

GERMAR SCHEERER  
CERTIFIED CHEMICAL ENGINEER

Postfach 1113  
71094 Schönaich, Germany  
Phone: +49 / 7034 / 31 8 35

Germar Scheerer, Doc. 84 transl.,  
A-#: 78660016, July 9, 2001



To  
Office of the President, Department II/ Legal  
University Stuttgart  
Postfach 10 60 37  
70049 Stuttgart

Your correspondence of: 3/4/1996    Your ref.: V 7812.54/3    Date: 4/16/1996

Re:    My Graduation Proceedings at College 3/ Chemistry at the University Stuttgart  
Application dated July 11, 1993

Reference: Your correspondence referenced above

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Graduation Committee at the University Stuttgart,  
Dear Mr. Bollinger:

I would herewith like to answer the issues mentioned in your correspondence as follows:

**To 1.: Legal validity of Judgement**

The judgment of the State Court Stuttgart against me, case no. 17 Kls 83/94, has become legally valid in accordance with the decision by the Federal Supreme Court dated March 7, 1996.

**To 2.: The Facts**

The 17<sup>th</sup> State Chamber at the State Court Stuttgart had to rule whether or not the version of my opinion, which was propagated by O.E. Remer, was punishable under criminal law. As my attorney stated correctly under No. 10 in his argument for the appeal dated November 16, 1996, case no. 95/119 lb/k, the Chamber has not disclosed whether any of the published or unpublished statements which have been attributed to me, contain punishable facts. Consequently, the Office of the Federal Attorney has argued correctly in its statement dated January 19, 1996, case no. 1 StR 18/96: "It was not to be examined whether or not the contents of the publications listed under no. 10 in the argument for your appeal is punishable. The Defendant's participation in the compilation of said publications is not subject of the sentence." With its decision dated March 7, 1996, case no. 1 StR 18/96, the Federal Supreme Court has agreed with said opinion.

Therefore, I'd like to point out that it must not be the graduation committee's business whether or not I have written anything anywhere because these matters were not subject of the sentencing and have, therefore, not been confirmed as legally punishable acts and cannot be used for evaluation of my honor.

I will now answer the individual issues of your correspondence in detail as follows:



**a) A fanatic ... perpetrator by my own conviction**

I agree with you in one respect: I do what I do out of deepest conviction: I advocate that everybody can publicize and discuss anything he or she deems right. And I stand up for that which I consider right with all resulting consequences. It is the highest duty of every scientist to act this way. If you do not agree with that, one would have to assume that your knowledge swings with the wind and you do not put the truth first. Of course, then you would renounce independent science.

**b) A fanatic *extreme right-wing* perpetrator by my own conviction**

Whenever a group of scientists uses the word "extreme right-wing" these days, one can be sure that they only choose this adjective in order to quickly avoid an uncomfortable dispute with unwanted factual arguments. Do you seriously believe that you are able to do away with even one single revisionist argument by labeling it "extreme right-wing?" On the contrary, it will be interpreted as a declaration of bankruptcy since you cannot think of anything to counter my arguments. Furthermore, your accusation that I misuse science for political purposes only reflects badly on you since you as scientists are supposed to care about factual arguments and not the possible political intentions of other researchers and scientists. Your use of the weapon of political suspicion only proves that you yourselves seek refuge in politics instead of tilling your own--scientific--field.

And finally: An act is either punishable or not but it does not become more punishable or of a more serious criminal character if it is conducted by someone who supposedly acted for reasons of political conviction, no matter how fanatic. How do you actually justify your sentence in light of the fact that there is no justice of moral conviction in the Federal Republic of Germany? Do you plan on introducing it once again through the backdoor?

**c) A double life**

Apparently, you do not even have a command of the German language. A double life is led by persons who act according to opposite or, at least, dissimilar principles in two parts within the same realm of life. However, I have always acted according to one principle alone: I attempt to find the truth, whereby as a scientist I must not pay attention to any taboos and dogmas (notarities), exclude any questions and have results dictated to me. I followed this principle during the writing of my dissertation as well as historically revisionist treatises.

However, I must state that even though you preach and probably live by scientific principles in your ivory towers, you seek refuge in political suspicion whenever an explosive topic approaches you, instead of paying attention to factual issues. You are the ones who live double lives!

**d) Consultation with O.E. Remer**

It is untrue that the court in Stuttgart has imputed that I was aware of the fact that O.E. Remer would garnish my opinion with commentaries. This imputation is based on the fact that the state court has, in at least a grossly negligent manner, distorted a number of statements from different participants of the proceedings as well as evaluated the submitted documents in at least a grossly negligent and one-sided manner.

However, I understand that you must stick to the text of the opinion of the state court Stuttgart. So let us take a closer look. It says on page 115:

*"Even though the Jews are not expressly accused in preface or afterword of having invented the portrayal of the holocaust particularly for their political and material benefit, the purpose of the Remer version of the "expert opinion" for persuading the chamber was to suggest exactly that and, therefore, to stir up hostile emotions against the Jews. This follows because the reader, under the assumption that the allegations in the "expert opinion" are correct, and due to the tendentious statements and diction, had to and was supposed to come to the conclusion that the surviving Jews as the most important witnesses of said events, the survivors as directly affected persons, and the Jewish researchers had to have had deliberately falsified the reports about the holocaust."*

There you have it in black and white: The deeds I was accused of-- public instigation and incitement to racism (Art. 130f, Criminal Code)--are not even accomplished by Remer's comments! According to the laws of 1993, only those persons were to be punished by imprisonment who expressly accused the Jews of having invented the portrayal of the holocaust particularly for their political and material benefit (qualified Auschwitz lie). One has to read between Remer's lines! With this approach, every court in the world can construe any document any way it pleases. Pure arbitrariness reigns!

I cannot prevent you from agreeing with it, but, in return, do not expect me to deem you worthy of your academic degrees.

**e) The Jews as the greatest liars and crooks in the history of mankind**

First of all, let me state exactly where you found this sentence since I am sure you do not want to give the wrong and fatal impression of holding this opinion. It is my opinion and has been taken out of the following context:

*"If the holocaust turns out to be a unique tissue of lies, [...]any sympathy in the world for the greatest liars and crooks in the history of mankind will shatter,"* Judgment, p. 80. This was taken from an unpublished, quickly and roughly drafted file in my computer which was confiscated in the fall of 1993. Since it was unpublished, a criminal act could not even have been committed in theory; therefore, the question regarding my worthiness of an academic degree is as irrelevant as any other thought of any person in the world which has never been brought to light. By using this sentence as a reason for my lack of honor, do you possibly intend to establish a thought police which brings to light that which would never see the light of day without such methods? Are those your constitutional principles? Is this not proof enough that you lead a double life since, on the one hand, you are using big words about the constitutional state, and on the other hand, using unpublished thoughts of a candidate for a doctor's degree to evaluate his honor?

Let's be honest: If the holocaust turns out to be one big lie, it is safe to assume that the liars and crooks left to be determined will certainly no longer receive sympathy--



worldwide. It is an obvious fact that those liars and crooks statistically will have to be sought mainly among the Jews since, doubtlessly, the share of Jews in comparison to the world population would be significantly higher than the average. By the way, this is a well-known fact, as it were, recognized by the German justice system. It also is of the opinion that the Jews would be unmasked as the greatest liars and crooks in the history of mankind if the holocaust--understood as the complete extermination (incineration) of all Jews apprehensible by the National Socialist system--were to turn out to be one big lie. With no other reasoning are revisionists sent to prison, even if they spread the thesis that the holocaust did not take place in purely factual contributions without political statements and without any reference to Jewish issues. Through such theses, according to the justice system, the impartial reader must automatically get the impression that the Jews are exactly those liars and crooks and that this conclusion would be inevitable since hardly any other conclusion could be drawn. But since this conclusion must not be drawn, it cannot be, according to the prevailing opinion of the German justice system. That's the whole miracle behind the overtness of the holocaust: What must not be, cannot be!

Since you as scientists agree with this opinion, you are throwing all basic principles of science out the window and replacing it with the highest of maxims: It cannot be, what must not be. Now this is certainly wishful thinking on your part but no longer a factual review of facts.

In the event that revisionist theses are confirmed, we Germans wouldn't have much to laugh about either because the Germans would be second on the list of the greatest liars (to themselves) and crooks (and self-deceivers) in the history of mankind right after the Jews. And this is not owing to higher moral integrity but solely the (doubtfully) lucky circumstance that there are more uninvolved Germans for every liar and crook simply because our people are more numerous.

In this context I would like to recommend a book, which might enlighten you that Judaism is, indeed, the only religion on earth, which condones, approves or even requires the lie and the fraud against non-believers. This might stimulate your brain cells to think that, after all, it can be what must not be: Israel Shahak, *Jewish History, Jewish Religion*, Pluto Press, London 1994. The author is a left-wing Israeli Jew, professor emeritus in chemistry. He has not yet thrown scientific principles out the window like you and the likes of you in Germany.

**f) Jew Republic of Germany**

Once again, this term was taken from a private letter to a friend. And once again you act as conviction police and cite something which you are not even allowed to use for evaluating my honor; see e)

Let me also give you the entire quote; judgment p. 77:

*"Dear Karl,*

*Thank you very much for the Newsweek article. In this regard, America is quite simply still the land of freedom. We, however, have finally and completely landed in the nut house after our president Wheat Bag [translator's note: play on words with the name*

*'von Weizäcker'] suggested the election of the criminal I. Bubis (construction bribery scandal in Frankfurt, illicit advertising affair of the HR, illicit trading, and today probably drug trafficking as well) as federal president. From February 28, 1993, on, when I received word of Wheat Bag's glorious idea, this country will for me only be the*

*JRG  
Jew Republic of Germany [...]"*

The problem of the great number of Jews in organized crime in Germany (see Hersch Beker or *The Shadow Man*) is a rather old one and has to do with the fact that in post-war Germany, Jews have become morally untouchable due to their alleged fate, which some understood and understand as a free ride for criminal activities.

This realization is nothing new and was already intensely discussed at the time of Adenauer when the topic was the large number of Jew in the red-light district of Frankfurt. Nahum Goldmann, president of the Jewish World Congress at the time, revealed that he apparently told the Secretary of State (*Israel must change its view*, Rowohlt, Reinbek 1976):

*"'Deport [the criminal Jews]! They are parasites, deport them!' He [the Secretary of State]: 'Yes, but there will be an outcry: Anti-Semitism in Germany.' I suggested: 'I will write you a letter, if you want to go ahead with it, as president of the Jewish World Congress, that I suggested it. Put the blame on me!'"*

It did not happen then as it does not happen now: They can do what they want because our entire elite lives a double life: With the constitutional state on their lips, they close both eyes when it comes to Jews.

By the way, I would like to point out to you that my aforementioned letter neither contains value judgment of a Jew as such or the Jews as group nor have I claimed a certain political opinion, and my opinion about the NS persecution of Jews can also not be derived from it. It only calls into question the moral integrity of the chair of the central committee of Jews as well as the fact that said chair was seriously suggested as candidate for the office of president. Since, in my opinion, Mr. Bubis has neither shown any particular moral integrity nor excellent political performance or experience, said suggestion for candidacy can only be based on the fact that he is chair of the Jewish central committee. If, however, the attribute of being the highest representative of an infinitely small minority in our country despite the lack of other characteristics suffices to become candidate for the office of president, it is only because this country pays overly great attention to a tiny minority. Therefore, it seems quite justified to accuse this country of conforming to this minority. It also seems justified to add the name of this minority as prefix to the country's name. This designating naming does not even represent an insult to anyone since nobody would feel insulted with the names Christian Republic of Germany or Muslim Republic of Germany; it would simply describe a certain situation. I'd bet any amount that nobody would complain if the FRG were to be called Christian or Muslim Republic of Germany in a similar context. Only when it concerns the Jews everybody is suddenly beside themselves. The reason is that in this country one can neither criticize a Jew or the Jews

collectively nor the majority's attitude towards this minority. This in itself is sufficient proof for the correctness of my thesis. If this republic didn't conform to the Jews and their (supposed) will in the extreme, nobody would get excited about my words. Your quotation of this passage only proves that you agree with me in this value judgment, for which I thank you.

By the way, I no longer hold the opinion that this republic deserves the name JRG because this only would pay extreme respect to that which is being said and/ or wanted by certain spokesmen of the Jewish faith or what is assumed as their wish and command by a precipitous act of obedience. After all, in our country rages the fear that critique of anything Jewish might lead to the accusation of being anti-Semitic. But this is the worst stigma that could possible exist in Germany after Hitler. To call this republic JRG would falsely equate the majority will of the Jews with that which our "elite," through an act of preventive submission, declare as such. The case of the former president of the Lower House of Parliament, Philipp Jenninger, may serve as an example. His "Faszinosum" speech about the "Crystal Night" led to a scandal at the end of the 80's, in the course of which the Lower House dismissed its president in an act of rash consternation and preventive terror. When several years later Mr. Ignaz Bubis held the same speech before a different audience, he was praised. He has told of this experiment some time ago and we have to thank him for it since it shows the pathological. mental condition of our "elite."

Therefore, it would be more correct to abbreviate our country as follows:

JCC

Judaophile Conviction Dictatorship of Central Europe,  
so as to not defile the terms *Republic* and *Germany* with that which predominates in this country.

**g) Neo-Nazi publications and leaflets**

At least on the basis of the leaflet drafts, which were reproduced in their entirety in the judgment (and none of which are mine and have ever been circulated), you should have come to the realization that they have nothing to do with National Socialist ideology but are about hard scientific and technical facts. However, if you prefer to once again side-step towards political murder vocabulary, you once again demonstrate your academic incapacity in the worst possible manner.

All statements in my writings are based on verifiable sources. Nowhere are there political statements, arguments or agitation. You, however, are throwing political dirt all over the place ("extreme right-wing," "neo-Nazi," "dangerous vitiator of the political atmosphere," etc.). The only thing that makes those publications, which you titled neo-Nazi publications, different from the rest on the market, is the conclusion: The holocaust did not occur. This is the only thing which makes them "neo-Nazi" publications in your eyes. But this only proves that, according to your belief regarding this topic, there must only be one (politically correct) conclusion. All others are politically dismissible and punishable. Do you seriously believe that this still has anything to do with scientific argumentation? *You* are not worthy of academic degrees and titles!



Furthermore, I'd like to state the following:

You impute to the NS regime that it had an interest in 6 million dead Jews, killed through mechanized mass murder. At the same time you insist that this mechanized mass murder took place at exactly this magnitude and you place anybody in the wrong who doubts or attempts to disprove it. With your picture of National Socialism you have in common not only the interest in 6 million murdered Jews but also the NS regime's methods of fighting dissenting persons: they are covered in insults, robbed of their dignity, made fair game, deprived of their rights and locked up, for which, due to lack of sufficient numbers, no concentration camps are yet necessary, but that will surely come to your mind eventually. I therefore state that you are the ones that fit the patterns of behavior, which you call "neo-Nazi-like."

**h) Academic aliases**

I did not know that the use of pseudonyms is punishable or morally disreputable. The occasional use of the doctor's title for Mr. Gauss can be justified with the assumption that in a constitutional state I would actually have held this title only a few months after the initial use of the pseudonym.

It is not my fault that it is being kept from me by a clique of conviction sniffing politicians at the University Stuttgart.

The reason why the authors of the brochure *Time Lies!* chose these 4 pseudonyms follows from the brochure itself and has its roots in the reality satire which German courts have gotten into the habit of performing if people like me present expert witnesses in order to prove our theses: A technician is rejected because he would also need an education in chemistry for the technical issues in question. A chemical engineer is rejected because he is not a technician, a historian because he is not a chemical engineer and toxicologist, and a toxicologist because he is not a lawyer and historian. I admit that experts should only be heard with regard to their fields of expertise, but the courts are quite ingenious when it comes to making up excuses. Even if there was an expert, who is a lawyer, historian, toxicologist, technician, and chemical engineer all at once, he would probably be rejected because he is not a theologian, and as is well known, this is the only field of expertise one really has to have mastered in order to recall the holocaust stories. Of course, these extreme requirements for experts only apply if the court fears that the witness might not subscribe to the prescribed doctrine. Otherwise, suburban pharmacists (Jean-Claude Pressac) and social services administrators (Werner Wegner) are enough to firmly wrap up overtress.

Maybe it was wrong to crown this satire of the German courts with the publication of the brochure *Time Lies!* under an accumulation of pseudonym experts, which include all those fields of expertise required for a revisionist expert if a German court is to accept him. But it was a beautiful satire, even though it might have been wrong to add my "placet" to it.

Since I know from experience that it is forbidden in Germany to make jokes about this



topic and then to laugh about them--only dictatorships and totalitarian systems forbid jokes--I do not expect you to understand this matter nor laugh about it. There is no longer any humor in German universities, anyway.

Since I only count five pseudonyms after this explanation, I don't know if you, who talk about six pseudonyms, cannot count or if I misunderstood Adam Riese.

### **To 3.: Disturbing the social peace**

The question of who has been disturbing the social peace for the last 50 years surely does decisively depend upon whether the conventional representations about the holocaust are true or not. Before this has been clarified (which is being prevented by the overtness formula) any decision as to how revisionist works are to be evaluated, must be ruled out. But even if conventional history were to be correct, it is certainly not a given that there aren't other groups in societies of this world who belong behind bars for massive disturbances of the worldwide social peace. After all, not only the Jews but also the Germans deserve worldwide protection of their dignity. However, it is unbelievable what has had to pass for collective guilt, liability, shame, and responsibility theses for the last 50 years in order to continuously expose the German people to psycho-terror and with an increasing tendency directed towards a one-sided attention to certain aspects of said 12 years. Because even if established history were to be correct, it would not change the fact that, according to Western administration of justice, there is neither tribal liability, collective guilt nor inherited guilt. The worldwide propagandistic actions towards the German people are, therefore, nothing more than a permanent public instigation of all people in the world--including the Germans--against the German people.

I would like to look even closer at the root of the problem and to ask you to follow a somewhat complicated-sounding yet, in principle, quite simple argumentation, which deals with the question whether revisionist theses are, per se, socially damaging.

*Some revisionists conclude from their thesis of principle incorrectness of history regarding the holocaust that it covers up one of the greatest falsifications of history, hence one of the greatest crimes in the history of mankind. Apparently, the prevailing opinion is that those revisionists spread this opinion solely in order to stir up hate against the Jews. The weekly DIE ZEIT from December 31, 1993 even stated that, after all, the revisionists' theses are used to hide the desire to plan and execute a (second) genocide (according to the weekly) against the Jews. Persons with similar ideology hold positions in our legal profession, media, and politics.*

Now, may I turn the tables and apply the same argumentation to the opposite side.

*Their thesis declares that the National Socialists, based on a preconceived plan, exterminated the Jews as much as possible within their realm of power in the name of and with the tolerance and active support of the German people, particularly through an industrially-operated mass murder process using poison gas, and, therefore, committed a unique crime in the history of mankind. What would happen if somebody, for whatever reason, took the view that said thesis regarding the murder of Jews was spread at the end of World War II and afterwards solely for the reason of stirring up hatred against*



*the Germans in order to make their genocide possible and to justify the partial genocide which did take place through expulsion, bombing terror and starvation during imprisonment during war? People who would argue in such a way would be prosecuted.*

How could the legal inequality of these structurally identical arguments be justified? It might be argued that the official holocaust representations are apparently correct and the revisionists' theses incorrect. However, one has to realize that the revisionists are generally convinced of the correctness of their theses, i.e., they do not deliberately speak the "untruth" or lie. Therefore, I allege that in both cases presented above, the respective persons are subjectively convinced of the correctness of their opinions. Therefore, they must be treated equally.

*If the intention behind the spreading of the generally accepted opinion that the holocaust took place does not serve to stir up hatred and the preparation or justification of genocide crimes against the Germans, then how can the intention behind the spreading of the also generally accepted opinion that the written history about the extermination of the Jews is wrong, serve to stir up hatred and the preparation for genocide of the Jews?*

Of course, the same also applies the other way around:

*If it is desirable to spread the opinion, considered to be true, that the holocaust took place because only the continuous remembrance of this crime can prevent a repetition of similar crimes in the future, then the question arises as to why it should not be equally desirable to spread the opinion, also considered to be true, that the written history about the extermination of the Jews is wrong, since one could argue that the continuous remembrance of the crime of arguing and maintaining an incorrect historical picture might prevent repetitions in the future.*

Regarding this point, our legal experts, politicians, and media representatives have only one answer: They simply declare that the revisionists know that they speak the untruth, hence lie; and one lies only with bad intentions. This proves that anti-Semitic attitudes are the real motive of revisionists and not the search for historical truth. However, evidence is never presented because it would hardly be possible to prove that a person holds a complex opinion against his better judgment. Therefore, it is possible to explain the conviction that everybody who has a different opinion about the holocaust must be a liar but with an unusual delusion. Due to a lack of expert knowledge or one's own shady (political) intentions, one is not able or willing to listen to the other side and to enter a topic-related discussion in order to possibly revise one's own prejudice and/or opinion.

And this is exactly what applies to you, dear members of the Graduation Committee at the University Stuttgart: You are either completely incompetent to evaluate those matters and presume to give an opinion which you are not entitled to, or you argue against you own scientific principles on a purely political level solely to "poison the well."

Either one denies you the worthiness to bear academic titles.



**Therefore, I declare that I do not withdraw my application for eligibility for graduation at College 3/ Chemistry at the University Stuttgart because the Graduation Committee is apparently of the opinion that I am not worthy of an academic title, even though this would already constitute sufficient reason.**

**Rather, I declare that I withdraw my application for eligibility for graduation at College 3/ Chemistry at the University Stuttgart because I have come to the conclusion that the members of the Graduation Committee at the University Stuttgart do not possess the necessary dignity to bestow an academic title upon me.**

For the same reason, I also withdraw my action in this matter at the civil court Stuttgart. Furthermore, I would like to ask you to return the documents included in my application to my aforementioned address.

Sincerely,  
[signature]