

Our Advertisers Represent Some Of The Most Unique Products & Services On Earth!



www.PhysicalAddictions.com Discount Nutrition Center

Update On Heroic German Atty Sylvia Stolz Trials

5-31-9

Day 8 Mannheim District Court, 30 April 2009

Ich gehe ins Gefängnis, das ist mir die Wahrheit wert, und das ist mir das deutsche Volk wert. Sie wollen mit einer Strafe meine Überzeugungen ändern, aber das können Sie nicht.

"I am willing to go to prison for the sake of the truth and the German nation. You are determined to destroy my convictions by imprisoning me, but it is beyond your power to do so."

--Quotation from SPIEGEL Magazine, 9 May 2009

Reported by Günter Deckert posted at globalfire.tv/nj/09de/verfolgungen/sylviaStolz_revision1.htm

Translated from the German by J M Damon. jamesmdamon@yahoo.com his translation available on request as an MS Word document.

Background to the Stolz trials: in January 2008, petite Attorney Sylvia Stolz, known as the "German Joan of Arc" for her courageous defense of patriotic dissidents, was sentenced to 42 months imprisonment by Mannheim District Court and led from the courtroom in chains.

For Günter Deckert's on-the-spot account of that event, visit www.loveforlife.com.au/node/3372 We must realize that more is at stake in these "Holo" trials than the fate of individual revisionists. The whole Enlightenment concept that judicial truth should be determined by empirical evidence rather than authoritarian decree is in jeopardy - see article by Prof. Egon Flaig at www.codoh.com/newsite/sr/online/sr_155.pdf> We are greatly indebted to Günter Deckert for his detailed and sympathetic coverage of these modern witch trials. He too endured years of incarceration in the struggle for a representative German state. His reports

are the only alternative to the venal accounts in the "Establishment" media.

Eighth Day, 30 April 2009

At 9:12, Presiding Judge Olaf Rinio allows Attorney Bock to begin.

In order to illustrate the deliberate falsification of contemporary history by the German media, Bock begins by referring to an article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung in which the town of Dachau is called "a symbol of organized mass murder."

He gives numerous illustrations of postwar anti German propaganda, such as factual evidence that the Americans forced German prisoners to build the so-called "Dachau gas chamber" after the War had ended, and that German prisoners were coerced into confessing atrocities that never occurred, such as shooting captured US soldiers. The best example of intensified and incessant postwar Allied atrocity propaganda is that of the coerced confessions presented by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, which provides the basis for allegations of homicidal gas chambers and mass murders of Jews.

Bock refers to several well documented and unrefuted books, such as Judge Wilhelm Stäglich's *The Auschwitz Myth* and Germar Rudolf's *Lectures on the Holocaust*, which are proscribed or indexed in Germany because they support a German point of view.

Proscribing a historical work without refuting it strongly suggests that the work is true.

Reading these books would illustrate Sylvia Stolz's transition from believer in the official version of "Holocaust" to doubter, if the Court would permit evidentiary motions. German law clearly instructs judges to investigate the defendant's motives for committing "criminal acts."

However, the Court refused to consider the books, ruling them "irrelevant to the determination of guilt."

Bock points out that they should be considered in determining a lesser sentence than 42 months' imprisonment, which is the purpose of the present appeal trial. He urges the Court to consider that logical thinking has not yet been entirely forbidden in the West, and Sylvia's position should be considered as an attorney, she is an "Organ der Rechtspflege" ("instrument for the administration of law"), given the responsibility of defending her clients.

To emphasize this point he refers to several judges of the Third Reich who were allowed to continue their legal careers in 1945, such as a Dr. Woll, who became the head district attorney in Karlsruhe.

The Stuttgart District Attorney dismissed indictments against him.

Bock points out the Court's crass duplicitous morality.

He also mentions Judges Müller, Orlet and Folkerts who in their verdict of the Deckert case emphasized the defendant's "very strong character."

As a consequence of their verdict Judges Müller and Orlet were placed on sick leave and Orlet was forced into early retirement.

These judges narrowly escaped indictment for observing that the defendant was a man of "strong character" because the anti German media and certain craven politicians orchestrated a world wide howling campaign.

Bock points out that, fifteen years after the Orlet affair, the judges of this Court are understandably eager to avoid Judge Orlet's fate. In order to prove their loyalty to an arbitrary and tyrannical system, they must pronounce increasingly harsher sentences. This is the only way they can avoid criticism by venal politicians and slanderous attacks by the media.

By upholding the growing repression, they can avoid having pickets posted in front of the courthouse and their residences. They will not have to worry about being forced into early retirement with reduced pensions.

He notes that all the unpleasantries that can befall them as members of this Court are contingent on their complicity in repression and injustice. He remarks that these same dark forces of repression will not allow them to lift Sylvia's *mittimus* (arrest warrant), even though there is no danger of flight. He calls Article 130 of the Penal Code a legalistic anachronism,

used purely as a *Würgeisen* (instrument of repression), since the existence of the Federal Republic has never been threatened by Revisionists. The present government likes to call itself a defender of freedom, but there is no freedom for dissenters. Was there ever a regime that did not allow its subjects to agree with it? At 9:29 he concludes with a famous quotation from Schiller: "Enlightenment is always limited to the few!"

At 9:30, Sylvia begins her summarization with references to a proven falsification that continues to be published in the anti German media, a fake photo that purports to show German soldiers shooting Jews in the Ukraine during World War II. It was first published in SPIEGEL magazine in 1966. In his article "Do Photographs Prove Extermination of Jews?" the photographic expert Udo Walendy proved the photograph to be a fake.

[Posted at <<<http://www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth/fndgcffor.html>>>] In July 2008 SPIEGEL again printed the same fake photo, this time in conjunction with a review of *Les Bienveillantes* (The Kindly Ones) a novel by the American Jew Jonathan Littell now residing in France. What is one to think of a major German news magazine that continues to publish fake anti

German propaganda after it is proven fake?

Then Sylvia refers to testimony from the Nuremberg Tribunals in which a Jewish witness admits that among the tons of captured documents from the National Socialist period, there was not a single photograph of Jews being "exterminated." Next, she quotes a statement attributed to the American Jew Walter Lippmann (1889 1974), a well known journalist with close ties to powerful politicians: "Not until the war propaganda of the victors has found its way into the history books of the vanquished and is believed by subsequent generations can German re-education be considered as really successful." She explains that what is continuing to occur is the transplantation of the victors' moralistic values, emphasizing once again that there are plenty of good reasons to doubt the official depiction of "Holocaust."

Sylvia points out that it is far from true that "Holocaust" is "manifestly obvious" even though the courts insist that this is true. The only thing that is obvious is that empirical facts do not require enforcement through misuse of the criminal laws. Germany's vassal occupation government has deliberately obscured the true history of "Holocaust" and implanted the views of our enemies in the media and history books. Then she describes the mission and purpose of the puppet "Federal Republic" or *Organizationsform einer Modalität der Fremdherrschaft* (Organizational Form of a Modality of Foreign Rule) as its authors called it in 1948. This mission is to eternally depict Germans as a nation of criminal perpetrators. She points out that in her present trial, the Court has included the verdict from her first trial. In their reasons for judgment, the courts are hiding behind their own findings in order to protect themselves, otherwise they would have to exonerate her. She says that she has enumerated a great many empirical reasons for doubting official "Holocaust" historiography, but the Court has rejected all of her evidentiary motions on the pretext that they are "irrelevant." The Glenz verdict made no ruling on the matter. In such a situation, what knowledge of official "Holocaust" could she or should she have had? For this reason new determinations are required, based on established rules of procedure. She emphasizes that she has never acted against what she believed to be the truth. She has never admitted "criminal acts" or signed confessions, as the Glenz verdict alleges. If this Court is to dispense justice it must first determine the truth, otherwise no legitimate ruling is possible. Instead of this, the Court plays tricks with the facts of the case in order to suppress evidentiary motions. For example the Court disallows the evidentiary motion that would reveal the basis on which the so-called "Manifest Obviousness" of "Holocaust" rests (the International Military Tribunal, which dispensed with rules of evidence.) The Court's mere reference to the Auschwitz verdict at Frankfurt (1969) is obviously inadequate.

Again she explains in detail the recommendation of the Petitions Committee of the German Parliament regarding "Manifest Obviousness" and reminds

the Court of its responsibility to investigate pertinent matters of fact. It is genuinely obvious that the assumption of phony "Manifest Obviousness" is designed to severely restrict the Defense. It is a genuinely obvious necessity that the Court discuss the foundations of "Holocaust" in order for the defendant to establish his position regarding it. And yet all German courts, including the High Court have consistently refused to consider the basis of "Holocaust." In order to help the lay judges understand this important issue (they have not asked a single question during the whole trial), Sylvia reiterates that this court too is obligated to establish for itself the fundamental questions regarding "Holocaust" such as time, place, numbers of victims, perpetrators, weapons used, etc. This is what courts have to do in enlightened societies. She describes how the Glenz Court operated in a complete vacuum regarding these fundamentals, since under penalty of law "Holocaust" allegations cannot be examined regardless of how absurd they may be. This circumstance is unique in criminal law -- it is incomprehensible! It exhibits official capriciousness and is therefore a major violation of law and judicial procedure. She points out that "Holocaust" trials are not a matter of law, but rather Talmudic logic. Then she refers to her evidentiary motion of 11 December 2007.

After a pause she continues her explanation of why the Court's conduct is extremist and obviously partial. The Court is clearly relying on intimidation. In her present (appeal) trial, the verdict was obviously decided before the trial began. She repeats the points she has made, following the principle of "keep hammering until the nail is driven in." Hoping that the two lay judges will be able to comprehend what is going on, she makes the following eight points:

- 1) The "Manifest Obviousness of Holocaust" is not built on expert forensic evidence, but rather on coerced confessions and contradictory accounts of biased witnesses, as is well documented in the book by Stefan Graf.
- 2) On 19 March 2008, Chancellor Andrea Merkel stated before the Israeli Parliament that Israel's security is the "raison d'etre" of the Federal Republic! [This reminds us of the declaration of "Sozi" Struck to the effect that the security of the BRDDR (the present government, the two German puppet governments that merged in 1990) must be defended on the Hindu Kusch!"]
- 3) The Merkel intervention in the case of the English Bishop Williamson. According to Merkel, this intervention in a Church matter was necessary because, since it concerned "Holocaust," it had to do with "a fundamental matter of national principle."
- 4) Germany has not had a government that represented its national interests since 1945. Sylvia explains the problems connected with the so-called Federal Republic, its Grundgesetz (Basic Law) and OMF (Organizationsform einer Modalität der Fremdherrschaft = Organizational

Form of a Modality of Foreign Domination, the description provided by its author Carlo Schmid in order to avoid using the term "puppet government.") She also discusses the 2 + 4 Verträge (Two Plus Four Agreement), etc. [Under "Two Plus Four" both the US and USSR agreed to remove their military forces from Germany and the present regime renounced its claims to its eastern provinces.] Sylvia explains that despite everything, the legal fact of the matter is that the Reich continues to exist, although it is not allowed to carry out its legitimate functions. This was the official pronouncement of Bundesverfassungsgericht ("Constitutional Court") in 1956.

5) Maintaining "Holocaust" as moral and political basis of the Federal Republic obscures the existence of close political connections and global control by world Jewry, especially the role of Alan Greenspan in the US Federal Reserve Bank, which is a private bank controlled by world Jewry. Then she explains how this brought about the present global crisis beginning on Wall Street, and its global consequences. World Jewry inevitably charges "anti-Semitism" whenever its misdeeds are revealed! "Holocaust" also provides cover for the genocidal policies of the Zionist settler state, including the most recent assault on Gaza.

6) German courts are not oriented toward truth and justice, but rather "success." This pursuit of success validates the courts' resort to terror. As proof of this she refers to Horst Mahler's Munich prison sentence of 13 years. The severity of his sentence is obviously a desperate attempt to deter those who would follow his example. This in turn gives rise to suspicions that "Holocaust" judges receive given special extralegal training, as was proven in a trial of Prof. Robert Faurisson in France. In that case, the presiding judge took part in seminars conducted by the Wiesenthal Foundation.

7) Sylvia makes the point that in Nuremberg type show trials, it is difficult to "put a good face on bad deeds." Then she appeals to the professional ethos of the judges. If they are interested in nothing except her conviction, they are acting with criminal intent. She relates an illustrative instance of juridical malpractice, the case of a judge in the former DDR who sentenced a political dissident to eight years in prison. The Bundesverfassungsgericht found that such a prison sentence for opinion crime was designed to protective the regime. It was therefore criminal in nature, an aggravated bending of the law and perversion of justice. This ruling by the highest court can be applied to "Holocaust" trials. The present persecutions of "Holocaust Deniers" are designed to punish and repress negative opinions of the present power structure. She observes that today's "BRDDR" (the merged puppet governments created by the victors of World War II that combine the worse elements of both) finds itself in the same situation as the former DDR 20 years ago.

8) Sylvia warns the Court that officials cannot excuse their misconduct by hiding behind government decrees. Both professional and lay judges have

personal responsibilities, even if they are not aware of them. Sylvia warns them that the wind will certainly change some day it is bound to blow in a different direction. She explains that her remarks are not meant as insult or threat, but rather as a well-intentioned admonition of the Court's unavoidable responsibility to strive for the determination of truth and fulfill its sworn duty to the German Volk.

At 12:04 she requests another pause and Judge Rinio announces noonday recess until 1:30. After noon Grossmann returns to represent the District Attorney's office.. Sylvia begins by submitting a complaint as well as two additional evidentiary motions. One of the motions concerns author and musician Gilad Atzmon, an Israeli Jew living in exile in London. She refers to a lecture and discussion in Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung in which he documents some of the many ways the Americans and Zionists have falsified history. He too disputes the orthodox number of "Holocaust" victims and reiterates that there is no forensic evidence of "Holocaust." [At the time of that lecture, I (Günter Deckert) filed a complaint of "VERHARMLOSUNG" (understating the seriousness) of "Holocaust" such as had been filed against me. The investigation was quickly dropped, the District Attorney saying that nobody heard the lecture except a journalist. The DA claimed he did not report it and consequently nobody heard it.] The second evidentiary motion called for an expert witness on the history of the Third Reich and "Holocaust," which would show that every intelligent, informed and objective observer has doubts about "Holocaust."

Sylvia reiterates that imprisoning dissidents is an act of pure caprice and arbitrariness. The motivations of dissidents are neither malicious nor criminal. Dissidents are motivated by a quest for truth and objectivity; but this quest is blocked by judicial verbiage. The courts do not want to research the truth, since doing so would imperil the political power structure. However, only the truth can make us free. The power elite are also afraid that exposing the "Holocaust" lie will hasten the restoration of National Socialism. Sylvia points out that the National Socialists had no intention of exterminating Jews and made no attempt to do so. What they accomplished was in fact the liberation of Germany from Jewish domination. Then she responds to the District Attorney's charge that she has undergone no change in attitude while in prison. The District Attorney maintains that she is not remorseful, has not repented, and persists in her heresies and therefore there is no reason to lessen her sentence. Sylvia asks the question: why would the District Attorney expect her to change her opinion? She has seen no evidence to suggest that the District Attorney's office has made any factual determinations. That office has never informed her what she is supposed to think, only what she is not allowed to think. That office has done nothing except refer to the "criminal nature" of her evidentiary motions and her legal attempts to defend her clients.

The District Attorney has never debted her, never attempted to dispute anything she presented to the Court. On the contrary, the District Attorney

prohibits the Defense from pursuing the truth and punishes the Defense for attempting to submit empirical evidence. Does a book lose its intrinsic validity just because it is placed on the forbidden list? It is very clear that the Court "heads the prosecution" and influences opinion and belief with violence and coercion, exactly as George Orwell describes it in his novel "1984." Whoever does not "believe" in "Holocaust" is existentially destroyed and robbed of his freedom. Sylvia asks the Court: Do you really expect to bring about rejection and renunciation of Revisionism with such methods, in view of Revisionism's overwhelming empirical evidence? For persons with character and integrity, proscription and persecution merely strengthen their determination to resist.

She tells the Court that they are going to uphold her prison sentence because she is not dumb and cowardly enough to believe in "Holocaust." They are going to affirm the sentence because she continues to believe that her country is being destroyed by the "Holocaust" Lie. The Court will again say that she is ungrateful for over sixty years of "freedom" in Germany. Well, it is a very curious sort of freedom when citizens are imprisoned for harboring dissenting opinions on historical subjects. She observes that every individual has to make certain basic decisions for himself, and he who decides not to decide has also made a decision. That decision is for spiritual and intellectual slavery.

Next, Sylvia explains how her trial is also connected with the global change in basic concepts and attitudes brought on by the financial and economic crises. There is no easy way out of these crises. Whoever shuts his eyes to the truth or remains silent even though he knows better, is inculcating himself. Only the really dumb slave thinks he is free. She says that anyone who goes to jail for the sake of freedom and justice is free in his soul: prison is not a shame but rather an honor! At 2:05 there is another recess, until 2:30.

Then Sylvia explains that these latter day witch trials are compelled to disallow evidentiary motions because they have to protect the "Holocaust" Lie. She is intimately familiar with the difficulties facing the Court and aware that nothing she says can influence its decision. She understands that the Court is programmed to see an evil person in her, someone who has to be stopped because she advocates National Socialism, which they believe is evil incarnate. She reminds them of how they are compelled to rule out any possibility of investigating historical truth. Her evidentiary motions, all of which they have disallowed, prove that there is an abundance of factual support for her convictions and motivations. If the Court followed the legal procedure prescribed by enlightened nations that are ruled by law, it would not be able to dismiss support for her convictions. The German courts make a mockery of enlightened legal procedure.

She remarks that some of the judges leafed through a few pages of her evidentiary motions before disallowing them. The lay judges are even less

concerned with determined her opinions and motivations than are the professional judges; they appear to be unable and unwilling to form a studied opinion. She stands by her decision to have acted as she did and she accepts the consequences of her actions. In every "Holocaust" trial, there is more at stake than the fate of the individual dissident. It is not fate of the individual that is important, it is the fate of the German Volk. Furthermore, the forces that are preying on the Germans are preying the whole world.

She says that she has also attempted to put herself in the place of the professional judges. She has asked herself: what causes German judges to act the way they do and not some other way? What makes them disallow every single evidentiary motion? What would she do in their place? She says that she would have tried to get to the bottom of the case, to the root of the matter. If she had been in their place, she would have allowed the defense attorney to act in a normal and routine manner. The attorney has the option of declining the case and staying out of the matter -- of simply refusing to defend the accused person. The judges do not have this option, however. Her case was assigned to this court and no other. If this court had allowed her evidentiary motions it would have caused very great problems! The least of these problems would have been a career setback for the judges.

Sylvia says that her motions clearly show that official versions of "Holocaust" continue to change with the passing of time and the results of new research. Although the Court makes the easy assumption that she is a falsifier of history, it has never accused her of falsification or prevarication. Anyone who objectively reads and considers her documents would have to admit that doubts concerning official depictions of "Holocaust" are justified. She says that any judge who blocks objective consideration is acting arbitrarily! Such conduct casts a revealing light on the judge's integrity and background. It is natural and inevitable that the background and the reactions of a German judge would be somewhat different from that of a non-German. If the judge should happen to be Jewish, his or her problem of conscience would be intensified. Sylvia knows all too well that professional judges are placed under tremendous public pressure. In order to continue a normal existence they are forced to pass a conformist sentence that is acceptable to the power structure.

Sylvia is making a strong appeal to the conscience of the Court here. She points out what is at stake here: truthful presentation of what really happened three generations ago. The present regime acts only with proscriptio and suppression. It never attempts a factual refutation. The compliant "court historians" consider nothing except allegations that based on coerced confessions and the testimony of biased witnesses, often hearsay evidence. Conformist historians do not present forensic evidence in support of these allegations. They do not even attempt to obtain such evidence. They avoid the questions of "why" and "who benefits?" like the plague.

Their refusal to consider forensic evidence certainly does not benefit the German nation!

Sylvia points out that revisionism and the revisionist method -- the process of constantly changing hypotheses to conform with known and demonstrable facts -- form the basis of every science.. Science flowers and grows not from proscription and taboo but from constant questioning, probing and investigating. It prospers under constant re-examination of existing factual knowledge. Thus revision forms the soul of every science, through the interaction of proposal and counterproposal and always subordinated to the body of known and provable objective facts.

[In the case of Pedro Varela of Barcelona, the Spanish High Court in 2007 decided that "Holocaust Denial" is lawful because Revisionism is an integral and indispensable part of the scientific method.] In Germany, the official version of "Holocaust" has to be protected from scientific inquiry at all costs, by the misuse of criminal law. Germany protects and enforces its state cult of "Holocaust" by segregating, ostracizing, muzzling and bankrupting individual Revisionists. When all else fails it does not hesitate to incarcerate them, for life if need be, as is shown in the case of Horst Mahler.

Turning toward the sneering Judge Rackwitz, Sylvia says that Germans who feel an obligation to acknowledge historical truth are treated like criminals in their own country. She asks if they know who or what is behind official distortions and perversions of history in their fatherland. Are they aware that official "Holocaust" historiography is the basis their peculiar judicial behavior? If it is true that nobody is interested in hearing what Revisionists have to say, why imprison them? Do they ask themselves what powers lie behind the muzzling of Revisionists? She reminds the Court that they could easily determine the truth if they so desired. The uncontested documents that she submitted in her evidentiary motions contain all they need to know. She says the Court should consider that censorship and proscription are powerful recruiting devices for Revisionism. Those Germans who are inspired and imbued with the spirit of the Enlightenment are inevitably alienated from the regime. The Court should consider the Enlightenment credo of defending the right of free speech even when one disagrees with what is said. Contemplative persons are inevitably mistrustful of governments that impose censorship; such is the "fruitful spirit of doubt."

[This reminds us of Robert Burns' famous toast: Here's to him who would speak And here's to him who would write; For there's none ever feared that the truth should be heard Save him whom the Truth would indict!]

Then Sylvia quotes several passages by historical personalities from Michael Berthelm's book *HEIM INS REICH Handbook of Liberation* (published by Europa Publishing House, 2009). She goes on to quote Ilja Ehrenburg, Theodor Kaufmann, Henry Morgenthau, Winston Church etc. in order to demonstrate the real causes of World War II by documenting the war aims

of Germany's enemies. She observes that the defeat of the German armed forces did not change the Allied war aims. Since 1945, Germany's enemies have continued the War by other means, mainly psychological. [These means include Umerziehung (Re-education): see Udo Walendy's Historische Tatsachen as well as Dr. Riegelmann's Auf dem Stundenplan Ersatzblatt für fehlende oder verfälschte Schulbücher, Nr. 4, edited and republished in 1989 by Günter DECKERT und Dr. Rolf KOSIEK.]

Showing signs of exhaustion, Sylvia requests a recess at 4:15. Proceedings continue at 4:30 and District Attorney Grossmann, who for some time has been nervously playing with his ballpoint, interjects that she might like to refer to the Jewish folder instead of quoting from her books. Sylvia promptly replies that she will be glad to do so. Then, Judge Rinio censures her quotations, which he says do not belong in a summarization. Sylvia replies that she cannot keep all her references in her head and needs her notes in order to support her arguments. The judge allows her to continue speaking. Sylvia makes it clear that she is attempting to expose one-sided depictions of history that work to the disadvantage of Germans. It is her mission and purpose to help publicize counterarguments that are suppressed by the present government. She is unable to look on idly while her nation is devastated. She says the consideration of an accurate historiography is highly significant because of its factual content, and accurate historiography is the principal motivation for her actions. Tragically, after three generations of brainwashing, Germans no longer realize the extent to which they have turned into henchmen of their vassal government. The prevailing Gutmenschenmentalität (knownothing do-gooder mentality) of the masses amounts to cheap self-deception in the service of the puppetmasters who are pulling the strings of government.

At 5:30 Sylvia is showing signs of extreme exhaustion and requests a longer recess. Proceedings resume at 6:07. Judge Rinio asks both sides to state their positions on the two submitted evidentiary motions. Judge Rinio indicates that he wants to continue, but Attorney Bock explains that Sylvia is extremely fatigued ("her battery is low") and requests an end to today's proceedings. The professional judges whisper for a while, then Judge Rinio ends today's proceedings. The trial will resume at 2:30 pm on 8 May.

Günter Deckert Weinheim an der Bergstraße, den 6. Mai 2009

For materials documenting these reports, contact me at
guenter.deckert@gmx.de.

Disclaimer

<p>Donate to Rense.com Support Free And Honest Journalism At Rense.com</p>	<p>Email Article</p>	<p>Subscribe To RenseRadio! Enormous Online Archives, MP3s, Streaming Audio Files, Highest Quality Live Programs</p>
---	---------------------------------	---

MainPage

<http://www.rense.com>

This Site Served by TheHostPros