1945, and one may ask oneself whether or not a German culture exists today. Only, however, when it comes to language and eating habits, but hardly in terms of philosophy, history and religion.

Germany became never itself again, and probably will not in the near future. And we are many who think that is a good thing, because German-Semitism, we do not care about. Nationalism and racism neither.

In Germany, the Holocaust is a fundamental myth that no one shall offend. No other country in the world has such harsh laws against those who question the Holocaust story, and the starting point of these laws is that you do not judge people based on whether what they have said is true or untrue, but from what they say, whether it's true or not. A statement, which the Zionist rulers in Germany, does not like, is always illegal in Germany, whether or not it is a historical or scientific truth.

Racism is illegal, and the definition of racism in Germany is that a statement is a nuisance to Israel and its friends in Germany. Those who manifested such will be put in jail, and their books are, of course forbidden to either buy or read, and it is forbidden to make websites - wherever in the world you are - who question the German understanding. The methods are tougher than those Hitler used, but unlike the situation in the 30s, the German's though-criminals have only a few places where they can escape to. Some have tried to flee to countries that claim to defend freedom of expression, namely the UK and USA. But they have faced deportation.

Holocaust is the fundamental myth that the West's political self-image based on. When Israel and the United States today are vying to threaten Iran with bombing and destruction, it's - formally - because Iran is trying to develop civilian nuclear power. In reality, the reasons are probably rather that Iran - the only country in the world - has dared to put spaces for a conference of the so-called "Holocaust deniers", as in December 2006 could meet in Tehran for two days and discuss their opinions, without fear of arrest, which would happen in any of the so-called "democratic" countries in Europe.

Holocaust kills. The fact that you are the World's leading "victims" leads - accordingly many Jews - to believe that one is morally defensible, and hence you can do as you please. Therefore, can or dares no nation in the world to force Israel to comply with international conventions of warfare, as other countries have to respect. There is no international war tribunal which dare arrest the Israeli conductors, although they in more than 40 years has kept Palestinian land occupied and although they regularly colonize more and more of this country and in this context bombs and kill civilians and defense those citizens who are living in the occupied territories. Israel is untouchable, which any politician in the Western world knows. If you are not a friend of Israel, you cannot possibly become president of the United States, which the current ongoing campaign clearly shows when the candidates have to participate in a meeting in the

Jewish AIPAC to promise allegiance and loyalty to Israel, regardless of the politics of this state chooses to lead.

The end justifies the means. The Americans and Israelis believe that what they stand for is better than what all others stand for. The Americans were the rescuers and the Israelis were the victims, when the world's most evil man tried to dominate the world. Therefore, they have the right to do as they please and all who dare to protest will initially be vilified as being "Anti-Semites" and "racists" and thus they become marginalized socially. If this is not enough, then there will be other measures. And by then would not they already have become "terror of residues", and thus should be imprisoned and tortured without trial or at least recorded so that authorities in the future can keep an eye on them? Yes, there are many ways to scare citizens, and all this is justified because it is exercised by those who were victims or saviors in the Great War; a war which still is simply identified by many as being the Holocaust. Did anything whatsoever happen apart from this in 1940-45?

One of the biggest lies that the proponents of Holocaust are trying to fool people into it is that this story is internationally recognized and that all believe in it. It does not fit. The mythology of the Holocaust and its dramatic consequences is something that is beneficial to the Western countries, and it is perfectly in other countries. We are not naive, and you know that it is the victors who wrote history, and they do it with the purpose to achieve a part of it, both economically, politically, morally and militarily. Therefore, one looks with great skepticism on the history of the Holocaust. In most countries school books does not mention this event, and it does not exist in leading encyclopedias and official and semi-official institutions in many countries which do not belong to the Western sphere of influence. We know that Holocaust is part of the West mythology, and this story has the goal to make the West - especially the United States - morally invulnerable. It does not quite succeed, but it helps.

This folk wisdom exists of course especially in the Middle East, where the history of the Holocaust is the moral reason for Israel has been allowed to rearm with nuclear weapons and to use US military technology that has enabled them to win all their wars and to dominate its neighboring states. Therefore, the prospect of a signed peace agreement and a settlement of the Palestinian issue is nowhere to be seen. Two states which is living side by side, it's an impossibility the Jews will never let the Palestinians have a total area that can accommodate a viable nation. And one unified state where all can live together the Israelis does not want this. They are afraid of a "new Holocaust" they say.

Therefore, everything continues as it does. The third world war is already underway, and it will continue for many more years. It has its moral source in Auschwitz and it fought hardest in the Middle East. But it will be fought everywhere on Earth. And an end to this war cannot be seen. Once again the good are fighting the evil, and from a Western point of view, there is no doubt about who is who. If one is in doubt, it is certainly wise to keep one's mouth shut, because they do not want to create any doubt about where their loyalty belongs to. The new war is also a Holocaust, and it is today. The millions who die in Africa because of disease and malnutrition could be saved if only a small part of America's gigantic military budget was used for developing aid. But it does not happen, because in the fight to avoid "more Holocausts" the ones in power are unfortunately blind to the Holocaust, which happens today, especially in Palestine, in Africa and in the world other poor and underdeveloped religions.

There, where people do not have the freedom to decide for themselves, and where a functioning society cannot be built up. Where, hunger, disease, war and injustice are the only reality that people know. Where, the real victims of the Holocaust are living. Not the myth of the Holocaust, but the historical reality.

6. WHAT IS RACISM?

Racism is where the doctrine that the individuals of a particular race is morally superior to the individuals of a different race. When it comes to animals, then the racist teachings beneficial as it helps us to understand the animals and their quirks and to use them for what they are good at. A cat is good at catching mice and a horse is good to ride on. It's not necessarily that a cat worth more than a horse, or vice versa, but teaches us to teach us to acquire the animals that we need.

When it comes to people the case is quite different. No one would deny that there are different categories within humans, and some choose to designate these categories as races. But when it comes to people, so is the doctrine of these are researching I just sadly through the ages been abused to such an extent that one must reject race-concept as such. It is not to compatible with that good morals, human or Christian faith to believe that there are some people who are worth more than others, the notion that some are better, leads necessarily to discrimination, enemies, Nationalism and Supremacism.

Once we even talking about that man has a value, then this expression has threesome meaning.

1. Human has a value of production, i.e. the value as power of production. Human creates value for society.
2. Human has a family value, i.e. the social and economic importance it has in the family and in the social milieu.
3. Human has an absolute value, i.e. the value that one presumes in relation to a metaphysical element, which we call God.

Racism claims that human value in the first two of these categories depends on what breed it belongs, and therefore racists believes that it is appropriate that members of different races live separately, so as not to impede or interfere with each other. To the extent that there is a racial mixing in a given nation, racists say that this is destroying the nation, and children who have individual parents from two different races respectively father and mother, they perceive as failure (" bastards ") similar to dogs whose genetic ancestry is mixed.

But there is a difference between animals and humans. Racism makes sense in the case of animals, but not in the case of humans. The question is where does this doctrine originate from? And here the answer is not difficult to find, because racism is rooted in all of the world's major religions, even in spite of these religious often - on the surface - do everything to distance themselves from what they call racism. In fact, racism is so closely grown along with the religions that most of these religions do not recon their thinking as being racist. But it is that.

Christianity and Islam are - in a sense - racist religions, because due to one distinguishes morally between animals and humans. Animals and humans belong to - according to biology - different species and thus different breeds. So if you believe that a person has moral precedence over an animal, then you are in a sense a racist. You build at least a moral decision on a classification system that is created by people and therefore - hardly

by coincidence - counts people as the highest stage of development of the biological ladder.

While it is clear to Christians and Muslims that people are equal before God, then it is equally clear to the followers of these religions, that a man is always of higher value than an animal. It is therefore morally acceptable to kill animals for food, or if you think that could use its entrails for medical purposes. Even an unborn human being would most followers of these religions believe is of higher value than a monkey. Not because the fetus has developed higher intelligence or better sensory properties, but simply because it is human. Christianity and Islam can well be described as racist religions, but the racism that I am talking about is not the one we usually think of when we use that term. Perhaps we instead should call it "species-ism" as the boundary goes between species, animals and people. But to distinguish and discriminate species makes it necessary to discriminate races, when a race is a subcategory to the nature (according to Wikipedia).

Two other of the great religions are also racist, of course, without wanting to admit it openly. It is about Hinduism and Judaism.

In Hinduism people believe that man is reborn (reincarnated) and that the same soul, thus live through a number of life-changing bodies. Some believe that the human soul only reincarnated in humans, while others believe that the same souls can travel from rock to animals and humans. As for another second metaphysics it applies that one should not ask too many critical issues for a concept that is just as difficult to defend in rational terms, as it is to explain the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. What matters is also not to understand the teachings of reincarnation rationally, but in contrary to view it in relation to the concept of racism. Because reincarnation doctrine says that the souls who live a worthy life will be reborn at a higher level, and to those who live poorly, will be reborn at a lower level. Therefore, Hinduism followers are not outraged by the social differences and the "injustice" found in India and other places where the teachings of reincarnation are widespread. The differences, which is between people is not an expression of the society is bad, but that some people do not deserve to live better than they do, and that the suffering they have to experience, is a part of a cleansing process that they necessarily have to go through. It is therefore not (officially) an expression of racism when untouchables not have the same rights as the Brahmins in India, but a sign that these people are reborn at a lower level and that they have a debt to be paid. They must of course be happy that they even have been born, but they also need to know that life is a kind of exam where you have to do your best, if you want to be reincarnated on a higher level next time. Complaints and social redistribution is of no use, for no one can put the laws of the universe out of power. Some people does simply not deserve to live better than they do, because they have sinned in past lives and they can only hope that their good deeds in this life will lead them higher up in the spiritual hierarchy in the future.

Judaism is also racist although most would rather not talk about it. Here it is namely believed that the Jews are a special people with common DNA that God has chosen and has equipped with special moral rights over other people (goys). How this particularity works, there are different opinions about, but in both Torah (Old Testament) and the Talmud there remains no doubt about that all that stands in the way of Jewish prosperity, should suffer death and in recent times there have been examples the rabbis who has declared that - acc. Talmud - it was allowed for a Jew to kill a non-Jew if he needed to use his kidney.

Unfortunately, it is precisely the Talmudic embossed Zionism, which has been the leading political force in Israel through a number of years, and the consequence of this teaching is that you think you have a moral right to put ones beyond the norms that the world community otherwise profess (human rights). Therefore, you have nuclear weapons, therefore one uses torture, thus one is occupying a foreign country and therefore one continuously threatens the surrounding states with war actions. Israel is for the same reasons the only state in the world today, where it is legislative ruled that only members of a particular ethnicity (people with a Jewish mother) have full civil rights. Others – e.g. Arabs - have the right to live and work in the country, but they do not have full right to vote, own land and thus to protect their own interests.

Closure

Racism is not a dead ideology that exists only in the stories in the history books it is actually omnipresent in all major religions. What the difference is between these religions is solely what kind of racism, they advocate for. It is in all cases to some races are raised above the other in moral terms, and that they therefore have the right to use, abuse, oppress and kill the others if it is to their advantage. Racists say that this is how things work in the animal kingdom, which they are right about. The animals eat each other and feel nobody feels due to this reason that the animals are "evil". They do, however, only as they are programmed, and one cannot change that. It's the natural order.

The racism that is present in today's debate is about the racism that claims to part of mankind which is chosen by God and thus equipped with higher moral rights than others. Those who say this usually belong to this segment, and the kind of racism they practice is evil because it legitimizes differences in treatment, humiliation, discrimination and genocide. It is this kind of racism that the thinking man - in my opinion - must dismiss. I do not pretend into that one should be able to prove - scientifically - that "racism is wrong" because science is occupied with objective facts, and not values. It is of course open to anyone to claim that he and his genetic peers are particularly lofty. Whether this is true or not, can neither be proved nor disproved.

But the racism era is over. As time passes, it becomes more and clearer to me that the world we live in need cooperation between nations and between the different peoples. Everyone should be allowed to believe that their nation, culture and religion is better than all the others, and it is certainly inevitable that some people think this way. But in a time when democracy is ideal and where our common future as people depends on our ability to cooperate, then the racist thinking is rejected. Because racism and the resulting emitted Supremacism is not a possible basis for cooperation across nations and cultures, and such cooperation is the ideal that we must seek.

Although all religions in one form or another is racist, it's still my contention that racism is against God's will. In each case, each of us choose whether we want to live a life based on respect for other people and focusing on what all people have in common, or whether we will focus on the differences. If God exists, there is reason to believe that we are all equal because we are all created by him. So we individually have our destination in life and our vocation. But if God does not exist, then it might be different, then it is man himself who determines the values that everything must be judged upon. So I think, unfortunately, that the strong will dominate, and the weak will be discriminated just as racists have a wish for. But it has no benefit, because, racism leads

to Supremacism. Furthermore, supremacism leads to nationalism and nationalism to war. And we do not need this.

What we need is knowledge and belief that we have a common assignment that can only be resolved if we are united and if the strong helps the weak. Who is best, is irrelevant, because it is about the angle on which the issue is viewed from. What it is all about in the future is the ability to see similarities. We humans are increasingly in the same boat, and therefore, we do well to act together. When racism is dangerous, it is precisely because it makes the community impossible. It divides people into categories, which one categorizes as good and less good. But what the times requires is not fragmentation but gathering. In a globalized world with the pollution, resource abuse and danger of war, we simply need to stand together if we want to survive.

7. THE GERMAN DISEASE

Introduction

Let me say it openly: I do not like Germany, as it is today. I do not share many Danes' admiration for our great neighbor, and I do not think that this neighbor has changed its moral character since the last war, which cost 60 million lives. Not because that Germany today is a threat to its neighbors, but because Germany today is an enforced nation that allows itself to use and abuse the goals that have nothing to do with German interests and even less for the benefit of the world which Germany is a part of. The Germans are idealists, but they are also opportunists. They talk their master by mouth, whether he is in Washington or Tel Aviv. And he does.

My negative attitude to the German contemporary culture does not mean that I am blind to the greatness that Germany has created in the past. Some of the world's greatest composers, philosophers and theologians are of German origin. I am also aware that the German culture is the core of which is envisaged for European culture, and thus also in European exile culture that is the foundation of modern America. My prejudices against the German have nothing to do with that I decry the role that Germany has played in the civilian conditioned humanity over the last thousand years. No, all that I do acknowledge. The very fact that the two most significant showdowns with power - Reformation and the Marxist labor movement - was created in Germany, says something about this nation's potential. And the fact that the Catholic Church's showdown with reformers (Council of Trent) and the capitalists' showdown with Marxism (Nazism) took place in this country shows that the Germans not only deliver the thinkers who inspired rebellion, but also those who are in able to shut this rebellion down again. The German ideology is powerful, no matter which way it moves, and my aversion to it now as being Germany has not anything to do with this ideology, but they are against its absence. For the Germany we know today, is today an enforced, unworthy and ill nation whose citizens who do not have freedom to think and speak, and whose view of itself is marked by non-knowledge, displacement and stupefaction. The Germans do not know their own past, because they may not know it. They know they lost a war, but what this war was about and what the consequence of the defeat was about, they know little about. They think that the war was only about money, which is why they put it behind them, Germany today is a rich nation, as they have always been in peacetime. And what the war has cost, besides from material damages, they know nothing about. They must and dare not know their own past, and the fear of being smarter is so great that the production of knowledge is prohibited. One put up with copying the writing from the books that the new rulers produce, and one might feel ashamed. Not about contributing to intellectual counterfeit goods, because one is scarcely aware about that one might be doing this. One is ashamed of his own story.

It is the winners of the war who write history, so it is no wonder that German history is not written by Germans. At least not the Germans who feel in accordance with German tradition, this tradition have been largely rejected. Today one is looking for a new identity, and judging by German television and mass media, it is in the Christian, Catholic and - not least - the Jewish, one attempt to find new sources of power.

The present German culture and identity I will allow myself to describe as being sick, but I do not mean that any German qualifies for a psychiatric diagnosis, or that this disease could be cured through psychological therapy or medication. The German

sickness is rooted in German culture, which can rightly be called a loser culture, a culture that is ashamed of itself and that is so weak that it cannot even bear to hear the utterances of its own critics. Any encounter with the truth triggers panic attacks and uncontrolled anger, and these indications are recognized in general psychology to be sufficient for a patient to be declared sick. For when one's personality is so fragile that a single word can cause it to collapse, then there is something wrong. Was it about a single individual, one would recommend the doctor and medication, but when it comes to an entire nation, as the disease has become the norm, and no one sees it, in fact, in the same way as a fish cannot see the very water it swims in. Only when the German meet people from other countries, rooted in a different cultural context, they can see that they are missing something. They are different, but not in a good way. When you travel you see why the Germans isolate themselves amongst other Germans. They do not want to experience too close contact with others, because they are afraid. They know that it can be dangerous to talk to other people, and they know that other people have a negative view of them. Therefore, they protect themselves, and it is understandable. But unfortunately this is not the way to get healed, because healing requires freedom and openness, and that is what the Germans do not dare. They are best within its spiritual darkness. Anything but this makes them afraid

Let's look at the German pathology in point form:

Self Image

The German self-image is characterized by feelings of guilt and of denial. The Germans believe - or pretend to believe - that their parents and grandparents have exterminated 6 million Jews in gas chambers. The remembrance of anything else that the Great War has to do with is disappearing, but the faith of the Holocaust is as strong as ever, despite the fact that the concept was firstly known by ordinary Germans in the late 70s in connection with the launch of a Hollywood series with this name. And the Germans' understanding of their own history, dating mostly from Hollywood productions that appear again and again in German cinemas and TV channels. Hitler produced in his 12-year re-delegation period three anti-Jewish film but the American film industry has during the corresponding period produced no less than 1000 movies and documentaries, which should serve to criticize and denigrate the German culture and disseminating an image of the Germans as a nation of anti-Semites and mass murderers. And these films have greatly helped to create the Germans' self-image, and thus the modern German identity - as regards to the past - is characterized by discontinuity. The Germans are trying to oust the period of their history that they are ashamed of, they dare not learn too much of it. What was the reason for the Nazi's evil, and what does it actually consisted of, no one knows and no one who dares to ask about. You know the answer in advance: I know nothing of anything and I will not talk about it. Do not ask again, and do not be too critical, because then one suggests that you are anti-Semitic. Which you probably do not want to be?

The Germans know themselves as those who gassed 6 million Jews. Every German could tell that his ancestors had no part in this crime, but no one will deny that it took place, and that it was done by his countrymen. And it is precisely these 6 million Jews who are the major moral problem for the Germans. The fact that at the same time, 48 million Catholics, Orthodox, Muslims, Gypsies, Africans and others were slaughtered has no interest. For in recent German history - just like in the old - there are people who are worth more than others. It was what Hitler believed in, and I think you still do in Germany today. The only difference between the old and the new racism is the order of

the hierarchy. Those who were at the bottom of Hitler, the ones which he calculated as the nation's enemies, are now those who you have to show reverence for today. They are the ones who no one dares to speak against, those who we are building museums and memorials for in the German towns and those who can receive billions of Euros in compensation. This is despite the fact that these people - the Israelis - not yet has paid anything in compensation to the Palestinians as they drove out when they formed their own state. But there is a crucial moral difference between Jews and Palestinians, any citizen of Israel, and in Germany, of course knows this.

The Germans have introduced rules, which make it prohibited to put doubt on the progress of the last war. A proper research about the war progress - what regards the iconic event - is therefore not taking place, and those who - in their spare time - has tried to make a contribution is in prison. In Germany, one accommodates the grounds on which the Israeli understanding of history suggests. One does not discuss the realities of the Judaic concept, despite the fact that you might even once have heard of the Talmud and its view of the infidels. What is true for the German understanding is what was decided at the Nuremberg Trials after the Great War. This was not a trial the outcome was a foregone conclusion. But even if the world has evolved a lot in the time since then, so the German understanding of history is not changed, and there is no interest in the search for something new. For the Germans know they have powerful enemies, which controls the press in the world's most powerful country, and possessing nuclear weapons, which they probably are not afraid to use should they feel threatened. And the Germans prefer peace over truth, the whole apparatus of the state has the task of ensuring the Germans against the doubt and thus against the danger. Better to live with the lie than to die for the truth. One is still an idealist, but it comes down to more dangerous areas. One is kind to animals and gives generously foreign aid. This – there is nobody who protests against.

For Germans the Holocaust is the inaugural event, and most Germans are proud to live in a nation that has exercised such a gigantic crime. Not because they believe that the crime was legitimate, but because they believe that the size of the crime provides a special honor to those who have confessed to have committed it. It gives memories of the German greatness, also in other areas. And although they do not feel personally responsible for this crime, then they like to brag to others that they are the ones who - according to their own opinion - strongly denounced it.

Just as the Jews thinks it is enough that their grandparents have been two days in a concentration camp for them to describe themselves as "Holocaust survivors", then it is for Germans enough to be a relative of one of Hitler's soldiers, to contribute to their shared responsibility. And when one is responsible, then one has to confess out sin, and they do so with joy. They will then be cleansed and healed, which they believe, and therefore they are simultaneously elevated to a moral level as other Europeans cannot achieve. The Germans have in this way purified their souls. They have said sorry, they have paid the bill and they also benefit from the history of the Holocaust, as the historical backdrop that can attract millions of tourists, thus give good revenue. They see themselves as brave, because they have done away with evil and they see themselves as those who are mostly active of all fighting against the new Nazism, racism and the evil Holocaust deniers. To demonstrate its tolerance, one must put people in jail for their opinions. It is quite natural for a German it was also done in the 30's. But today the struggle has expanded and is common all over the world the Germans are not content to just be stringent in their own country. It has always been too small. Therefore, the citizens of the US, Britain, Australia, Denmark and other countries

are extradited if they violate the rules that apply in the German paradise. For they know very well that not all has gone as far as themselves. Not all places are research prohibited and doubt an offense. Not all places put dissidents in jail. There are other countries where you have the right to question the truths that the Germans must not doubt. And this the Germans obviously do not like.

Shame and megalomania

Mental illness is associated with shame. This shame is on the one hand contributed to the disease, and on the other hand, the expression of it. There is a kind of functional reciprocity between content and symptom in the German sickness. On the one hand one are ashamed over one's own past, but on the other hand, one regards itself as innocent, as the events in the last war must be understood from the humiliation that the defeat in the first war (1914-18) led with it. But, the shame exchanges with its opposite attraction, namely the sense of grandiosity. While one do not want to talk about one's past, then one is proud of - in one's own optic - to have reconciled with this past, and thus earned indulgence for the salvation of his soul. And it should show - preferably very demonstrative - for the entire world. Although people in England and America do not look favorably on Nazism, then one has in these nations still not been restrained from discussion and free information on what the content of this ideology was. Yes, there are actually both British and American-Americans who - today - call themselves Nazis, and it is fully legal, even if other people consider them to be crazy. But such is not the case in Germany, where such individuals are imprisoned. The German self-image is in fact so fragile that it cannot tolerate being reminded of its own roots, because one knows that one has not done away with these roots. Not credible. And therefore the German identity is so fragile, because it rests on suppression. Everyone knows that you cannot effectively remove recollection, eradicating an ideology or prevent people from asking questions, just by putting them as they are afraid of prison, and that is exactly what they do in Germany. Therefore, the sacred narrative is never discussed critically, because it is forbidden. One chooses to see the story as a sacred dogma that no impunity should question.

All German knows the story of Galileo and the medieval witch persecution, so they know that both the church and the public could be mistaken. But for this to happen again, nobody dares to think of, and only the fear of getting in doubt makes you crack down on all history of science, which is not rooted in the doctrine which has been the German credo. As other mentally ill and frail people, they do not tolerate contradiction. It takes only one remark labeling politically incorrect material for a rage to break loose, and the one who has said too much is forced from his job and excluded from the social community. Thinking in Germany is therefore only possible if one is fully capable to keep the outcome of its deliberations for themselves. The slightest wind can get the house of cards to collapse, and the Germans want first and foremost tranquility and prestige among the new rulers whose words and point of views one have chosen to make into law.

If the Germans believe in the mythology that has been regulated, there is reason to doubt. If they really believed in it, as they seek to convince others, so it was hardly necessary to prohibit people to contradict this belief. Most Germans believe that the earth is round, but still it has not been prohibited from claiming that it is flat. Anyone who believes this are allowed to freely expressing themselves, and then the public itself forms its opinion based on their assessment of the validity of the arguments of gravity. But the same cannot be counted for with regards to gas chambers or the sacred

numbers. This requires discipline, and a single sentence that reveals a citizen doubt, is enough to bring him into serious trouble. When the Germans in the spring of 2009 began the law case against the British bishop Richard Williamson, it was because he was in a lengthy interview for half a year ago to a Swedish television crew, where he had expressed doubts about the sacred truths. Not the resurrection of Jesus or the Pope's infallibility, but the number of victims in a Polish concentration camp.

But the Germans are not sure of their own mentality and especially they are uncertain whether the surroundings perceive them in the right way. The fact that somebody doubt on the sacred history has the impact that others need to demonstrate more diligently their commitment to being good towards the victims and thereby to have learned from the past. Nowhere in the world will one find people with the fanatical desire to demonstrate their "anti-fascist" character in attire and behavior like in Germany. Young people obviously want to demonstrate that they are just the opposite of what their grandparents were. The "autonomous" youth movement unfortunately makes small errors that show its content in a deplorable degree. E.g. one uses the same logo as a notorious corps in the 30's (skull on a black background) and using the same violent methods to prevent the ideological counterpart to express them and to hold public meetings. But beyond these unfortunate similarities with Nazism, they do anything possible to distance them from the German past. But when you actually know nothing about the past, other than that it was marked by discipline and persecution of the Jews, thus you have a weak ideological basis. And therein they resemble greatly the ones, which they claim to distancing themselves from.

The banned questions

The list of questions which it is forbidden to ask one or another in Germany is long. There is no official manual for the correct political behavior, but to keep up in the newspapers and by talking to people, you learn it eventually. And the purpose of the many prohibitions there is no doubt about that. The aim is to protect the German population's mental stability.

One of the people that the Germans regard as a saint is the Jewish writer and Nobel laureate Elie Wiesel. He tells in his books that he and his father escaped from Auschwitz, along with the German captors, when the Russians were about to liberate the camp. Why his father chose to flee from the camp just before it was liberated by the Russians, no Germans dare to ask about. Why he fled with his German captors, who - allegedly - would murder him and all other Jews? Is it not illogical? Yes, it probably is to many people, but not for a German. When it comes to Jews, so he knows that he would be wise to keep quiet and pretend that he believes in it.

There are many other questions that Germans are not allowed to ask themselves. Luckily, they have found out that the gigantic crime that their ancestors committed did not happen on German soil. It all happened in Poland, and therefore without the average Germans involvement. It was only the deceitful Poles who knew about the camps demonic and of course the British and Americans, who already from 1942 had decoded the German's signal systems and the Red Cross, who visited the camps several times. But neither Churchill, the Pope (Pius XII) or the Red Cross knew anything about some gas chambers, so the Germans have a good excuse that they did not know anything. But over the years they have obviously become wiser. Today all believe that these gas chambers existed and that 6 million Jews eradicated in them. No German can deny that. And the Germans are responsible. If anything of evil kind

happened in the Nazi period, then the people who fostered this ideology, is to be held responsible. This is accepted by the Germans, and this is why they also have learned to live with the situation, as history has brought them in.

The German sickness cannot be cured, but you can avoid using provocation to the people who suffer from it. This is done by not to talk about certain topics and to avoid asking questions that Germans do not like to answer by example these: Why did the Germans not like Jews? Why did they choose Hitler? What was their (or their parents') personal role in the great crime? All these questions you get no response to because the German sickness is so unpleasant that those who suffer from it have learned to keep their mouth shut. They accept that they are ill and therefore it must be enough. The disease cannot be cured yet, and only time can relieve their guilty conscience.

Closure

The German health involves both culture and individuality. It is not a disease manifested by normal social contact with German researchers, but only when this game - from the German's point of view - is disturbed by non-compliant information. And such non-compliant information is all that consciously or unconsciously strides against the German world view. Every person has a model of the world he lives in, and any culture is based on such a model. It is not something that is special to the Germans. What is special to them, the nature and the conflict-containing and labile in the personality which this world view is built upon.

It is sometimes mentioned that there are Germans who do not believe in the realities behind this so-called Holocaust, but for these the case is not any different than the other. Any clarification can only cause harm to the fragile structure which underlies the German psyche. When the German sees himself threatened by dangerous realization of his past time he draws back and acts introversive and stays among his own. He is afraid of being exposed and afraid to adhere to moral unpleasant facts. One thing is for certain and that is that no matter what the truth is about the great crime - whether it happened as told, or not - then the German suffered a gigantic deception. But this deception no one dares talk about, because it would lead to demands for clear about what the deceived was about and whether it remains in force. And such a claim is dangerous.

Any kind of historical knowledge is - potentially - a threat to the Germans, who prefer to live with their illness in silence, rather than have it diagnosed and brought to light. The traditional psychoanalytic approach to displacement ones accept in theory. Freudianism's father belonged after all to the holy people. But the psychoanalytic practice, bringing displacement to light and to see themselves as they are, in fact, this they do not want to practice. Knowledge hurts, one believes, and it can be dangerous. The price of the German economic success in the post-war times has therefore been an intellectual stagnation. You prefer to live in the kind of innocence that comes from not knowing anything, and not wanting to know anything. Historical and humanities research is therefore not being effectuated in the former so great country, simply because such activities can be dangerous. Germans prefer to live in the darkness, and those who have a different view, they are not afraid to put in jail. Democracy and freedom of speech has probably never existed in Germany, so it's only a few people who are looking for this. The German sickness is therefore not cured the therapy consists of openness, debate and exchange of opinions, exactly the same way as you'll treat patients in psychiatric institutions or in psychological clinics. The difference between the cure, leading to individual healing and leading to national healing, is only

the that pills do not work on an entire nation. And it makes healing more tedious. The best one can recommend is quietness and that is exactly what the Germans prefer. Empty talk and family friendly entertainment, it is what the majority prefer. But you always have hope. Perhaps the children are healthy, even if the parents were sick? Mental illness is not always hereditary in the same way as other ailments, so some believe that there will be changes in the future. Maybe the Germans once will be mature enough for freedom, but it's hard to spot a light ahead. The disease has lasted for 60 years and still more are wondering: When will the Germans be allowed to think freely?

8. WHAT IS THE HOLOCAUST CULTURE?

The part of the world we live in has many names, as it has been given by its friends and enemies: "The Western world", "the Christian world", "the free world", "the democratic world", "the secularized world" or "the modern world". Which of these signatures is the most real, I cannot decide, as they all say something that is true. These designations are individually placing a weight on an asset that characterizes this world, and since one characteristic does not exclude the other, there is no weighty dominant reason to prefer one term over the other.

They all say something true about this world, but they won't say it all. However, in the following I will attach a new term to this world that I believe in a higher degree than those, say something more important. I am struck not by this world's geographic location or its formal form of government, but by the mythology that characterizes it, that is the form of faith, the ideology and the paradigm that the individuals in this world are expected to join. And I am not talking about metaphysical paradigms such as Christianity and Islam, but first and foremost about the view of history and the ethics which are resulting from one believing in the history of the Holocaust. Whether there is truth behind this myth, or whether it is about lies and distortions, I will not discuss in this article or whether the Holocaust is reality or not, it is a fact that the history of the Holocaust - the myth - it is alive and well, the vast majority believe in the fact that it is one of the most fundamental myths in the cultural sphere, which we belong to. This is shown by this particular myth is the only one, which the citizens in the European countries may be punished for not agreeing on. All other myths can be rejected or doubted, but not the myth of the Holocaust. It is fundamental to the entire Americanized world legitimacy and self-understanding, and therefore one allows you not to challenge it.

In this article I will list the main characteristics of Western culture and the role of the history of the Holocaust plays in this culture. This act makes it hopefully clear that the defense of this mythology, plays a crucial role in the Western world's understanding of itself that it also serves to moral legitimization of the western world imperialism and exploitation of the poor countries and that this story - not at least - the core in Israel's self-understanding and thus the most important reasons to maintain the moral special scheme for Israel and its residents when it comes to international law. What the others do not have the right to do, what the others are being judged and condemned by the international justice courts, is what the rulers of the Jewish state law is allowed to perform without anyone dares to challenge it. This is both on a national and individual level, a special ethics when it comes to the alleged victims of the alleged Holocaust, and therefore it is natural that those who most strenuously struggling for the mythology's maintenance, are precisely those who earn money and otherwise profit from it. Not quite by coincidence, it is precisely the same people who dominate the press and ideology dissemination in the western world, so it is a power full group. Those who challenge this group can thus expect sanctions.

The understanding of history

The core of the Holocaust mythology is the understanding of the Second World War as a conflict between good and evil. Hitler was evil and Americans were the good. Naturally. The war is seen as a realization of the classic drama model with the pursuer, the victim and the rescuer. The persecutor was the evil Hitler, the victims were innocent Jews and the rescuer was the heroic USA. As it always is true in these stories

so does the listener identifies with one of the actors and rejects the others. The critical importance of the Holocaust mythology is to show that Hitler Germany was not just a belligerent power, but that this country was ruled by a demonic ideology. The battle between Hitler and the Allies, was not just a conflict between states, it was a battle between the ultimate evil and the heroic good.

The wanting to exterminate the peaceful and innocent people in gas chambers solely based on the basis of their ethnicity and religion are obviously very unsympathetic, and therefore the defeat of those who had this goal was an indisputable good deed. In it, the Western dominant history writing, the Russians played no significant role in this struggle. In reality, it was the Russians who had 90% of the fatal victims, but nevertheless the Holocaust mythology's followers considering it - first and foremost - to be the Americans' credit that Hitler was defeated. This they are basing on the truthful statement that the Americans had overwhelming material resources and therefore also the best weapons. Therefore, it was the Americans who fought for freedom by defeating Hitler in WW2. This has Hollywood shown in countless movies, just as in countless movies it has shown that Hitler exterminated Jews in gas chambers and to fight against this evil, therefore it had a moral universalist character. For the Holocaust mythology's followers Hitler was a racist, and the others were not. It's also a staple of the western historical understanding that Hitler wanted to fight democracy and that hated Jews. The fact that he sought to make peace with England and his cooperation with the Jewish authorities in Palestine in the 30s to the German Jews to emigrate, and that the Jewish world's federation declared war on Germany in 1933, one does not want to become public knowledge. It does not fit with the objective picture of the battle between the evil and the good, when the latter - first and foremost - are Jews.

The legend spread

There have been more studies on the prevalence of the Holocaust mythology. They show that 10-20% of the population in Western countries is doubtful to what they hear on TV and read in textbooks about the Holocaust. Few people know the arguments that the so-called "Holocaust deniers" uses, but they know that these people exist and can therefore guess that one can actually find arguments against the prevailing point of view. They also know that the Holocaust denying is very controversial and that it is a criminal offense in many countries, and therefore they have no desire to get closer into it. But despite the fear of further knowledge of the dissidents then the awareness of their existence alone has an effect on the public. If revisionism was as a lack of content and deceitful, as its opponents claim, the research and legal laws whose purpose is to fight these people, would be unlikely to be required. It has, after all, no special institutions or laws to combat those who believe the earth is flat or that smoking is harmless, so there is obviously a difference between the so-called "wrong" points of views.

The part of the western population, who doubt the reality of Holocaust, is not alone. In Arab countries, this doubt is very widespread, even if the governments of these countries do not allow publication of any revisionist books or organization of revisionist conferences. You know that the myth of the Holocaust aims to legitimize the Israeli atrocities against the Arab states and the Palestinian people, and the position is therefore doubtful as to the basis upon which serves to legitimize these abuses. Similarly, we find considerable skepticism in the Holocaust mythology in the Eastern European countries and in Asia and South America. Here are these questions are not relevant to the nations own history, so only few finds them interesting.

Media and brand image

The heroes of the Holocaust cult are the poor Jews who - according to legends - always have been persecuted and never have done anything wrong. It was they who were the center throughout the 2nd World War and this war has nothing else important to remember than that 6 million Jews were allegedly killed in Hitler's gas chambers. Since this event is so exceedingly gruesome, it has a special status. Most ordinary citizens in the Western world are increasingly tired of being filled with Holocaust propaganda, but the rulers believe that it can never be enough. Therefore, each country has a number of Jewish museums or "Holocaust museums", which should serve to remind the sacred event, and it was decided between Western countries that there should be an annual Holocaust Day, where everyone memorizes this unique event.

Being a Jew, is considered to have the same status as being persecuted and therefore there cannot be any normal moral directions lines for the conduct that Jews can afford and which the Jewish state - Israel - have the right to perform. It's about murder, terror and everything, right up to nuclear war. Everything is allowed as long as it is performed by the Jewish people who are considered as having a gigantic moral capital which they can spend as they please. What they are doing may be wrong, immoral and harmful to the world, but it does not really matter. They are allowed to do as they please, because they have been so persecuted.

The themes of the basic mythology repeated over and over on a daily basis. It happens in TV programs, radio and in newspapers. Not a show about WW2 can go across the screen, without the history about the 6 million Jews repeated. Most media have a specific editor or an employee whose job it is to deal with Jewish topics, such as Israel, Holocaust, discrimination and anti-Semitism. And this should not be understood as an expression of a desire to conduct fair journalism, because the same media has rarely a similar corresponding Muslim employee to treat Muslim subjects or a Catholic employee to deal with Catholic themes. There are special rules when it comes to the Jews. There is, therefore, not any discussion taking place about the positive truth in the Jewish mythology, which - according to the way it is treated - cannot be compared to Christian or Muslim mythology. The fact that Jesus "resurrection" one always has the right to question and hints that Muhammad could be a pedophile is not considered to be controversial. But to doubt the Jewish suffering and the extent what is said that they have had, are both prohibited and punishable. Freedom of speech applies, they say, but not when it comes to Jewish issues. That is precisely why the media ensures themselves with specific Jewish or philosemitic employees, and average citizens take precautions against damaging charges of "anti-Semitism" by not mentioning the controversial topics, or to stick to the contradictory and unreliable official understanding. No one dares to risk anything, and it's dangerous not to follow the crowd. Dissidents are not treated very well.

It is of course part of this mythology that the state of Israel is a kind of heroic state, like its residents are innocent victims of discrimination and persecution. You learn in school that this state was founded on an empty area that the Jews for thousands of years counted for being theirs. In practice, this region has been part of the early Ottoman kingdom which the British had occupied during the First World War, so they are not interested in the history of the world, but are though nevertheless conscious of being against the alleged Islamic offensive in the West, can also support the Holocaust mythology. Because it serves, as everyone knows, first and foremost the interests of Israel and those who serve Israel are - after own point of view - helping to keep Islam

down. The Jewish heroes must therefore not only be thanked for their efforts against Hitlerism, but also for their efforts against the new times authoritarian ideology that is claimed to be Islam. And in the struggle against authoritarianism, of course there are no limits to what authoritarian means which the rulers in the Holocaust culture countries can afford to use. The fight for freedom is so important that it requires the elimination of freedom. The end justifies the means.

Demonization of opponents

The basic mode of the Holocaust culture is hatred and contempt. The culture could not exist if there were not an enemy that you always had to adjust to having to fight, economically, militarily and ideologically. A time ago this enemy was the communist countries that you thought was marked by anti-Semitism, but after these countries disappeared, one has turned the hatred against the minor followers of the Muslim and Arab states, which - like the communists - thought to be characterized by "anti-Semitism". The worst of these states is currently Iran, which both Israel and the United States regularly imply that they want to bomb and destroy, as they - according to what the mentioned state leaders declare - is developing nuclear weapons. This the Iranians are refusing, and a prolonged inspection from the UN Atomic Energy Commission has been unable to find evidence that this could be true.

But that does not matter when the Holocaust culture apologists adapt their strategy. The question here is to avoid any repetition of the terrifying, so that a new Holocaust should be possible, and to achieve this goal it is only fair to kill thousands or millions. For the reason that there are differences between people: some are worth more than others, and the Iranians are not among the most valuable.

In addition to the external enemies which the Holocaust culture fights, there is also a significant and very dangerous inner enemy. It's about the anti-Semites and the Holocaust deniers. No antipathy is considered to be more unpleasant than the uncongenial and punishable anti-Semitism. To hate and smear Muslims is considered to be quite natural, but to say something that Jews may feel provoked by is completely unacceptable. In practice, the Jewish people consider it to be infallible, to say or to imply something that could impose a form of guilt, and therefore it is illegal.

Some of the worst thing you can possibly be is obviously one that denies the historical truth of the event which modern Judaism bases its legitimacy on, namely the story of the gas chambers and the 6 million. To be a Holocaust denier, everyone knows, is highly morally stressful for a human, and there are indications that such people are in many respects more unpopular than another of the Western hate objects, the pedophiles.

Holocaust denial is illegal in many countries, and it is said to be that way, for example in Germany, because "the country has a special story." But if this was the reason, then it is difficult to explain why the same rules should apply in France, Poland, Israel and the Netherlands. These countries have no Nazi history and were - like Denmark - victims of Nazi violence. But here, too, Holocaust denial is illegal, which indicates that this legislation has nothing to do with this and that country's historical background, but only with the political and economical interests of the ideological rulers in Western countries, seeks to accomplish.

Only very few people in the Holocaust culture has ever met a Holocaust denier, and even fewer know anything about the arguments, which these people base their denial

on. But it is also quite irrelevant, because there is consensus that the Holocaust is a truth of such a kind that to speak of its reality is a crime in itself. Holocaust is real because it has happened, and it happened because it is! There are no requirements for logical or legally evidence that show this event happen in reality and those who have argued against that do not get the opportunity to express them. It is debatable whether Holocaust denial is to be legally illegal in Denmark, but the rulers of this country do not think it's necessary because this ideology still has so little influence. But the discussion is ongoing anyway, and the various institutions that are designed to keep the mythology alive, are fumbling with thoughts to ban it. The best argument against such, however, is that many will become unemployed in these institutions, as it has as one of its main stated objective to combat these deniers with ideological means. If deniers were banned and did not exist, this fight against them, of course, would be unnecessary.

In the media the Holocaust deniers are portrayed as poorly oriented people with an evil will. They are naive, right-wing extremists and anti-Semites. They are bad people, and anyone who hear them express themselves, should immediately withdraw. One should not argue with these people when they are out to spread the lie and as these human beings therefore are not able to express themselves in the media, ordinary people know virtually nothing about them. They do, moreover, not have the possibility to hold public meetings, as such is sabotaged by violent so-called "anti-fascists" who with good help from the police ensure that such meetings are destroyed. Some deniers will therefore become so desperate and seeks fellowship with other unpopular minorities - e.g. Nazis - which they do not share an ideological community, but which they look with sympathy on since this group also are being persecuted and discriminated.

Which of the Holocaust culture minorities who are most despised, is hard to say. Is it the pedophiles Nazis or the Holocaust deniers? It is difficult to determine. A review of the newspaper articles show that the Nazis are partly perceived in a humorous way, like a group of young confused people who look for provocation. Only a few take them seriously. However, there are many who take pedophiles and Holocaust deniers seriously. The former threatens our children, and the latter is supposedly trying to spread the lie. Therefore, they must be fought. An indication that the pedophile is the most unpopular is that pedophilia is prohibited, that is, if it is practiced in one form or another. There are several newspapers in recent years where there have been interviews with pedophiles, and it is considered to be a disease to be a pedophile, as the individual pedophiles cannot help what he suffers from. The same does not apply to Holocaust deniers, who are considered to be evil and misguided people who want to harm the holy people and the country, by means the Jews and Israel. That is the image which is searched to be created in the dominant propaganda as carried out on film, television and in the many memorial parks and Holocaust museums. Therefore, it can be argued that Holocaust deniers actually have now an even lower social status than the pedophiles, but no scientific studies have been made of this subject, so we have to make do with guessing.

The international status hierarchy

Between nations, there is a status hierarchy and it is also between individuals, even when these are only identified by the nations that they come from. This international hierarchy brands you in contexts, and where people from different nations are gathered. What gives prestige is to belong to those who can communicate with all who speak the common language and which belongs to a large and strong nation, which

belongs to a nation with a heroic history and which belongs to a nation with a good international image.

It is clear that the personal qualities that characterizes a human being, is essential for the social prestige that this human has, but even before that these properties have the opportunity to prove, one is placed in a status category, subject to his nationality affiliation. It is based on this baseline-status - high or low - that the individual is unfolding in the social community, and depending on how he is doing, his move up or down is relative to the national conditional status. Lowest in the national hierarchy are nations like Ethiopia or Bulgaria, and lowest in the personal hierarchy are people who do not speak English, who are stupid, dirty, uncomfortable and unreliable. An Ethiopian who have low personal status characteristics will therefore lie at the bottom of the overall hierarchy, and his status will be so low that he will have significant difficulty being with other tourists, and thus to travel at all.

At the other end of the hierarchy are the Holocaust mythology's winners. It could be Israelis, if this is essential to be decided in one of the Holocaust culture countries. But you find yourself in an Arab country travelling Israelis usually choose to keep a low profile with their country of origin. Therefore, Holocaust history victims are not always the highest status and the sympathy of the international community, because there are countries where if one is coming from Israel it is considered to be specifically bad. The national winners are British and Americans who freely can travel most places in the world and is considered as representatives of the rich and militarily powerful nations. Admittedly, these countries have done much evil in Iraq and Afghanistan, but - despite this - recognizes their will to do good, so long this does not conflict with their own national interests.

It is not only the economic and military realities that make England and the USA to the international community's top nations. Here too Holocaust mythology plays a role, because it is obviously because of this that the Americans can brand themselves as the free world saviors. It was they who liberated the world for the greatest seen of evil (Hitler) and it was they who thus stopped the Holocaust. An American, who incidentally is a docile and friendly person, will therefore be at the top of the international hierarchy, where people from different nations meet. He should preferably be a little critical of his country's foreign policy, so he avoids being identified with the violence they have brought with them. But nationhood, he can usually be proud of. Everyone wants to be friends with the Americans, all to deal with them and enjoy their riches. And this involves naturally that you have a positive attitude to the US tourists and national citizens, wherever you encounter them.

The Holocaust mythology plays a role in many places. Not only to legitimize violence against dissidents in Western countries and the suppression of freedom of thought. It also plays a role in deciding the prestige individuals have when it enters an international context. A well-trained and cultivated Dane will have the same status as a vulgar and unknowledgeable American. The latter comes namely from a nation that already in advance is considered to be better than it where the former comes from. And if someone from Israel is interfering in the community, and if this takes place among people from western countries, he will be considered to be representative of the saints, that is, the victims in the all familiar story. Several nations - the war's losers - will feel guilty in relation to him, and others will feel inferiority complexes because they know that their nations did nothing to prevent the tragedy. A Jew from USA with friendly appearance and good communication properties is the highest you can be in an international

context. At least if this interaction takes place in the Western sphere of influence, which means 80% of the Earth's surface. The Jewish Americans and the dirty Ethiopians are actually so far apart, purely status point that the chance that they would meet is minimal. And if this should happen, they would not have anything to talk about.

Philo-Semitic religions

In the Holocaust culture the religion which is the dominant mythology shall serve, have in a good sense allied with the numerically speaking larger so-called Christianity. The Christian religion was founded by a person named Jesus, who rebelled against the Jews' faith for two thousand years ago, which the Jews - for the same reason - chose to crucify. Therefore, you would think that Christianity would be a kind of alternative to Judaism, or that one would stand critical against the Jewish theology and mythology. However, this is not the case. In the Holocaust culture Christianity has completely adapted to the ideological rulers, and developed his own theology and understanding of history to what these rulers take delight in hearing. The Catholic Church has adapted. They held over the period from 1962-65 a large council (synod), where one joined the Holocaust cultures standards, and tried to avoid being held partly responsible for the alleged mass murder. Certainly Hitler and Hoess (the leader in Auschwitz) Catholics, and Poland, where Auschwitz is located, is a Catholic country, but nevertheless one liability and claims - like the Red Cross who visited the concentration camps - that they were not aware of any gas chambers and mass murder of Jews. There could indeed be a simple explanation to this, but they do not want to use it. You dare not to challenge the mythology, as it will give enmity with those in power in Israel, who controls the Christianity's holy Christian sites and the majority of the American press and therefore considered to be important cooperation partner.

Similarly, the dominant tendencies within Protestantism has adapted the Holocaust mythology and many of these sects make today a great effort to raise money for Israel, and therefore - indirectly - to continue this country's occupation, terror and colonization of the Palestinian territories. In these areas, there are indeed some Christians, but it does not worry the so-called Christian churches that would rather make themselves popular among the rich and powerful Israelis than among the poor and powerless Christians. It is money that controls the philosemitic religions, and the appeasement strategy they profess, will likely lead to their own destruction. But they do not wonder about this, because they see themselves as being in the process of preparing the return of Jesus. Also, for those Holocaust is a key concept, but only for the good. It shows that the end times are near.

The anti-fascist corps

The Holocaust culture core countries usually present themselves to be very humanistic, and this characterizes their administration of justice. Experience shows that it is better to sit in jail in Denmark or Germany, than it is to live as ordinary working people in many African and Asian countries. Because they both place great emphasis on proper evidence, the possibility of appeal and the safeguarding of the rights of the accused, it is usually a lengthy process to be convicted of anything in the Holocaust culture jurisdictions.

This means that it is hard to fight the Holocaust ideology's fighters efficiently, even though in several countries it is prohibited to broadcast the revisionist point of

views. Therefore, the governmental secret services allies with a youth corps of "antifascists", which they offer special sanctuaries and free opportunities to express themselves, even if this involves violence. As long as one can see that these groups provide a convenient and violent efforts in the fight against the "rightists" then they are satisfied, and let them unfold. That there - formally - is freedom of expression in the Holocaust culture countries it has no practical consequences for the dissidents, who are supposed to have been those who could benefit from this freedom. But that one does not want. Therefore, they have no opportunity to organize meetings or demonstrations without these being violent attacked by the "anti-fascist" terrorist gangs. These anti-fascists are usually aged between the age of 16 to 30 and they are dressed in black and use skulls as a symbol. The somewhat reminiscent of Hitler's SS corps which they would claim that they are opposed to. Also here they wore black uniforms and had skulls as part of the public image.

The anti-fascist groups are unusually well informed about the meetings and activities of the so-called right wing, and it is hardly likely that they have obtained this information from its own sources. There is therefore reason to believe that there is co-operation between the so-called anti-fascists and police intelligence, as has every opportunity by intercepting various telecommunications services to become aware of the activities of the right-wing. The payment for performing this practical and violent anti-fascist work, these anti-fascists gets in other ways. In Copenhagen it is about the movement around the so-called Youth Centre, which has had a unique success in their efforts to get a new house using violent demonstration forms. This would normally lead to a sizeable policing and strict sanctions against the guilty, but when it comes to anti-fascists, different rules apply. So one cannot judge the young people to violence, because if you did it in the degree to which their actions have justified, it could risk scaring new young people from joining the environment. And so the prospect of a continuous struggle against the revisionists and so-called Holocaust deniers would be significantly lower. For no other than these young people according to tacit agreement with the police dare to take this fight up. Everyone are supporters of free speech, they say, but this freedom should only apply themselves and those they agree with. People who do not believe in the Holocaust, you are allowed to silence with violence as seen when David Irving was trying to get to talk in Copenhagen.

Penalty for dissidents

Holocaust culture is one thing of the surface and another under this. It is a culture that has made openness and freedom to its formal ideals but also attaches the utmost importance to suppress and combat ideological dissidents who you think is a nuisance to the reigning rulers. As in Galilei's time, it is an offense to question the prevailing understanding of history, and experiments in this direction will only be met with anger, but also with legal sanctions, violence, fines and imprisonment.

It is one of the EU Community classic discussion topics on whether to ban the so-called "Holocaust denial" in all EU countries, but so far such laws apply only in the large countries that dominate the community. One claims that you have freedom of speech, but this speech unfortunately cannot include those "who themselves do not advocate freedom" they say. Admittedly, there is not a single Holocaust denier who has ever expressed a desire to reduce the freedom or democracy in Western countries, but it does not matter. We have succeeded in power to create the image that these people are Nazis and right-wing extremists, and therefore, most also assume that they want to abolish democracy. And to imprison those who want to overthrow democracy, it is considers

only to be natural. Therefore, freedom has its limits where dissidents speak against the system's own basic mythology. It is permissible to deny God and to make fun of Muhammad, but it is not permitted to question whether Hitler killed 6 million Jews or not.

The first kind of criticism only get the Christians and Muslims, and these people still have no real power, nor even though they - formally perceived - are the majority. What it is about is to please those real rulers, those who have money and those who have dual citizenship. Those no politician dares to provoke because he knows that it leads to his own downfall. When it comes to choose, there is nothing that is more important than having good sponsors. Admittedly, it is the people who deliver the votes, but it is the media that tells them where they should be placed.

Appeasement-personality - fear and silence

Holocaust culture is characterized by the fact that most people do not like to talk about the Holocaust. They are perhaps a little unsure about the realities behind this story, and they sense intuitively that it is risky to talk about the subject, especially if you come to express doubt or to utter criticism of the way in which this story is used. Everyone knows that Israel's existence is based on the belief of Holocaust, and nobody wants to be accused of "anti-Semitism" or "Holocaust denial". Therefore, the Danes prefer, and most other Westerners, to let the discussion take place in milieus where interest in mythology maintenance is strongest, and that is in the environment around the Jewish communities and the organizations that these communities have built up to defend their ideological interests. And these organizations are very powerful, has lots of money and the best contacts to the major media. The contesting mythology can thus expect to be demonized and his futuristic career opportunities will be limited. In short: There is reason to be afraid, and the majority knows, regardless of what they additionally think about the event on which it's all about.

Holocaust culture citizens have therefore developed a personality type, which is characterized by appeasement, i.e. the desire to obtain peace with its surroundings, even if that peace requires submission to a religion which the fewest confess to. But even if you do not adhere to a religion, then one might think and live as it is dictated by this religions followers. This is done by the Western man, who is familiar with the Jewish roots of the Christian faith, but only to a small extent has made it clear that the understanding of history which you profess to has a religious origin.

One usually distinct - formally - between religion and science, but which facts that are genuinely scientific and which, are based on the grounds of religious beliefs, there are few who can tell. And what about religion in general is, you have (in Denmark) also only a vague idea of, because all you really know is Lutheranism. One envisages that religion is something to believe in God, to read a book and going to church. The fact that religion can be a worldview, a way of doing what is right and wrong numbers and in general something that is far above science, it is hard to imagine. The Danes' own personality is shaped by a religion, is also completely unknown to most, and if they had to deal with this statement, they would believe that it was about Christianity which they - formally - believe to belong.

But Holocaust culture personality is not only synonymous with the Danish it is rather the Western community personality type. They are the ones for whom the worst is to be anti, intolerant and discriminating, and the best thing is to have a sense of humor, to

advocate women priests and gay equality. Openness and aforementioned humor, does not extend so far that you can be open to those who question the society's fundamental mythology. God and Jesus, you are allowed to make fun of, but not with Holocaust and the holy people in whose service this mythology is sustained.

9. WHO WON THE 2ND WORLD WAR?

For the Catholic Church, the Jews have always been a problem. On the one hand it is no doubt that the church's founder, Jesus, was Jew. So was his mother the Virgin Mary, his father Joseph and all his apostles. It is therefore evidently true when they say that the Christian church was founded by Jews. But on the other hand, these Jews were in opposition to the vast majority of Jews in their own time.

Christianity began as a Jewish sect, but quickly became larger than the religion as it came from, after it had decided that anyone could join the new religion by being baptized. This repealed to the exclusivity that had characterized the traditional Judaism, who claimed that the Jews were an ethnic people with common hereditary traits. The Jews were, according to the Old Testament, God's chosen people, and this people could remain selected, so it had to ensure its own exclusivity, which they did by prohibiting Jews marrying non-Jews, and by keeping strict control over who converted to the Jewish faith.

In the New Testament, we can follow the first discussion among the Christen. Some believe that the Christian religion must be a direct extension of the Jewish and the exclusive character of the Jewish religion must be continued in the new Jesus-religion. Others believe that the new religion must be open. When one thinks that God gives redemption to the baptized and those who receive the transformed bread in Eucharist, then it is also believed that anyone can be a Christian. Because how can you believe in a loving God that excludes people from this salvation, simply because they like those Jews call goys who have not the right hereditary traits? If God loves he must open up to salvation, so it is available to all, and it means that everyone should be able to join his "only true" religion

The result of the debate between Jesus' followers are, then, that the Christian faith is open to anyone, and when Jesus is crucified after the request from the Jews, the church reached a point where they not alone have separated themselves from Judaism, but also placed themselves in a decisive mismatch with the Jewish religion.

The conflict between Jews and Christians are really aggravated when the Talmudic writings, which Jews consider to be holy is to be translated into Latin around 1200 AD. Only now have the Popes eyes to what is actually contained in these writings, and it leads to a clear condemnation. Pope declares that the Talmud should be banned and burned. The Christian churches change apparently at this time their views on Judaism, which they now consider to be an anti-Christian and demonic religion. Therefore, it is decided by the Crusaders, who freed Jerusalem in the 1200s, not only to slaughter those present Muslims but also Jews. For the Christians, both Jews and Muslims are infidels, and the fact that the Jews had chosen to make the Muslims the Crusaders interpret - perhaps rightly - as an expression of that Jews are deemed to be enemies of the Church.

During The Middle Ages it is thus considered that the Jews in Europe are enemies of the Church, and to avoid conflicts between groups of people, many cities select to let Jews move into a special Jewish neighborhood in greater or lesser degree shielded from the remainder of the city, referred to as "ghettos".

But the physical separation of Christian and Jewish housing does not mean that the Jews are isolated from society. On the contrary, they play an important role in a number of industries where Christians cannot do well for themselves due to religious

prohibitions. The church forbids for example the Christians to take interest, which means that interest in lending money, is very small. The same prohibition should not comply with Jews and therefore a number of international Jewish-controlled finance houses that exist even today, are founded.

The conflict between the Jews and the Christian church are mostly latent, but in some special times, it plays a role in past major historical events. The Spanish royal family considers that Jews conspire with the Moors in southern Spain, and therefore chooses to expel them from the country. One also think that the Jews play a role in the social movements, which in a most crucially degree helps to reduce the Catholic Church's influence in Europe. One of these events is the reformation in the 16th century, the other Enlightenment in the 18th century and the third is socialism and the labor movement in the 20th century. It would lead too far here by having to explain the role that Jews played in those social movements (read E. Michael Jones: "The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and Its Impact on World History"), but since the Talmudic inspired Judaism is full of hatred for Jesus-followers of the religion, it is no surprise I see that the Jews are attracted to anything that might help destroy the Christian church and its beliefs.

A complete transformation of the relationship between Jews and Christian happens in the 20th century, when two great wars changed the relation of power in the world. By the 19th century's start the unified Germany has since 1871 been one of the places in the world where Jews have the best conditions for freedom. But this is changing. The First World War is lost by the Germans because the Americans go into the war, and it happens because the British Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour makes a deal with the World Jewish Confederation that it will give the Jews a state in the Middle East, the World Federation ensures anti-German propaganda in American newspapers to such an extent that the Americans overcome their isolationism by entering the war. It happens, and therefore the Germans lost. The result of this defeat will be a number of humiliating peace terms which the Germans forced to approve the Treaty of Versailles (1919) and a consequent upsurge in the German antisemitism and revanchism. This leads to Hitler overtaking power, in an official declaration of war from the World Jewish alliance against Germany in 1933 and thus to the internment of German Jews along with other anti-German forces in Hitler's concentration camps.

The course of the war, we all know. As Germany is beaten and destroyed the country get occupied, and now it's the people, which rules the country, that Hitler sought to conquer. What saves the country from long poorness is the Cold War, when Americans see the new Germany as a political ally, and therefore gives the country Marshall Aid ensuring a reconstruction in record speed. Already in the late 50s, the Germans - the war's losers - obtained a higher standard of living than England, who won the war.

But victory is not only something to do with money it is also about identity and ideology. The English lost most of its colonies after the war and they could not build the English economy at the same pace as the Germans could. One can therefore wonder who that really won the war. And the answer to this question is perhaps that it was neither England nor Germany. The former lost their colonies and had to spend decades rebuilding the economy. The latter was put under military and political administration for many years and therefore only formally considering got their freedom again.

Those who really had won were those who had secured the allied the victory by convincing the American people that the US had to enter the war. It was the same which happened in both the 1st and 2nd World War. And these people were therefore also

redeemed the promise which had been made by the British in 1917, and now they were allowed to establish a Jewish state in the former Ottoman territory in the Middle East, which still was occupied by the British. The new country was called Israel, and the argument was used, to get UN approval to see this colonization plan was that the Jews had been persecuted for 2,000 years, and that this persecution now - after Hitler - had to be ended once and for all. Hitler had allegedly killed 6 million Jews, and it may never happen again.

The factual reality of the history of the Holocaust should not be discussed here, but it is clear that this story has become increasingly true over time and after the end of the Nuremberg trial, which was to judge the defeated Germans as being brutal and immoral. One did not want that German militarism would to expand again, and therefore had to use an easily understandable key point that could make the understanding of all why the war had been fought. The story they told was simply the war had been a struggle between good and evil. The evil Hitler and the gas chambers, and the good thing were the Americans and the Democracy. This praise of democracy should not be interpreted to mean that it would give the Germans to be allowed to decide for themselves in their own country. No, the country remained occupied, and it is in a sense still today. Nobody dares to risk a flare-up of German nationalism, and therefore one need to teach the Germans to understand that their ancestors were evil and misguided, and that the new Germany therefore had to rest on radical rejection of ancestral ideology. As some Germans had trouble understanding this, you had to introduce laws that forbade the publication of books and public statements that could be miscalculated as interfering with the allied views on the war results. The Holocaust was made sacred, and today is the only myth that a German cannot doubt without being imprisoned. This history is so true that it is not even allowed to discuss it. That the earth is flat you are allowed to think and the so-called freedom also provides every right to question the sanctity of Jesus and Muhammad's prophecies. But to doubt the Holocaust or publishing research that makes this story in a dubious light is today a crime. And there is no doubt about who has the advantage of the new dictatorship. It has those who have made the Holocaust a rewarding career. In Poland the Zionists demands compensation for the land, which they believe that the Nazi took from them, but these Zionists did not even want to pay replacement for the Palestinians as they once chased out of their homeland and whose land they seized. But there is no reason to concern, because no nation in the world dares to protest. The Jews simply cannot sin and even if they do it, they do it wisest by keeping their mouth shut. No one will of course be accused of anti-Semitism. And therefore, Israel can occupy all the land they want and threaten their neighbors with nuclear weapons. Criminals from all nations are free to travel to Israel without worrying about extradition if they just remember saying that it all is caused by the Christian rulers' anti-Semitism. Yes, there are lots of opportunities to enjoy the sacred history, especially when those who the story is about, has control of the majority of the American film and media industry.

This is said all without the slightest accusation or whimper. It is simply about understanding the world as it is. And those who run the world are the ones who control what we must learn. It is not realistic to believe that there will ever be truly democracy in this world, and such a democracy has hardly ever existed. If it had not been for those who Hitler followed, which today has the power to persecute others and to use their disproportionate power over the world's strongest state (USA), thus it would be different. Those in power do not have to follow the moral rules that others must adapt to. And it also applies to today's rulers. What I am wondering about is simply this: Will

the conflict between Jews and Christians ever be resolved without one of these parties must submit the other's absurdities.

10. THE EUROPEAN PSYCHOLOGY

Psychology is the study of human personality, i.e. their thoughts, values and behavior. All psychology is based on the time and the life that the studied individuals live in, although there are universal human characteristics, the study of these do not however have the same saying in the same way as the study and the characteristics which characterizes an individual or a group of individuals within a specified time.

The topic of this article is the European psychology and it is my intention to describe this thought and behavior codex in a number of points which gives a general picture. Of course, European psychology is not necessarily characteristic for every individual in the geographical area it describes. It deals with the general features, and sees these as expressions of a historical development and situation - in interaction with the biological - is the intrinsic determinants of the described standards. Some would call this a cultural sociological study, but I find the concept of psychology - eventually social psychology - more aptly, as in the case of circumstances prevailing thinking and action of the vast majority of Europeans. But do not let this dispute about words confuse you it's about finding the properties that characterizing the European man, and - to my knowledge - there are not many who have tried in this genre before. I therefore send my thanks to the sources of inspiration that I have for this work, and here I will mention the American psychologist Kevin MacDonald and the Croatian cultural sociologist Tomislav Sunic. Their work has inspired me.

And so to the case.

Most Europeans have come to terms with the fact that the EU does not develop very fast, and may never become a common state or an area where citizens feel a kind of communion with each other. Such a community exists within the national framework in each of the Union's Member States, but on the pan-European level, it does not exist. It is mainly due to two reasons: one is that Europeans do not have a common language, and the other is that they do not have a common understanding of history and thus of their own national character. Europe is the story of contradictions, wars and conflicts, and those who have tried to find a positive joint European identity has not been able to justify that other than in the fact that you have not had war between European nations since 1945. Some think that it means that the war is over and there will now be room to develop a European identity, while others doubt it. Although I am optimistic and I believe that you already have the basic features of this European identity. The problem is that these fundamentals are not as positive as European leaders would have liked but - in principle - it is surely not a matter. It is about finding community ("sameness") in the jumble of differences, as we all can see. And this sameness exists in fact already, as the reader will see in the following. The features that characterize the European human are namely as follows:

Americanism

The European Americanism has the obvious historical reason that Americans were the decisive force that made it possible to defeat the Germans as well as in First World War. This military success was followed by America's expansive economical developing and still more increasingly visible global ambitions after WW2. Soon, the US economy became the world's largest, the American living standard the world's highest and American technology the best in the world and most widely used. Internet, which is about to take on the role as the world's common communication platform is

also controlled from America. Plus everything that is going on the Internet is controlled by the Americans.

Americanism is not only a European trend but is found worldwide. Everywhere you play American film, trade in US dollars and fear the US military. Everywhere the American values of freedom and private initiative are admired, while one is more reserved when it comes to American foreign policy, which clearly aims to serve America's economic and political interests, rather than to seek those values widespread. Americanism in Europe has deep roots with the American culture is a product of the - European Protestant exile culture. At the same time, the European-republican culture, as expressed in the French Revolution (1789) is the result of ideology imported from the US revolution in (1776). The impact has therefore gone either way, and just as it is reasonable to regard America as a European exile culture, it is reasonable to regard the modern European culture as being Americanized.

Americanism in Europe has multiple perspectives. On the one hand it expresses itself in a European inferiority-feeling in relation to the Americans, and on the other hand, in an attempt to import and implement the American ideals. One ideal that underlies everything else in American society - freedom of expression - one does not want to import. This ideal was popular during the cold war, which claimed that this particular democratic virtue was what separated the European democracies from communism in the east. But it ended in 1989 when communism collapsed. Thereafter they had no use for the anti-communist propaganda, and now moved focus on other forms of evil, as they express themselves in the modern "war on terror". Here the ideal is no longer freedom of speech, because it is not happening in the leading European countries, and therefore this concept is no longer used in the propaganda. Now it is about multiculturalism, and efforts by European leaders to placate the US and Israeli leaders in power, is seen above all in the EU-supported propaganda to promote so-called "anti-racism" and "anti-Semitism". That the mentioned anti-racism expresses itself by fear of uttering criticism of the world's only country which has racism as its ideological foundation, Israel, does not seem like the European politicians consider it to be a contradiction. It is applicable to the Europeans, but it does not apply to Jews. There is a difference, as there always have been, and racism thrives. Now only with an opposite sign as such as it worked during the 30s.

Mammonism in culture and politics

Not so many years ago, Europe was divided between a socialistic and a capitalist fraction. Both parts had good and less good sides, and in the cold war's propaganda the parties mutually attempted to exhibit the other's weaknesses. In the "free world" in the West the means of production was owned by private companies and in principal the citizens were allowed to startup businesses, including book and newspaper publishers. It also claimed that there was freedom of expression, which meant that you could say and suggest almost anything as long as you were not suspected of supporting the communist counterpart in the East. What one lacked of freedom in the Soviet-controlled countries were nonetheless when it came to national control of the means of production. In principle it was the state who owned everything, and when the state was ruled by the Communist Party in collaboration with a coalition of other parties, there was no doubt that it was in fact the country's citizens, who owned the production's funds. This ownership was indirect, but it was nationally. No companies were owned by international private equity funds, which its citizens had insight into or influence.

Since socialism was abolished in the eastern countries, it also meant that the power of capital was increased. Now the power of the press and publicity of reducing agents primarily dependent on money and control of the political process and the "democratic" elections were largely controlled by the capitalist-owned media. And it was not only in the East, that there had been a change, it was also in the West. For while capitalism had triumphed, the ideal of the welfare state has been compromised, which led to the political power passed to liberal parties, whose purpose was to reduce government control and, to establish capital power instead. The mammonistic ideals were obviously disguised as freedom. They made it a natural thing that the country's largest newspapers and television stations were owned by private chapter in equity funds, and it was claimed that it was an expression of freedom, those funds could buy their way to success by politicians whose election campaign they funded and supported.

All this was possible because the Europeans had seen Socialism's bankruptcy, and therefore the opinion was that now the power of money, the only alternative for - as Francis Fukuyama ("The end of history and the last man") claimed - now was the story ended. Mammonism thus became the widely accepted management ideal in Europe, not just as radically as in the US, but sufficiently for capital to receive the necessary extra-parliamentary power. European politicians still tried to control cash flows and cross-border financial crime, but when the capital was better to move than these politicians is to cooperate, the results have been small. The ideals of wealth, beauty and success were also known through the American dominant programming in European TV channels, and European politics in risk was even selected according to these ideals. If you were a smoker, overweight or had a bad look, there would not be any good chances of being elected. Because the messages were essentially the same in all the politicians so the voters had to decide after which one were the best-looking one.

This development is nothing new. It happened in the US many years ago, and here one therefore also knows the dangers posed by the capitalist media control (and thus of the political process) entails. Here it is no secret that the 2% of the population belonging to the Israeli religion has a dominant influence in the media. Some books have been written about it (e.g. Mearsheimer / Walt, "The Israel Lobby") and discuss it openly. But just to suggest that something similar is true in Europe, can trigger a prison sentence. Newspapers which are edited by Muslims or Catholics can expose for what they are: Propaganda. But there ends the freedom also. No one dares say anything about editors and journalists who belong to the Jewish religion, and it fits rulers just fine. As long as one lives hidden, you live well. And the power that you cannot see, you cannot protest against.

Idealism and megalomania

Since Constantine the Great presided at Nicaea-Vatican II in the year 325, Christianity has been regarded as the single pan-European religion, and from this point, the former European polytheism has been replaced by the doctrine that in this world there is only one God and thus only one truth. Europeans have always known that there were problems finding this truth, whether it was in science or theology, but the belief that it existed, there has always been doubt about. This is expressed in the Greek logic, hereafter it is considered self-evident that only one of several contradicting statements could be true. If one scientist, theologian or historian said one thing and the other something else, then of them must be mistaken

This monolithic epistemology has been especially recorded in the German thinking that since the 1500s has been leading in Europe, and when Karl Marx wrote "Criticism of the German ideology" (1845), it was precisely these ideas that he thought of. He described this ideology as being idealistic, which of course he was right about, because for all thoughts that claim to have universal validity, is per definition idealistic, and it counts for not at least the Christian faith in the Roman version and the German philosophers, Marx regarded, including Kant, Hegel and Feuerbach.

But the German idealism is not only a philosophical concept it is also a common idea-doctrine that exists in many versions. Common to these is that you are looking for a universal truth, whose purpose it is to civilize the world. So it is about finding an ideology which can justify power, because power is what the Germans and their Roman sources of inspiration always have sought. When you know the truth, you will naturally want to pass it on. To popularize the German ideals have always - by the Germans - been regarded as a good deed, even if that disclosure might take on brutal forms. As the end justifies the means, one believes in the Monotheist philosophy, for just as a loving mother will not fail to take her children to the dentist simply because they cry, then the Germans (today: Europeans) obviously cannot fail to spread their ideals simply because the lucky recipients not immediately understand their value. Often you give the gifts to others, especially to children, who first will know how to appreciate it later on. So the eventual resistance to the colonial peoples had to practice against European intrusion must be forgiven. It is an expression of ignorance, and thus only a testament to the benefit, as they will have the new power structure.

The German ideals have been taken over by the Europeans as a whole, and they have throughout the post-Constantine history been behind all wars on the continent. Each of the participating nations have always referred to the desire to create the good society and the justified social order as a justification for their war effort. These ideals have been based on common language, ethnic purity, common religion, freedom, justice and democracy. The ideals have certainly been interpreted differently, but it is the same that has always been used, whether they were behind communism, the Hitlerism ideology or the so-called democratic society. Stalin, Churchill, Roosevelt and Hitler were so all supporters of freedom and justice. But they had different ways in which these ideals should be manifested.

The European idealism expresses itself in what is called Megalomania, namely the belief in having a culture that is objectively better than others. This ideal was behind early colonialism as well as the modern US-European effort to create global dominance. It recognizes - in principle - to every people and every nation has the right to manage their own affairs, but when this autonomy is expressed in ways that are inconsistent with euro-Americans' own interests (mainly economic) one also withdraw other and conflicting ideals which also are counted as eternal and irrefutable, and which serves to justify the modern colonialism. It can hurt to be at the doctors, we all know it. But what happens is, of course, for the good, and no one knows better what is good for the people than the Euro-American alliance that both have faith in the eternal ideals and military power to destroy other attempts at political control. Thus, they have both the opportunity and - after own opinion - the right to colonize the nations that do not appear cooperative. Not that these nations sought to convert to the Christian religion, because the imperialists do not even believe in it. But such that the submerged nations are forced to engage in the global food chain, which is controlled by the rich nations and which serves the maintenance of living standards in the rich world.

Absolutism and Messianism

Absolutism has deep roots in the European tradition. In pre-Christian times all the kings and emperors made themselves as God's representatives on earth, and the obedience they demanded of their minions, was justified by the notion that they were God's representatives on earth. Going up against the ruler, was to turn against God. This claim that one's decisions are of divine origin, was carried on in the Roman papacy, where popes saw themselves as temporary workers for Christ and God's spokesperson in a sinful world. With the Reformation for the first time Christianity was developed, where leaders were not claiming to be God's spokesperson, but this de-sacrament was in turn followed by those leaders' insistence that power should lie with the king or prince in the area where the citizen lives. This person - the king - was regarded as God's representative, and hereby thus were back to the pre-Christian understanding of power.

Absolutism roots are so old and well-founded within European countries and the two dominant religions in this area supports each other in its own way this Absolutism. It is therefore no surprise to find that the only countries in the European community, which has genuinely democratic constitutions (except France), are those in which the Constitution was drawn up after the Second World War. Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Spain, Belgium and several other countries, which claimed to be democratic, is formally ruled by a royal family, whose power is a superset of the parliamentary majority decisions. In the Danish Constitution, the word "democracy" is not mentioned, and it is evident that no parliamentary decisions have any legal effect unless it is approved by the Danish royal family, whose rulers are in succession.

In modern Europe, the German absolutism converted into common ideology, and the attitude is that there exists only one truth, and that truth has found its true advocate in the European Union (EU), which is based on the ever-true values, rule of the majority, human rights and freedom of expression. That none of these goods actually are protected or revered in the European community, the politicians for the most part are indifferent to, because there is no real and coordinated political opposition in the European Community. They speak different languages, and consequently, there are not any popular discussions across national borders. The number of Europeans number is therefore not expressed in a comparable wisdom. You are blind to one's own mistakes, and appears therefore on the international arena as rich and naive fools who boast of their own wealth, but who have nothing to contribute than the so-called "development aid". In Afghanistan, this development means about 5% of the amount used for the Nato-led war machine that kills civilians based on the grounds that they "belong to the Taliban."

The German philosophy is today made to a common European way of thinking, and the idea of "the one definitive truth" is a common standpoint of the Pope and the European politicians. On the surface there appears to be a contradiction between the Pope and the politicians, as the Pope again and again criticize these politicians to profess "relativism", and their unwillingness to let the Christian religion influence laws and norms in the European area. The papal claims to Christianity must be enrolled in any European constitution, as Europe's foundation, and politicians' rejection of this is an expression of the mentioned breach. The Pope believes that he represents the absolute and European politicians do too. But they have different perceptions of what the absolute consists of. The Pope believes that it is the Christian religion, and politicians believe that it is democracy.

But the difference between the pope and the politicians is only apparent, because even if the politicians do not claim to have an absolute truth, so their views are nevertheless an expression of that. The European position is namely that democracy is an absolute value, which overflows everything else in moral terms. When Pope thinks to speak for God, the politicians believes to talk for an absolute second absolute truth, namely the right of peoples to self-determination.

The difference between the pope and political absolutism is not a greater or lesser degree of relativism, but only the linguistic form which - in their own optics - the absolute truth is presented. Common for the European positions is the belief that one's own values are better than all others. That is what has always been the main theme in German idealism from Luther ("here I am and I cannot anything else") over Kant, Hegel and Adolf Hitler to Habermas. The belief that one's own values are universal and that they therefore should be sought out widely in the entire world, is an expression of monotheism, which has always been the core of European theology. There cannot be placed a rational argument that this doctrine should be truer than others, but by faith in the one and universal God, but so will confidence will uprise that thus the believers may have an insight into the universal truth. For the God they believe in says that he is identical with the truth, the way and the life (Jn. 14: 6), and although no one claim that the biblical statements are objective, then it is after all those who are behind the European ideology, whether it is expressed by the Pope or European politicians.

Paternalism

Europe is full of contradictions. On the one hand, Mammonism and liberalism are ruling, on the other absolutism. The story we see that Europeans are comfortable with guardian state, though it prefers that this ideology is presented under another denote, which today can be environmental policy, anti-racism, welfare ideology or social justice.

The ideological guardian Semitism has always been part of the European culture, which is best seen from the fact that the fleeing Protestants in the Mayflower in 1620 had to look away from their homeland in order to realize their desire to live life as they even considered it correctly. They lived in a time when the church's truth could not be challenged, and where attempts to this could lead to imprisonment and execution. And the same faiths in the truth of the rulers' thoughts exist today, where a number of thought forms are prohibited in the dominating European countries. This expresses itself for example in the European laws against racism and Holocaust denial, which, in several European countries are equal. What the Holocaust really consists of and what Holocaust therefore contains of rarely explained. None of the people, who have so far been convicted of this offense, were thus meant to be "Holocaust deniers", but this has not stopped that they went to jail.

The European guardian Semitism does not always stand out to be searching for the truth. It says so explicitly in the German Criminal Code, it is not an excuse for the accused in cases about Holocaust if they can prove that their claims are true. It is not about finding the truth, but to show political correctness, therefore, it is to ensure that one's search for truth appears to exactly the same result as the allied used in their propaganda against Germany as it was staged in the so-called Nuremberg trial.

External and internal enemies

The idealistic philosophy has the consequence that it occurs urge to mission, but it also has the consequence that one develops an enemy image. For when there is only one truth, and it is the one that one stands for, then other cultures obviously are on the wrong track when they will not recognize the same systems of thought. Therefore, Europeans have always had strong enemy images that have been created from time to time due to remaining political conflicts in the world, and the purpose of these enemies has always been - and is today - to benefit those in power in their efforts to create discipline and obedience among their subjects. And here we encounter the paradoxical logic: When you claim to believe in democracy and freedom, and when others seemingly turn against those values, then you even have to repeal them. Because one cannot really control a population, that lives in freedom and are able to overthrow their leaders through parliamentary elections. Therefore, freedom is always the first to be eliminated when the fight for such freedom must be! When freedom must be restricted as part of the "war on terror", requires naturally, that citizens believe in the existence of an external and internal enemy, and such has been always been fortunate to exist. Once people fought against Islam, which were reflected in the Crusades and later on in the fight against the Ottomans, who would take Vienna in 1683. In the last century it was important to fight against communism, but after it ended, you had a problem.

It is hard to find these images in a world that no longer is divided between two superpowers. Now the world is controlled by the Americans, and in the absence of a credible opponent, one has declared war against the so-called "terrorists", which broadly is a series of invisible network of Islamic type. These networks believe in the fight against Euro-Americans' occupation of their country, but this is not accepted by the Europeans. They thus see themselves as freedom fighters, but I think the Euro-Americans do not. They see them as terrorists, exactly the same way as Hitler once viewed his opponents in the occupied countries.

The fight against terrorism and fundamentalist Islam has therefore the Europeans keen interest in more than 10 years, even if the total number of deaths in this war even is under a tenth of a fraction of the number of people who die from cigarette smoking every year. There is mainly a political scam that seeks to legitimize the maintenance of the global dominance, which is the NATO alliance main goal. Not to prevent terrorism, but to control the oil and to create legitimate basis for removal of freedoms that the free world was once characterized by. All the kind is indeed a threat, not against individuals, but against the power.

Holocaust culture

In Europe you have to believe what you want, if only you do not say it out loud. The statements which are most forbidden of all, is: "Holocaust is a lie." Whether the statement is true, I should not decide, but whatever, it is considered to be as offensive to per definition the always persecuted Jews, that it is simply not to be uttered. If you believe that Jesus is gay, Muslims are terrorists, that Hindus are dirty or that one or another ethnic group is an underdog, then it's no problem. It is only those statements that target the Jewish understanding of history that are prohibited, and not the others. And here there is no question that through consensus is to agree to this or that view of the last war is more right than others. Here it is not about a majority that requires its own perception of reality to be recognized as the most correct. Here it is a

minority that requires that freedom of expression applies only to them, and how it works already in most European happen in countries including Denmark.

If one is not an extremist, and believe in the extremist history understanding, then you cannot get a job as a historian at the European universities. And one could perhaps live with it. But unfortunately the ban on expression counts for much more than this. One likewise cannot become a school teacher, government official or manager in a private company, if you have such views, which is deemed to be contrary to the European spirit. The situation is comparable to the time when the Europeans believed in witches, and where doubts about its existence could lead to one was accused of witchcraft, with serious consequences. Or with the situation that Galileo was in when he had to choose between personal freedoms or to speak his mind about the universe in context.

Holocaust culture apologists argue of course that they nationally provide the pure science, just like the theologians argued during the witch persecutions and the Pope and Luther at the trial of Galileo. Power has, even today, the privilege of calling himself the "scientific", also despite the fact that this requirement definitiveness is obtained by imprisoning those who believe in something else.

Europeans Holocaust hypnosis characterizes every bit of the European psyche. Most Europeans dare not even talk about the subject. The lowering his voice and rushes away when they hear the forbidden words. Just to say "Jew" is somewhat controversial, and it is immediately suspected of anti-Semitism. For the television and mass media, there's no doubt about the truth, just as there was 500 years ago when everyone just with a modicum of intelligence knew that the sun revolves around the Earth.

Most people in Europe expect therefore discussion about Holocaust to be uninteresting, or downright dangerous. There are daily television broadcasts that inculcate the extremist history's warranties, and no one can be sure what the politically correct understanding of history is. And less of it all is the Germans who - in the dominating understanding of history - is considered to be a diseased or a less perverse people. But we prefer this violation and the previously mentioned limitations of personal freedom, rather than what could be the alternative. Israel has several times made it aware that their nuclear-bearing rockets could very easily reach Berlin. And it makes an impression.

Professor Norman Finkelstein wrote in 2000 a book on "The Holocaust industry". Had he not been a Jew and lived in America, there is no doubt that he would have been accused by the European Holocaust laws to the point of this book was that there are major economic interests associated with the maintenance of the extremist understanding of history - Holocaust mythology - as Finkelstein moreover even claim to believe in. But he believes that this tragedy is being exaggerated in scale and exploited on a distasteful manner to serve political and economic interests, which mainly relates himself to Israeli colonialism and the struggle against the Palestinians. Holocaust mythology helps to maintain the hatred and to lay the basis for new wars.

Fear - and a ban - to discuss the reality of Hitler's persecution of Jews is of such magnitude that free debate is impossible in both Germany and France. There have been a few conferences, but they are almost all held in the United States, where a small group of brave people have been so curious to know the truth, that they have put life and honor at stake. The same happened in Tehran in 2006, which held a conference attended by both opponents and proponents of the extremist ideology. It lead to Israel threatened

Iran with nuclear bombs, and tried to get the United States to lead the attack. Several conference participants were also imprisoned, when they came to the European countries they came from. This was also in despite of the fact that these countries claim to profess freedom of speech.

Extremism

Where mass murder of foreign nations is considered to be of a unforgiving crime - especially if it has happened to Jews - so does European not feel with the same rigor of mass murder against their own unborn children. It is taken for granted that a person's value derives from its production ability, and that a child has no production ability, this human is without value. No Europeans would deny that the unborn child is a human being, and that human life begins at conception. This is science, they think. But even if the unborn child is a human being, then this person is not protected by the same legal rights as the born and the working man. The unborn child can of course quickly be replaced by a new unborn child, and there are no major economic investments in its productivity. The mother may have a certain feeling for the child, and this feeling is emphasized, so that she - and she alone - is the one that determines the child's fate.

Completely different is the situation with the born child who society has invested money in. Here are invested from birth when the child is a future part of society machine, and thus a future taxpayer. Therefore, the cost of health care and child care centers are typically paid by the state in most EU European countries. This is considered to be part of the social welfare process, which does not so much have a humanistic purpose as an economical. The number of abortions is uncertain, but a good guess is that about 2 million unborn children are killed every year in the countries that is a member of the EU. The fact that all these countries have signed the UN right legal declaration in which they undertake to protect life plays in no role. They like to criticize non-European countries for overstepping human rights at various points, but the violations which are taking place in the EU countries, there is no debate about. Those they choose to ignore, since they all serve one overall objective of adapting the European psychology to industry requirements and to stay customer demands for rising living standards. The extremism which then exercised play no role in the Europeans' moral consciousness. A person, who kill her own unborn child to is counted as morally better than someone who does not believe in the gas chambers. It is not about whether people die or not die. It's about who these people are.

Historical revisionism

Characteristic of European historiography is its revisionism. The so called scientific history in Europe is first and foremost policy tools that will serve to legitimize the at any time ruling power and the values that this power try to defend. In a post-WWII period, these values - superficially seen – are the opposite of the values of the loser of the war, Hitler's Germany. Great effort is made to convince the European public, that the policies used in modern Europe, are the opposite of those which were in the 30s Germany. In order to ensure citizens' ideological connection to the current union-project, one need to rewrite history so that the central event, yes everything that WW2 was fought for, is about the Holocaust. This term begins to be used in the late 70s, when it was the title of an American TV series, which purported to depict a Jewish family who slowly was exterminated in Hitler's Germany.

This image has been maintained and when European schoolchildren must explain why it is good that the Allies won the second world's war, they know no other argument against Nazism than that "they executed Jews". In fact, few people know how many were killed in the war, or who actually fought against whom. But it is also the matter of the modern European historians that it is about Jews. This will also avoid having to completely reproduce the statements made by Roosevelt and Churchill to clarify war aims. One of these was the protection of freedom of speech, which was offended in Germany. That it is the same today, nobody wants to discuss.

The problem is that all the evil that Hitler stood for and which the war was fought to eradicate, exist at the same - or worse - way today, however just deducting Hitler's enmity toward the Jews. This kind takes place today, but as it is illegal, its influence is very limited. Apart from this, they are Hitlerian ideals still alive, but obviously in a different guise.

Let's look at some examples:

Hitler invaded a number of sovereign nations to create "Lebensraum" (living space) for Germans. The same happens in principle today with the American invasions of sovereign nations. This legitimized as a "war on terror", but the reality is that 90% of the terror which this war contains is exercised by the involved NATO-troops.

Hitler sterilized mentally retarded citizens, whom he did not believe that the nation could sustain life for. The kind of citizen-control is even exercised today, where one though is using advanced diagnosis of the unborn child, to find out whether they should be aborted.

Hitler was a racist and believed that the world was divided into higher and lower races, of which the white Aryan race was the highest. Therefore, expansion and extermination of other races, was not a crime but a necessity. Similar views can be found today in a number of racist parties of the European right, and in many of the traditional rabbis in Israel. They talk openly about that God's selected race has the right to exterminate others and that "a Jewish fingernail is worth more than a hundred Arabs". While the pro-Zionist press in Europe are doing a lot to say about the "Islam happening threat" and the lack of freedom in the Islamic countries do not do anything to indicate that Christianity mission is punishable in Israel.

Hitler did not like Christianity, which was a religion of slaves, in his opinion. He therefore felt disgust for the Christian view of human nature, and believed that the Catholic Church, which he formally belonged to, should be abolished. The same propaganda that Hitler himself turned against the Catholic Church can also be found today. A large part of Europe's population belongs to this church, but it is the post-conciliar church. Here you have forgotten all about Simon of Trient and the other "anti-Jewish" saints, and it has been agreed that all religions - including Judaism - can lead a man to heaven. And so it was, moreover - acc. Pope - not the Jews who killed Jesus. Mel Gibson's movie ("Passion of Christ") was on this subject, is "anti-Semitic", and maybe one will soon follow the Jewish rabbis all the way and declare the whole of the New Testament anti-Semitic.

It characterizes the European psychology of inferiority and shame, combined with a more or less well-founded pride of being the author of some of history's greatest spirits within religion, art and philosophy. Europeans commemorate therefore the old days,

when they should try to find self-confidence. They do a great job of hiding it, that all the ideals they fought in the last war, is to be ignored in modern Europe, and that this happens for the same reason as those that applied in ancient Palestine, namely the "fear of Jews "(Jn. 19:38).

The worst thing that can happen to a European intellectual is being labeled as "anti-Semite". Even the Pope tremble with fear to get this word plastered on his person, and he's happy to participate in persecution of people who have "denied the Holocaust" if his German countrymen asks him about it. The European discussion is un-free, and is unlike that which takes place in the US and in Israel, where the tolerance - contrary to what Europeans think - are much larger. The result of this self-imposed censorship is that Europeans intellectual level is falling, when viewed in relation to other parts of the world. Being European is the same as being shameful, ignorant and careful to speak out on controversial issues at all, and a number of such means is large. And it happens to be precisely those which the outer world cares most for. But it Europeans says it wrong, thus he goes to prison. Just like 60 years ago.

Neo-fascism

The European Union adopted in 2007 a directive that is supposedly "fight against racism and xenophobia". In this directive it stipulates in § 260, to all connected nations have a duty to combat movements which works against freedom and human rights, and are spreading hatred against others. For some time, even before the adoption of this directive, the European Community supported and funded an internal European terrorist movement whose must claimed to be "fighting Nazism and fascism" and which achieves this goal by the violence to an gripping legal demonstrations and meetings where representatives of the so-called "right-wing" participants. It is about the so-called autonomic movement that Danes know from its struggle against the Christian Father Ward for the preservation of the Youth House.

The autonomous movement arose in Germany and should be seen as an expression to the pressure of the rising German youth's desire to appear quite different from their Nazi-controlled parents and grandparents. It is a historical fact that there were practically no opposition in Germany against Nazism, and the only reason that Hitler disappeared, was that he lost the war and took his life. In order to gain legitimacy in the international community, it is not difficult to understand that the young Germans want to appear as being very rebellious non-authoritarian and anti-Nazi.

Their parents obviously understand this interest and support them in their endeavor. Unfortunately, what happens is, as so often is for the case when young rebel against their parents that they end up exactly the same place as their parents stood, but only on different grounds other than the parents used. Nazism was originally a rebellious movement that wanted to squeeze competitors out by violent means. And the same can be said for the German neo-fascistic youth movement that calls itself "autonomous". The movement began in Berlin to be a kind of black-clad house-occupying that would show the public that you could find a place to stay, even if you had no money. These young people made a number of house-collectives in Berlin, and based on these they created a political movement whose characteristic was that the supporters dressed in black, had many piercings and chains attached to the garment and an instantly a white skull on black background as its logo. The same logo as their parents in the SS had used.

But anarchist youth movements have inherently a short life span, and when the autonomous decided that one of their chief concerns was to be physical attacks on so-called "neo-fascists and Nazis", then there were forces in the EU who saw them and found out by the fact that the representation may be useful. Therefore they made an office to co-ordination the activities of young people across Europe. One talked about the young people had a network, and the office that would support them was therefore called ENAR ("European Network Against Racism"), and equipped with sufficient financial resources so that movement could be kept alive. The head of ENAR has for some years been the Danish-Pakistani engineer Bashi Qureshi, who call himself Muslim, but otherwise most stands out with strong pro-Israel views. In Israel - the world's only formally racist state - is there - acc. Qureshi - has no racism, and with such a sharp sighted man, has ENAR again and again signaled that they are willing to service the gentlemen who pay the bill. The German ideology can thus spread, with legal and non-legal means. The people like Daniel Goldhagen once described as "Hitler's Willing Executioners", is also willing to eradicate the resistance today. And the methods are essentially the same.

The European Union is - more than anything - a German project, which aims to export the German ideology and to give resorting researchers the superpower status they have always dreamed of. The German Empire had no success, the Reformation churches also only received limited distribution and Nazism was defeated. There is therefore a need for new approaches to the dissemination of the German ideology, and here the EU plays the dominant role. The goal of the Germanic rule is the same as it always has been, but the tools are new. But are still willing to spend the necessary violence, and for this purpose, and joy of the young, black-clad "anti-fascists".

The difference between the autonomous and the SS is first of all that the latter is claiming to be informally organized. They do not call themselves a militarist movement, and they claim to defend democratic ideals. This kind of hypocrisy is not used in the SS. For the new fascists is it also to combat the political opposition, as in SS-time was the Communists, but for the modern Neo-fascists it is the right-wing, which in practice meant all who are not applaud and believe in the Jewish history writing. And the Neo-fascists are effective. They attack the legal demonstrations and lecture events organized by their opponents, and then the authorities can ban them, on the grounds that they "lead to violence."

In Denmark, these autonomous manifested itself by preventing foreign speakers (e.g. David Irving) to hold public meetings in Denmark and the so-called right-wing has been repeatedly prevented from holding memorial marches for Rudolf Hess, who was once the criminal who tried to stop the war before it broke out, and therefore was sentenced to life imprisonment and later execution.

History three actors

In the European historiography it is primarily three religious actors who apply. One is Islam, the other Christianity and the third is the Judaism. It is under the influence of one or more of these actors that European history has unfolded, and it is therefore easy to understand that all Europeans - explicitly or implicitly - may identify with one of them, whether one belong to the small proportion of the population who are actively religious practicing or whether one considers itself as inert. Religion one cannot stay out of, for each of the three parties have their own history and characteristic of them all is the fact that the writing party sees itself as the victim of other people's assault and

unfairness. Just to know "its own" story, therefore it is the same as to have formed ties with one of these religions, for there is no history that is beyond these.

Europeans are, formally speaking, Christians, and one might therefore think that they would identify with the Christian tradition. But they have a schismatic relation to this religion, and whether they are Catholics or Protestants, their confidence in the Christian religion's theological and ethical dogmas is very limited. They love the Christian symbols and Christian churches, but they do not want to submit to Christian morality, at least in the version that served the churches.

A common perception among Christian Europeans is that Christianity has played a reactionary and negative role in history. And maybe they are right. Many believe that the Crusades were an expression of imperialism, and stories of medieval persecution of witches and the Pope's dispute with Galileo, has made an impression. The Europeans also believe, however, that Islam is evil because it is a militant religion that oppresses women and discriminate against adherents of other religions. Christianity and Islam are in a certain sense the same. They are both missionary and expression of a problematic morality. And both can degenerate into fanaticism and violence, which means that one should always be careful not to get involved in the religious practice.

The only religious actor that no Europeans have something to put out on to is Judaism. No one knows why these should ever have done something wrong. It is in modern Europe the common perception that Jews always been selfless traders who unjustified have been persecuted by the Christian or Muslim rulers, and Hitler's concentration camps and persecution, is only a logical consequence of earlier Christian anti-Semitism . Under Hitler allegedly 6 million Jews were gassed to death, which happened while a Catholic Pope (Pius XII) and his church were so passively. It is documented that he did a lot to hide individual Jews in monasteries in Italy and France, to shield them from the chasing pack. But until his death in 1957, he spoke at no time about gas chambers, the Holocaust or the sacred number: 6000000. And here he was, moreover, fully in line with Churchill, Eisenhower and DeGaulle. Indeed, none of them knew - apparently - something about the gas chambers. Anyway, they did not speak or write about it.

What was going on in the pope's head, there no one knows. What are the motives and justifications he had? Even today - 50 years after the war's end - there is no Europeans who know the cause of Hitler's hatred of Jews, and if you even dare ask the question, the answer will probably be something like "hereditary anti-Semitism", "disease "or "Christian tradition". That such anti-Semitism could have roots in other than disease and prejudice is for Europeans unthinkable, and if they should dare to think such a thought, they would do well to keep it for themselves. For Jews - per definition - have never done anything wrong.

The European psychology should therefore be understood in the light of the drama, as recent European history consists of. Transaction's theory game theory (Eric Berne) is an excellent tool to understand the connection. Any dramatic story such as WW2 - contains the following three roles:

1. *Persecutor (which is bad)*
2. *Victim (which should be compensated)*

3. *Rescuer (which is a hero).*

And it also applies in the European history of the Second World War, when the Germans are persecutors, the Jews are the victims and the Americans are the rescuers.

When Europeans want to atone for their sins, and because the past cannot be changed, there is only one way to create justice, and that is bend down and confess his guilt. It is an old Christian doctrine, and therefore the Europeans do it again and again. It has introduced an all-Holocaust culture, consisting of memorial days, museums, speech prohibitions and ongoing propaganda on TV and school curriculum. Probably it will not be many years before the term "World War 2" will be forgotten, and it all just going to be about the Holocaust, as most today they are getting in Israeli history curriculum (read Israel Shamir).

The Israeli Jericho missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and more times has made Germans aware that these weapons can easily reach Berlin. There is therefore strong evidence of cooperation from the German side, when the Jewish federation places new demands on restriction of freedom of expression and imprisonment of the new "anti-Semitic" dissidents. Sacrificing rather personal freedom, rather than fall out with the world's most powerful historical-political actor who is known for never doing anything wrong, and therefore are likely to have opportunity to get "accounts to go up" with respect to the post-Nazi German Kingdom in a nuclear Holocaust. And this will probably be without a counter-attack from any side.

The European status hierarchy

Europeans have a status hierarchy. There are some that are better than others, and there is also some that one would rather see ones children socialize than others. This is because there is danger in cultivating relations with the wrong. Evil and fallacy are contagious. The top of the Europeans status hierarchy consists of the Jewish Holocaust survivors, who - on the one hand - represents the European States' guilt and bad conscience, but on the other hand is the best proof that the Europeans recognize their responsibilities and seek to do evil good again. Not only in respect for the deceased and their descendants, but also by providing ample compensation to these people, their organizations and the state where a part of them have chosen to stay.

The next layer in the status hierarchy is the European royal houses and done on different American film stars. The weekly magazines are generally filled with stories of the celebrations, which states that celebrities are taking part in and the amorous relationship, they include. This is not only because the average European woman (m / f) sees these people as personal ideals that she follows along in their lives, but also to dream herself into a world she never even could be a part of. The weekly magazines and TV are designed to make users happy, and one is happy when one follows the interesting human lives, and imagines that one could be in their place. This there is nothing neither good nor bad about, and the modern press plays in this context the same role as the wandering storytellers did in the Middle Ages. It is about to nurture and satisfy the human curiosity.

The absolute lowest end of the European status hierarchy consists of welfare clients, the unemployed and the criminals. But in fierce competition with these - or even lower - are pedophiles and Holocaust deniers. The former is exposed to general hatred, while the latter almost is being greeted with astonishment and fear. We do not know what they

stand for and why they might think something so blatantly wrong seen through the eyes of the public. For just as it was obvious to everyone 500 years ago that witches existed, the Holocaust is an indisputable event for most Europeans. That for less than 40 years ago was a time when people did not know this word, they have long since forgotten.

Faith dilemma

The French film director Claude Lanzmann, who made the seven-hour documentary "Shoah", said: "Either one believes in the Holocaust or also believes in Christ." And he is absolutely right, because there is a gulf between the two concepts. I will not relate to the factual reality behind these stories, because it is not relevant for understanding the role that they play in the modern European culture. About Jesus lived or not, and the Holocaust is a lie, has nothing to do with it. What matters is that you cannot believe in both at once, just as one cannot both believe in the Heliocentric and the Ptolemaic cosmology. And here we come to the fundamental dilemma, which characterize the European psyche. For the Europeans pretend that they are doing the impossible: to believe in both Christ and the Holocaust. Either is Lanzmann wrong, or and so we must recognize that European religion does not actually contain what Europeans pretend that it does.

When there is an insurmountable contradiction between belief in Holocaust and faith in Christ, it is because that a crime as gigantic as it allegedly carried out the Holocaust, cannot be done if there is a loving God and that it could never take place in a country where followers of Christ are in the majority and without any reaction comes from temp of Christ in this world (= Pope).

If you believe in Christ, one must also believe that God holds his hand over his chosen people, and thus do not let it eliminated in the gas chambers. If you believe in Christ, it is impossible to explain to the successor of Peter in Rome did not respond to the extinction of the out-elected when he - better than anyone else in this world - knew what happened in Catholic Poland in the camps, which were guided by his own subjects. If you believe in Christ, it is impossible to explain how so much can violate Christ's commandments ('do unto others as you want them to be against you '), as happened to the Christian Germans. And if you believe in Christ, it is impossible to explain how one can be so indifferent to the suffering of others, as the Christian rulers in England and the United States was when the Jews in societies - even before the war ended - tried to raise one's awareness on the extermination. If the Holocaust is a historical fact in the form in which it is known from history books, then the Christian God is a demon. Or he does not exist. And here comes the problem. For Europeans believe in the Holocaust. They are absolutely convinced that this incident is real, and any challenge of truth in this notion therefore leads to hysterical reactions, censorship, violence, imprisonment and pathological defense reactions. To ask questions about the Holocaust is politically, economically and socially suicidal for Europeans, and although statistical studies show that 10 - 20% of Europeans have doubts about the stories, so the vast majority of these doubters has never had the courage to express those doubts. Freedom of speech has its limits.

The examples found on people who have dared to speak against the orthodoxy, is therefore all the people rooted in non-European countries, and usually even with a Jewish background for example Normen Finkelstein, who managed to hold a lecture in Germany and to escape afterwards, despite the fact that he has written a book in which

he claims that the Holocaust industry is based on lies and exaggeration, and that it aims to make money to an already economically prosperous elite. However, this could also only be done for Finkelstein as he is a Jew and an American citizen. And of course, because he claims himself to believe in it with the basic mythology, gas chambers and 6 million which the German post-Christian culture has made its credo.

What you really believe in, show you know the reactions that you come to when this faith is challenged. And here's the big difference in what happens when Christ and when Holocaust is challenged. The former is many are utterly indifferent to, and not even the Pope can or will do anything about it. A Danish film director made a state-sponsored porn movie with Jesus in the lead role, and it did not lead to appreciable reactions, let alone a ban of any kind. This must then be compared with the utterances contrary to Holocaust orthodoxy which is punishable by imprisonment in several European countries and that in other countries (e.g. Denmark) cannot get these published in the press or published on any publisher. Being a dissident is all about doubting the Holocaust, not in Jesus. The latter you must think about what you want. Everyone does not care.

Christianity is a cultural backdrop in the western world, but it is Christianity without moral commandments. The Christian doctrine in which one must "turn the other cheek", "forgive your enemies" and "not to kill" plays no role and no one believes them. The Western world loves war. The Christian churches have different settings for this fact, but the most common position is the defeatist. Everything indicates that the priests even believe in the gospel they preach, and it is vital to ensure the church's maintenance - and the priests' job - is not the belief in God, but money as the congregation pay.

Europeans and their Catholic and Protestant leaders have made their choice. They call themselves Christians, are not Christians. In return, they believe in a different kind of mythology, and as true believers, they react with rage when this mythology is challenged. Exactly in the same way as their ancestors once did against those who contested through the doctrine of the Trinity or the fact that the sun revolved around the earth. At that time, the dissidents were tortured, imprisoned or burned, but today content to expel and imprison them. Claude Lanzmann is namely right. One cannot both believe in Christ and the Holocaust, which the Europeans neither have done. They have chosen the latter.

Conclusion

Holocaust culture and Mammonism is the dominant axioms of the modern European religion. None ruled to practice abortion or polygamy, but it does not pay its church taxes or contesting the Holocaust, is no more welcome by the German Catholic bishops as stressed in the recent debate on opportuneness of recommences the ex-communist, English bishop and Holocaust critic (Richard Williamson) in the church. The history of the Holocaust has achieved a sacramental status. One is apparently no longer a Catholic baptism, but by declaring his belief in gas chambers and six million murdered Jews.

Characteristic of the European psychology are contradictions between the stated ideals and the actual reality. This contradiction most non-Europeans can easily spot, but in Europe one is not interested generally in others' opinions. It is certain that the God you (not) believe in so much is greater and truer than any other that you actually deny that these exist at all.

But the feeling that you hold the key to the salvation of the world is in contrast to the practice, which it argues. Europeans are unreliable, just like a doctor who does not dare to take the medicine he recommends to patients. No one believes him. There are therefore many contradictions in European psychology, and the European character type cannot be described as unique or one-dimensional. In conclusion, I therefore seek to establish a series of contradictions, which I think is characteristic:

On the one hand, Europeans are idealistic, but on the other materialistic. They think that they hold history's greatest truth and with a moral purity that comes from having done away with their own past evils. But on the other hand, they still cultivate most of the forms of evil, as they boast of having done away with, maybe not in the same form and with the methods, which this evilness once had done but in a much larger scale.

On the one hand the Europeans argue to be supporters of Christianity and the humanistic ideals, including the statements about humans that they have signed. On the other hand, the transfer of power to the core news sources to members of another religion, whose love of Christianity is anything but great.

On the one hand claim to be in favor of science and the necessity of free discussion, but on the other hand, believe that there are some that should be excluded from this discussion, as they already from the beginning can be said to be wrong.

On the one hand one have the ideals of freedom of expression is justified in the Enlightenment notion of the previously mentioned declarations on human rights, but on the other hand, there is the authoritarian demands for uniformity which media rulers are forcing everyone to comply with if they are to avoid jail and will be deemed to be respectable citizens.

On the one hand you have the ideals of democracy, and on the other hand, the fear of anarchy, which is expressed in the requirement of monarchy and thus the possibility of that the strong leader can overtake the charge, when they too easily manipulated-politicians must give up.

On the one hand one has the ideals that the last war was fighting to defend, namely freedom of expression and religious freedom. On the other hand, one had the philo-Semitic European cultures demand that all shall think alike. This leads to several smaller non-Christian religions (Scientology, Jehovah's Witnesses and others) is more or less prohibited in the Central European Germany, as it claims to be in favor of democracy and equality.

Ending:

The tax collector and the Pharisee

The European psychology is best illustrated by one of the stories that Jesus tells his followers. It is about the tax collector and the Pharisee, standing in the temple. The Pharisee says in his prayer:

"God, I thank thee that I am not as other men, extortionists, unjustified or like the tax collector there. I fast twice a week and I give tithes of all my income"

Next to it is the tax collector, who says:

"God, be merciful to my sins." (Lk. 18: 10-14)

And it was the tax collector who received God's forgiveness, says Jesus.

Most countries in the world, the Slavic, Islamic, Asian, African and Latin American all recognize that they are not fully perfect, either economically or politically. They want wealth, peace and democracy that they believe that they have in Europe, but they do not have the financial resources as needed to create such a civilization. Therefore, they want to develop, and are looking slowly approaching the education standard and the highly developed political culture that characterizes Europe. You are fully aware that you are not perfect, and we believe therefore does not mean that you have a social system or ideology that one can afford to compel others. These countries (= 80% of the world's population), is likened to the tax collector, who acknowledges his guilt and seek God's forgiveness. The Europeans are looking like the Pharisee who brags about his deeds and are seeking others' admiration.

The European psychology is characterized by Mammonism, philosemitism, Americanism and fanaticism. Nowadays, the internal standardization and the external expansion take place under the false slogan of "fight against terrorism". Once it was about "struggle against Communism" and in the future, we must fight against something else. Under the guise of this "battle", you give them the right to judge, invade and destroy other countries and to empty the world of natural resources. The perspective of the Earth's downfall is not only theological speculation, it has become a concrete and in realistic perspective in a time when all climate report predicts lasting changes for the worse.

Sooner or later the world will go under, we all know it. But when this should happen and how many generations of our descendants, who will be able to enjoy the pleasures that we have had access, it is an open question. The Judeo-Christian megalomania increases the possibility that it all goes wrong before too long. Consumptionism and Pharisaism has its price. Those who wish to confess his sin and repent have a chance, but the Europeans will not. They follow their masters in Washington and Tel Aviv, and they have long made the ideology of others to their own. They do not want to learn from his own mistakes and have the ability to renew him. The suffering of the age's rigidity, as a dying culture always has shown. The question is just, what comes after.

11. EUROPEAN DISSIDENTS - AUTHORS IN PRISONS

In recent years a number of European authors - mainly Germans - who have dealt with the Holocaust and the real history about the German Jews, were put in prison. None of them have been Nazis, but what they all have in common is that they do not believe in the official mythology about WW2 and the fate of German Jews. They have asked the wrong questions!

Most books that these authors have written is prohibited in Germany, but that does not stop this country - along with other NATO countries - to wage war and to destroy Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria because one do not believe that there is "democracy" in these countries. But there is just so in Germany!

About those convicted and / or imprisoned Holocaust critics you can read more on the Internet:

1. Chemist Germar Rudolf
2. Author Jürgen Graf
3. Historian David Irving
4. Engineer Gerhard Förster
5. Historian Friderich Töben
6. Gyorgy Nagy
7. Engineer Gunter Deckert
8. Professor Robert Faurisson
9. Publisher Ernst Zündel
10. Siegfried Verbeke
11. Wolfgang Froelich
12. Engineer Gerd Honsig '
13. Bishop Richard Williamson

12. GLOSSARY

Second Vatican Council (1962-65):

Large meeting in the Catholic Church, which directed the church's teachings into the experiences of WW2 and Jew persecution. Man went over to the belief that God has two covenants, one with the Jews and the Christians. Jews can be saved without baptism, and the Catholic religion is not a break with Judaism, but part of it. These Judaized performances have evolved into an intrinsic Holocaust-religion that the church today (2009) professes.

Anti-Nomian:

The theological notion that there is a difference between good and evil and / or that one should choose to do evil to promote its own salvation at the always forgiving God. The idea exists among others at Luther and Zabatei Zwi.

Anti-Judaism:

Resisting the Judean religion. Often justified in this religions racist and supremacist teachings contained in the Torah, Talmud and the Kabbalistic writings.

Ant-Semitism:

Means - formally - that opposes the Semitic people, no matter what religion they have. It is about Arabs and other historical peoples of the Middle East. 80% of all Jews are not Semites and the vast majority of all Semites are not Jews. Yet the inverted concept is often used in propagandistic intentions with the same concept as anti-Judaism, which means opposition to the Judean religion.

Holocaust religion:

The dominant religion in the West form has the following key concepts: 6000000, gas chambers, Auschwitz and anti-Semitism. A large majority of the West's residents believe in this religion to such an extent that they believe that it is reasonable that people who doubt its doctrine sentences should be put in prison. This of course only to avoid the two worst culprits of all - Holocaust denial and anti-Semitism – should expand beyond Judaism's own boundaries.

Judaization:

A fact based on a non-Jewish religion is influenced by Judaism and also takes on Jewish standards and the Jewish conception of history. This happened to the Roman Catholic Church after the second Vatican Council (1965) and the modern Evangelical Zionist sects in the United States.

Judeo-Christianity:

This idea is that there is no moral or theological contrast between Judaism and Christianity. The Jews did not kill Jesus and all his statements against Jews and Pharisee are invalied, at least after the Holocaust.

Judeo-Nazism:

It has always been an ideological connection and cooperation between Judaism and Nazism. This is described in many books, for example "Hitler's Jewish Soldiers". Hitler cooperated with the Zionists in Palestine, who offered to enter the war on the German side. Hitler also had many Jewish soldiers and he was wholly or partially Jew. Cooperation between the two ideologies is due to common positions regarding racism, Supremacism and nationalism.

Kabbalah:

It is an esoteric and mystical interpretation of the Hebrew-Jewish writings. It was developed after completion of the Talmud from 7th - 18th century. This Jewish doctrine is usually hidden from Christians because it contains many morally objectionable and anti-Christian elements.

Sephardic Jew:

This is a Jew, who formally converted to Christianity or Islam, but maintaining its Jewish habits and views.

Morano Jews:

They are Sephardic Jews from Spain and Portugal.

Particularism:

This is a point of view that only a particular selected part of humans have God's love. It is conversely Universalism, namely the belief that God loves all people and is open up for their salvation.

Proxy:

To manage through the proxy means to manage through the other, which means to get others to do the work and the actions that you do not even want to perform.

Racism:

The perception, that a particular people or an ethnic group, are closer to God and thus better than others. Racism leads to Supremacism, the doctrine of a people is above the other, and thus has the right to suppress, kill and mistreat members of other peoples. Racism and Supremacism is best known in the Jewish (Talmud) and the Aryan (Hitler) version.

Super Secessionism:

This is the belief that the Christian covenant with God in Jesus Christ supersedes all previous pacts, including the Jewish covenant through Moses. So there is only one covenant, and it makes all previous covenants invalid (see and so two covenant-doctrines).

Supremacism:

This is a kind of racism, the thought that a particular kind of people is superior to others and thus has moral rights that these others have not. Supremacism is different from beliefs in diversity, which recognizes every individual and every people's features and special abilities. In Supremacism one asserts that a people is generally superior over others, more loved by God and thus beyond the general morale.

6 million:

Mythological figures in Judaism. Originates from the Hebrew basic text of the Torah (3 Mos. 25/10), but can be found many times in later Jewish history, which claims to have been killed "six million" Jews. In most cases, the subsequent historians however, believed it. In Encyclopedia Britannica (1902) it is postulated that in numerous Judean magazines in 1919 it can be found and so already in the beginning of WW2 (1942) Jewish publications argues that now "6 million" Jews has been killed. When the late Nuremberg court of justice claimed that Hitler killed "six million" Jews, it is not an expression of a scientific calculation, but the mythology that says something about who controlled the court of justice.

Talmud:

After the Judaism's division in Christianity and Pharisaism the Jew's new holy book, the Talmud, which is a series of Rabbis interpreting the Torah. The book is strongly anti-Christian and racist and therefore kept hidden from the Christians. These detected it in the early 1200s, where Jews converts translate it and present it to the Pope. The book is condemned by the church and a number of popes.

Two covenant-doctrines:

The heretic and pseudo-Christian doctrine that Jesus' words about the road to heaven only to Christians but not for Jews, who have their own covenant made between God and Moses. According to this doctrine, Christianity must not be extended to the Jews who are being saved solely by virtue of their Judean roots. There are thus two valid covenants between God and man. One concluded with Moses and the other in Jesus Christ. A number of Protestant opinions in the US and other countries have joined this theology, as have some Catholic bishops (e.g. in the USA), which claims that this doctrine is the consequence of the second Vatican Council.

Tribalism:

This is the position that the Jews are a race or a tribe and that therefore they are obliged to defend each other against an evil world. Tribalists often claim that Jews have common DNA and thus the same appearance. Unlike this view there is Confessionalism who believe that Judaism is a religion that one can choose to (convert) or select from. In practice, both of these concepts are often mixed together and their followers live side by side without problems.

13. LITERATURE

- Adelskog, Lars: An empty sack cannot stand (Nordiska förlaget, 2007)
- Bjerknes, Christopher Jon: The Jewish Genocide of Armenian Christians (pdf, 2007)
- Black, E; IBM and the Holocaust. Crown Publishers, 2001.
- Blech, Benjamin: The Secret of Hebrew Words (Jason Aronson Book, 2001)
- Blum, Jacques & Eva Bøgild: lying roads (Lindhardt and Ringhof, 2002)
- Borgir, Arne: Genocide. Debate In Oslo (Connector Press, 2003)
- Butz, AR: The Hoax of the Twentieth Century (Historical Review Press, 1977)
- Davis, Uri: Israel, an apartheid state (Abridged version 2001, Zeed Books)
- Duke, David: The judiska Rasismen (Nordiska Förlaget, 2004)
- Finkelstein, Norman: The Holocaust Industry (Harvesting and Son, 2001)
- Friediger, M: Jewish history (Haase, 1934)
- Gauss, Ernst (G. Rudolf) (Ed.): Dissecting the Holocaust (Thesis and Diss., Press, 2000)
- Garaudy, R; The Mythical Foundations of Israeli Policy. SFI, 1997.
- Graf, Jürgen: Förintelsen Skärskådad (Oberoende Information, 1999)
- Graf, J. & Montoriol, B: Holocaust revisionism - The argument (Hist.Rev.Press, 2007)
- Heddesheimer, Don: The First Holocaust. (Thesis & Dissertation Press, 2003)
- Hitchcock, Andrew Carrington: The Synagogue of Satan (Rivercrest Publishing, 2009)
- Johnson, Paul: A History of the Jews (Phoenix Press, 1987)
- Jones, E. Michael: The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit (Fidelity Press, 2008)
- Jones, E. Michael: The Pope's visit and the End of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue (Culture Wars Magazine, July / August 2009)
- Lazare, Bernard: Anti-Semitism: Its history and Causes (Cosimo, 2005)
- Lipstadt, Deborah: Denying the Holocaust (1994)
- Macdonald, Kevin: The Culture of Critique (1stBooks, 2002)
- Mearscheimer & Walt: The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy (A.Lane, 2007)

Matzen, Jeppe: Israel's history of the Holocaust (Academic Press, 2002)

Novick, P; The Holocaust in American Life (Mariner Books, 2000)

Ostrovsky, Victor: Using deception (Collector, 1990)

Pike, Theodore Winston: Israel Our Duty ... Our Dilemma (Big Sky Press, 1988)

Rigg, Bryan Mark: Hitler's Jewish Soldiers (University Press of Kansas, 2002)

Shahak, Israel: Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel (Pluto Press, 1999)

Shahak, Israel: Jewish History, Jewish Religion (Pluto Press, 1994)

Shamir, Israel: Cabbala of Power (SurgeBooks, 2007)

Shamir, Israel: Galilee Flowers (BookSurge, 2005)

Shamir, Israel: Masters of Discourse (Surge Books, 2008)

Shermer, Michael, Alex Grobman: Denying History (Univ. Of California Press, 2002)

Slezkine, Yuri: The Jewish Century (Princeton University Press, 2006)

Weber, Mark: A Look at The 'Powerful Jewish Lobby' (IHR leaflet, 2002)