

Kristallnacht was Faked



by Miles Mathis

First published July 26, 2023

How do I know? Because the events leading up to it were faked. Let's start with the assassination of Ernst vom Rath by Herschel Grynszpan in November of 1938. The mainstream story is that Grynszpan (think Greenspan) was a 17-year-old Polish Jew born in Germany but living in Paris temporarily with his uncle and aunt. When the Nazis deported his parents back to Poland while he was gone, little Herschel allegedly got mad, bought a gun, and went to the embassy, where he shot Rath several times. When Rath died and it was reported back in Germany, the Germans allegedly got mad and rioted, breaking the windows of Jewish businesses and torching synagogues.

Already we should be suspicious, since I have previously blown the cover of most famous historical assassinations, including [all four US Presidential assassinations](#), Franz Ferdinand, Olof Palme, and so on. I have also blown the cover of the fake [Beer Hall Putsch](#) as well as the cover of the top Nazis themselves, [proving they weren't who we are told](#). So we should have already assumed all other major Nazi stories were managed or manufactured, the only question being to what extent and to what end.

I will start here with the most obvious hole in the story: a Jewish boy kills a minor German official in Paris, and we are supposed to believe this was sufficient reason for what happened. Allegedly, the SS, SA, Hitler Youth, and German citizens all went ape, damaging 7,000 Jewish businesses and destroying 267 synagogues. Because of one murder in Paris? Really? If a Chinese or Russian citizen killed a low-ranking American envoy in the US Embassy in Paris, do you think even one American would give a damn? No, not even Stormfront would load a gun or throw a rock. It would be a non-event. So why would this alleged murder in Paris cause such a ruckus? Well, as with the [Franz Ferdinand fake assassination](#), *it didn't*. You are only told it did, but it is all the usual con. It happened only on paper, and in the newspapers.

But again, how can I be sure? Here's one easy way. One of the prominent synagogues allegedly destroyed was the Fasanenstrasse Synagogue in Berlin.



It has its own Wiki page, and that is what it supposedly looked like afterwards. So what did it look like before? They have a picture for that as well:



That's supposed to be from 1912, right after it opened. One problem: that isn't a photo, it is an architectural drawing. It proves nothing. Why don't we have any interior photos of this famous synagogue? Why would we have to rely on drawings? Plus, it was destroyed by Allied bombing in 1943, so how do we know if the first picture is from 1938 or 1943? The answer is: we don't.

What about the other 266 synagogues? Well, we can search on that question, and it takes us back to Wikipedia, which [has a page devoted just to that](#). Unfortunately, it only lists 18 in Germany and 9 in Austria, which, according to my math, doesn't add up to 267. So let's look at some of the others,

starting with the first listed, Beuthen Synagogue:



Beuthen is in Silesia, which isn't even Germany. It is Poland. It was technically in Germany during the wars, but it was historically more Hungarian than anything else, at least in its rulers, being owned by the Hohenzollerns and Donnersmarcks. The Donnersmarcks were rich bankers who worked for the Holy Roman Emperor, and you may be interested to know they link us to Goethe through his wife, Otilie, who was the granddaughter of Count Viktor Amadeus Henckel von Donnersmarck, who was a Prussian 3-star general and Governor of Königsberg, as well as being a knight of St. John of Jerusalem.

They don't speak German in Silesia, they speak Silesian, which is closer to Polish.

After the war, the Count von Donnersmarck married the Princess of Luxembourg, in the first royal wedding to be televised:



So that's who we are dealing with here, as usual.

But I guess you noticed that photograph of Beuthen synagogue is also fishy. That is tagged as 1904, but was the sky really full of soot in 1904? Were photos really pixellated in 1904? Did they really have no resolution in 1904? The cameras back then were 8x10 view cameras, with huge plates, so the photos should have astonishing clarity and detail. So what happened? Just poor developing? Do we have any other photos of Beuthen synagogue? A couple, but they are equally fishy.

We are told that Goebbels himself traveled to Beuthen on November 7 to give a fiery speech against the Jews—the very same day that Grynszpan killed Rath. Wow, that was fast! And why Beuthen, a small city on the border that wasn't even ethnically German? Why would Goebbels start his speaking tour on this subject there? Beuthen instead of Berlin or Munich or Frankfurt or Hamburg or Cologne or dozens of other German cities more important to the Nazis than Beuthen?

OK, that was informative, so let's do another one. How about the Grand Synagogue of Nuremberg? Again, [it has it's own page at Wiki](#), but again the photos are all extremely fishy. How do you like this one?



As I have said before, it is absolutely incredible they have the chutzpah to publish photos like that. That is supposed to be from 1890-1905. But the synagogue is obviously just drawn in with a pencil. They forgot to colorize it with the rest of the photo. It doesn't look even remotely real.



There we have several other postcards where the synagogue is just a dome in the background. Proving nothing. And we have no photographs after 1905 and none of the damaged building. This is also

highly suspicious.

After the war ended, the city of Nuremberg did not decide to reconstruct the synagogue, in spite of the area being not overbuilt and available for construction work. Also, the winning entry of Nuremberg's 1947 architectural competition - intended to gather the best plans on how to rebuild the city - did not envision a synagogue on its original premises. **Heinz Schmeißner**, who won the prize, was also the city's official for surface construction from 1937 to 1945, and thus he also formally oversaw the destruction of the synagogue.

What! The guy who won the contract to rebuild Nuremberg was the city's official for construction during Kristallnacht! Remember, we saw exactly the same thing in Dresden. The director of construction in Dresden *before* the firebombing was Hitler's brother-in-law Martin Hammitzsch. So reread that paragraph very closely: even before Kristallnacht, the elders of Nuremberg wanted to get rid of that synagogue. They did not “envision” a synagogue there, and there was apparently no call or push to restore it, either in 1938 or after the war. Very VERY weird. I guess you are seeing a pattern here.

Next let's hit the Leipzig Synagogue. There was apparently a synagogue there in 1860, but the interior photo is again a drawing, and we have no photos of the damaged building. So it may have been pulled down as derelict any time between 1860 and 1938.


The Königsberg Synagogue is also a ghost, and we even get a bait and switch here. We are told there were *three* synagogues in Königsberg, including an Old Synagogue, a New Synagogue, and an Adass Jisroel. Only the New Synagogue was destroyed, we are told, but we are only shown pictures of one synagogue in Königsberg, with no interiors and no pictures of the destruction. Both the Old and New synagogues were allegedly built in the 1890s, though they admit on the Wiki page that the Jewish population of Königsberg was dropping from 5000 in 1880 to under 4000 in 1900. So why would they need to build two large new synagogues in the same decade?

What about the Spandau synagogue? No pics of this at all at Wiki, though there is a page for it. A Bing search takes us to this pic at Wiki/Everipedia, but it is now 404ed.




They apparently don't want you studying a larger version of that, and I just took it from the search. So we can mark that one as another ghost. It may have existed, but as with these others, I would assume it was derelict before the war.

What about the synagogue in Kassel? Wikipedia again gives us no photographs, either before or after, and if we go [here](#), we can see why. That Jewish site sells this as an interior photo of about 1930:



Yep, another drawing.



That's the exterior sometime after its construction in the 1830s. We see streetlamps, so it is probably nearer the end of the century, and already looks derelict by then. So I would assume it had already been pulled down by the 1930s, or it was scheduled for demolition.

I think you are seeing how this is going, so let's move on. There are more of these synagogues at Wikipedia if you need more laughs, but I am not going to waste anymore of my time on them. I want to return to the fake assassination victim Rath, who was Ernst Eduard vom Rath. The vom is like von and indicates he was a noble. In fact, they admit he was aristocracy, and the Raths were upper level, being related closely to the Princes of Salm-Salm and through them to the Hessens, Nassaus,

Lowensteins, Sternbergs, Croys, Wittgensteins, Hohensteins, Furstenbergs, Hohenzollerns, and everyone else. In other words, top Jewish or crypto-Jewish aristocracy. So you should find it strange that our little Jewish boy Greenspan just happened to target a fellow Jew, and no historian ever noticed that. It couldn't be because all the top historians are also Jewish?

I point out that is the second time we have seen the Hohenzollerns in this short paper. They were also closely related to the Donnersmarcks, remember? Which means our fake victim here was related to the ancestral Princes of Silesia, as well as to all the Kings of Europe. Which means he was a close cousin of the Kaiser. So what are the odds he would be shot by this Greenspan boy in Paris, and that the mainstream historians would never make any of these connections?

I also point out that the Furstenbergs link us to Karl Marx, since these are the Westphalens zu Furstenberg, and Marx's wife was Jenny von Westphalen.

Let's not leave the genealogies too soon, since there is a lot to find here. Rath was also a di Rossi through the Salm-Salms, which links us to . . . Napoleon. The di Rossis are also Baciocchis, and Napoleon's sister Maria married Felix Baciocchi, Duke of Lucca, in 1797. This proves once again the Rathes are Jewish, since [I have already proved that Napoleon was Jewish](#). We have more proof of that at Geni.com, where we find Rath's grandmother was a Boninger, a Koester, and a Davidis, three more Jewish names.

But vom Rath wasn't just Jewish, he was also an intelligence agent, and they also admit that. In 1933 he joined the paramilitary unit of the Nazis, the SA. As an aristocrat, he would have naturally gone into Intelligence, since these people don't like to get their hands dirty. As part of the SA, it makes no sense that he would be assigned a diplomatic post in Paris. Is a junior embassy official a paramilitary position? No, of course not: he would be assigned to an intelligence operation like a faked assassination, wouldn't he?



Now let's return to the alleged shooter, Herschel Grynszpan. As I say, that's the same as Greenspan, so the story this kid is from a poor Polish family looks like another fudge. Even before doing any digging, the odds are he is a peerage cousin of his fake victim vom Rath. That is what we have found every single time. Probably an ancestor of Alan Greenspan. His story makes absolutely no sense. Although allegedly a troubled youth, he was given a scholarship by Hanover Jewry to study at the yeshiva in Frankfurt at age 14, in preparation for a trip to Palestine. That doesn't happen to poor unconnected Polish Jews in Germany, or Eastern Jews. It happens for rich local kids. We are told he felt he was ready to go to Palestine at age 16, but the authorities told him he needed to wait another year to be of-age for the trip. So his parents sent him to Paris to hang out for a year. Again, not something that happens to poor Ostjuden. We are told he had to enter France illegally, but they admit his uncle was living in Paris. So there was no reason this rich kid couldn't visit relatives in Paris, or even live with them for a year. This is a direct quote from the mainstream history:

In Paris, he lived in a small Yiddish-speaking enclave of Polish Orthodox Jews. Grynszpan met few people outside it, learning only a few words of French in two years. He initially lived a carefree, bohemian life as a "poet of the streets", spending his days aimlessly wandering and reciting Yiddish poems to himself. Grynszpan's two greatest interests, other than exploring Paris, were spending time in coffeehouses and going to the cinema.

That one paragraph contradicts itself about ten times. Do poor kids with no jobs living off a dirt poor uncle lead Bohemian lives in Paris, doing nothing but going to coffeehouses and cinemas? And if he knew only a few words of French, what movies was he watching? Yiddish cinema in Paris in 1938? C'mon! Make sense!

Grynszpan's German re-entry permit expired in April 1937 and his Polish passport expired in January 1938, leaving him without papers. The Paris Police Prefecture ruled in July 1937 that he had no basis for remaining in France, and he was ordered to leave the following month.

That also makes no sense. If the Paris police had ruled that way, they wouldn't have ordered him to leave, they would have just deported him. They would have forcibly put him on a train and sent someone with him to be sure he didn't get off until he was in Germany. That's how it really worked, and still works.

On 3 November, Grynszpan received a postcard from his sister in Zbąszyn dated 31 October recounting what had happened and (in a line which was crossed out) apparently pleading for help.

So nice of her to date that Halloween! But just ask yourself this: why do we need to know when it was dated? Is that crucial information? No, it is just the usual opportunity for them to drop some numerology down your throat.

Grynszpan went to a gun shop in the Rue du Faubourg St Martin, where he bought a 6.35mm revolver and a box of 25 bullets for 235 francs.

No he didn't, since a legal gun shop with a storefront wouldn't have sold a gun to a poor 17-year-old Polish Jew who couldn't speak French and had no papers. As now, it would be illegal. Plus, that would be about \$150 dollars, so where did this poor Ostjuden with no job and a broke uncle get that kind of pocket money? We are told he walked out of his uncle's house that day with \$200, but the wording there is curious. Notice they don't say his uncle gave it to him, so we are supposed to believe he just found it in the sugar bowl, I guess.

At 9:45 am, Grynszpan identified himself as a German resident at the reception desk and asked to see an embassy official; he did not ask for anyone by name. He claimed to be a spy with important intelligence which he had to give to the most senior diplomat available, preferably the ambassador. Unaware that he had just walked past von Welczeck, Grynszpan asked if he could see "His Excellency, the ambassador" to hand over the "most important document" he claimed to have.[17]

So, let me get this straight, a poor underage Jewish boy “from the east” walked into the German embassy in 1938 and claimed to be a spy, and rather than arrest him they sent him directly to the highest ranking peer on-site, a cousin of princes? And they did that without putting him through any sort of security? Not even a quick frisk? But I guess the Germans just implicitly trusted Jewish boys in 1938. I mean, why wouldn't they? This is also amusing:

According to the French police account, he shouted right before pulling out his gun: "You're a filthy boche! In the name of 12,000 persecuted Jews, here is the document!"[18]

Note the number of the footnote. 18, aces and eights, Chai. But the funny part is that he called Rath a *boche*. A French word. Grynszpan only knew a few words of French, but he knew the word *boche*. In a froth of anger, he didn't speak Yiddish or Polish or German, though speaking to a German. He swore at Rath in French! The scriptwriters here are really testing you. If you will believe this, you will believe anything, and have.

Rath allegedly died on the 9th of November, which just happened to be the anniversary of the fake Beer Hall Putsch. That in turn was staged on the anniversary of the end of WWI in Germany and the proclamation of the German Republic by Philipp Scheidemann on that date in 1918. So it is nice that Grynszpan and Rath timed this so well, right? Just a coincidence, I'm sure.

As in the current fakes I have blown the cover of (think Manson for a start), Grynszpan was interviewed in his cell by reporters from all over the world—though the interview of murderers in their cells was not allowed in Paris in 1938 anymore than it is now. Only agents are interviewed in their fake cells. Grynszpan also made penpals of celebrities in Europe and the US, who were no doubt ordered to play along to promote the story. This is of course another huge red flag.

American “journalist” (read OSS asset) Dorothy Thompson spearheaded the promotion of Grynszpan, which figures, since this had been her assignment from the beginning. She had been telling Nazi stories back to 1933 and before. To gain street cred she was supposedly ejected from Germany in 1934. She was married to Sinclair Lewis at the time, and although the bios now sell her as coming from nowhere, we may assume she was peerage, possibly through the Thompson baronets. Her stepmother was an *Abbott*. Her mother was a *Grierson*, most likely linking her to the Stewarts that way. That would best explain her preferment. The Griersons were baronets of Dumfries.

Thompson was a famous lesbian with a Habsburg jaw, drawn to Zionist projects right out of college. Somehow she scored an interview with Hitler in 1931 and soon spun that out in to a book, *I Saw Hitler*. If you don't think it was raw propaganda, witness this snippet I took right from Wiki:

He is formless, almost faceless, a man whose countenance is a caricature, a man whose framework seems cartilaginous, without bones. He is inconsequential and voluble, ill poised and insecure. He is the very prototype of the little man. [12]

Not a hamhanded hatchet job at all, no.

By 1936 Thompson was famous, writing her column “On the Record” for the Intelligence rag *The New York Herald Tribune*—the *Washington Post* of its time, but much better. It was owned by aristocracy, at first the Reids and Bennetts, later the Whitneys, and was also linked to the Rockefellers. Anyway, Thompson used her pulpit at the *Herald Tribune* and NBC to rattle the cup for Grynspan, collecting donations for his defense which allegedly allowed famous fake attorney Vincent de Moro-Giafferi take up his case. He was French/Italian/Jewish aristocracy and was like the Vincent Bugliosi or F. Lee Bailey of his time, working only these fake cases.



And here is where it gets really weird. Moro-Giafferi knew he couldn't win an acquittal if the jury considered the murder a political assassination, so his defense was to tell the jury it was a crime of passion. How could it be a crime of passion? Only if there was some gay connection between Grynspan and Rath. But guess what, *there was*, and the mainstream historians now admit it. By the time of the trial it had already come out that Rath and Grynspan had previously been seen together at a gay Parisian bar. Several known historians have confirmed this, one quoting the diaries of Andre Gide. Of course this reminds of the fake [Orlando Pulse nightclub shooting of 2016](#), which was at first sold as an attack upon gays, until the gay community admitted shooter Omar Mateen was a known gay, frequenting clubs and chatrooms.

In the Paris event, this is still sold as just a salacious sidelight, but I hope you can now see it is much more than that. It acts as a further strong confirmation that this was a manufactured event, and that both Grynspan and Rath were agents acting their parts. The fact that they knew one another beforehand absolutely destroys the mainstream story, on a wide variety of points. It proves that Grynspan didn't accidentally choose his target, that the event wasn't political and had nothing to do with Judaism, and that Grynspan couldn't have been who we are told he was. Top aristocrats and poor eastern Jews don't meet at the same Parisian bars. And once we accept all that, the rest falls apart as

well, since if that much is lies, then the murder itself must be a lie. There is no chance that all the surrounding claims are false, but that the murder is true.

For more shenanigans, we find Grynszpan's defense stalled for almost two years, although their client was allegedly rotting in prison. We are told they were hoping the publicity would subside, but that is absurd. Even more absurd is that prosecution let them stall, though prosecution should have been pushing for a quick verdict. It was an open and shut case, right? Grynszpan was caught red-handed and confessed, so what was the delay? The delay was that both sides wanted to keep this in the worldwide papers as long as possible. That is how they work, then as now.

As it turns out, this stalling tactic didn't work too well, since when the Nazis took France in 1940, they illegally extradited Grynszpan back to Germany, ending up (we are told) at Sachsenhausen. Two more years went by, which of course also makes no sense. Given what we are told the Nazis were, we would expect Grynszpan to be tried immediately in a grand show trial and executed. Instead, Hitler and Goebbels allowed the farce to drag on and on, even allowing Grynszpan himself to bring up the gay defense, admitting he knew Rath from before. Which of course tends to destroy all the effort Wikipedia spent to deny it. After that, the case of Grynszpan just sort of evaporated. The trial wasn't called off, it was just permanently delayed. The Nazi actors and scriptwriters apparently had better things to do than to continue this farce, and they couldn't figure out the right ending for it, so they just shelved it. No one knows what happened to Grynszpan to this day, though the mainstream historians assure us he must have died in prison or been shot. Other researchers claimed otherwise, saying he had been spotted by many witnesses living in Paris after the war. I think you can now see which is more likely.

Regardless, you have to admit that is a strange ending to such a high profile story, and the ending doesn't lend credence to the beginning, to say the least.

So let us ask who this Grynszpan really was. To answer that, I remind you of Nachman Scholo Greenspan, a Polish-born rabbi who was most famous for his time at Etz Chaim in London. Wikipedia lists conflicting accounts of his birthplace and no parents, but in one account he came out of Lyakhovichi, which is currently in Belarus but had been both Polish and Lithuanian, being ruled by the Radziwills and Vasas. This reminds us that just because Grynszpan came from the east didn't make him a poor Ostjude. These Greenspans from that area were extremely prominent, with links to aristocracy and royalty. My belief is that our Grynszpan is of that line, since it is the only way he could have been hobnobbing with vom Rath in Paris before the event. Even the fact they were both intelligence agents doesn't explain it, since there are ranks and divisions there as well. The aristocrats don't party with the grunts.

There is only one Greenspan listed in the British peerage, and she comes later. But even that may be a clue, since this Lei Greenspan married Franz Ferdinand Graf von Habsburg-Lothringen. So if Grynszpan wasn't related to von Rath and all the kings of Europe before that event, he probably is now through his great-niece or something. Just a guess.

Some will say to me, "OK, maybe the assassination was faked and maybe they faked some of the synagogues being torched, but how can the whole event be 'faked', as you claim in your title? They have lots of pictures of broken windows, like the one under title, so something must have happened."

How could they fake it? Look around you. They do it every month, to this day. You have been watching fake riots and murders for years, though now it is often in support of BLM and staged race wars. Yes, real people get together and do things, but it is all managed. As in 1938 they still target

derelict buildings and set it up with the owners beforehand. To make the farce complete, one of their main targets over the past five years has been the chain store Target, which either needed to update its buildings and inventory, or went into some sort of special partnership with the DoD.

You have been living in a military simulation sold as real your entire life, and it goes back long before you were born. The Matrix isn't one of robot bugs, it is one created for you day by day by the government and media, who use it to herd and fleece you. This isn't hidden very well, as we have seen, since Hollywood—also an arm of the Matrix—likes to throw it in your face. In thousands of pretty transparent movies they have told us what is going on, then laughed at us for assuming it is fiction and entertainment. Their power is so complete they can taunt you to your face, knowing you won't figure it out even after they show you the trick. That is how little they think of you.