

1993

104991

Ola Misvær:

*The Perfidious Provocation
or ... Look to Norway*

Survey

It is a fact that we would have been spared for another World War, if the (then) merely "Phoney war" had not been extended in April 1940. That very *change* has been forgotten, overlooked and covered up, wittingly or unwittingly, by all historians - by court historians and revisionists alike. - therefore I think that I am filling a historical "gap" by my essay.

The essay does consist in many subjects (connected with the main theme) being treated in sequences as following:

A) Page 1: A look back at the beginning of the fratricidal 31 years' Civil War in Europe.

B) Page 2: I jump forward to 1939 (skipping the cold war interlude) and use some diary-texts by *Evelyn Waugh* as "focal point." Waugh wrote down many succinct observations (about air-raid scares, etc. in London, arranged by the warmongers already at the outset. Somewhere he even pointed out (not included here) that the common soldiers did not even listen to Churchill (or his "double's") radio-ranting. They were not critical to him, because they were not the least interested in his blather (contrary to the theory that they were duped, etc.)

C) I include (for obvious reasons - pages 67 - 69) something from Waugh's wartime observations in the arbitrary and artificial state-conglomerate¹ that was formerly known by the name "Yugoslavia." Still, actual and relevant comments by Waugh!

D) On page 3 my main theme takes up - I tell about the prelude to the British provocations and designs on Norway.

E) Pages 7 - 9: About the British bait - the "Altmark"-affair.

F) Pages 10 - 28: My findings from *The Parliamentary Debates*. Here I reproduce fully some extremely important source, which until now has been overlooked or only superficially discussed. Included is an interlude (pages 29 - 34): Indispensable views from the American scene, or: Backstage observations concerning what "Anglo-Saxons" term the "theatre-of-war."

G) An overlooked fact in Spaight's (real) "justifications" for his infamous *glorious* (or *splendid*) *decision* - the beginning of *saturation-bombing* perpetrated by allied war-criminals. Spaight's (and presumably his own mentor's) "explanation" was in fact a reference to a (mainly invented) seemingly "terror-bombing" committed by the Germans in 1940 - before

¹ Concocted by the Freemasons at Versailles.

the English started (on May 11). During the war, of course, nobody checked (or could check) Spaight's allegations, and now it is on time at last to do it (pages 40 - 44)!

H) I present also some of my own findings on Hiroshima-revisionism (pages 44 - 46). Nobody can dismiss Leahy's book (with a foreword by Truman himself!) as uninformed.

I) On pages 52 - 59 I include a tribute to Barnes, while we once more sit at his feet and learn about facts together with indispensable informative comments not available from any other source!

J) Pages 59 - 60: From war-guilt-revisionism to holocaust-revisionism, homage á Faurisson.

K) Back to Norway, including some monetary aspects of the wars (pages 64 - 65): with a conclusion from George Armstrong's classic "*The Rotschild Money Trust*."

Then *Appendix*

A) Pages 66 - 69, concerning Waugh's diaries. Then (pages 69f.) I include an extremely important part from Peel's article on the "Bund." That is, *how thoroughly the Zionist tyranny really is working*.

Many patriots do complain, others play the Jew-Power down, and most of us are often dismissing the very "Protocols"-scenario as an exaggerated bluff from our side (like outbidding the Levantines at their own bazaar-demagoguery in more or less paranoid accusations). - Yet, in fact that uncanny "Power-of-the-Purse" (Theodore Herzl) can *never* be exaggerated. What happened to the Bund is proof enough. The most important factor here is the *largeness* of the Bund - the potential! - and as a real power!! - When such a *realpolitisch* strong organisation arises - then and *only* then!! - will we witness the real power of Jewry! - Then the Plutocrats do show their muscles, and the sight and the result is most terrifying!²

In my essay I have used the word (National) "Socialism" in a positive sense, which may be confusing for an American reader. Most Americans are meaning "the dole state" and welfareism by the term "socialism." And the honourable patriot Thomas Watson did the same:

Watson vigorously defended Populism against socialism in the *Jeffersonians*. He pointed out that "no Socialist experiment ever succeeded. "In spite of all the terrible abuses which prevail in Europe and America," he

² We shall not observe such an overwhelming *might* when only minor anti-Jew fracas are happening - ants against a mastodon. I just read about what happened to the "Blueshirts" in Ireland. - It was *outrageous* indeed. Perfectly legal movements, organizations and a party was *outlawed*, outrightly by the tyrant (marrano-Jew) de Valera. Eoin O'Duffy was arrested and jailed (like Fritz Kuhn) without even a shadow of legality. de Valera's Ireland show itself as a totalitarian police state - the almighty Jew had spoken. (Throughout my work I call "a spade, a spade" and a Jew a Jew. I simply cannot the whole time make veiled references to "gentlemen of a certain persuasion").

wrote, "the non-capitalistic nations are the backward nations ... Turkey, India and China cannot be called the victims of Capitalism; but we wouldn't exchange places and conditions with them. Capitalism itself, is enormously advantageous, when Special Privilege is driven out."

Concerning collective ownership, he wrote:

"and it is because I have been a laborer, know the feelings of a laborer, and always expect to keep in touch and sympathy with the real laborer, that I stand so stoutly for the doctrine that the best reward and highest honor Labor can attain is the ownership and enjoyment of what it produces." He contrasted the Populist and socialist views of property: "The Jeffersonian Democrat says, "***Destroy Special Privilege***; make the laws conform to the rule of Equal Rights to all, and you will put it in the power of every industrious man to own his home." The Socialist says, "Let Society own the homes, and let Society move the man about, from house to house, according to the pleasure of Society."³

Yet that is only a question of terms: a definition. What Watson called "Populism" I shall call "Socialism." - And everything Watson did write in the name of populism I shall as a (National) Socialist underwrite in total agreement. Yes, the entire concept of Watson (see his unmaking of the Money Power) is 100 per cent in accordance with what *Gottfried Feder* later said.

³ From "*The Journal of Historical Review*", Vol. 3, Number 3 (Fall 1982), pp. 311 - 312.

Chapter 1

The German emperor Wilhelm II re-counted in his Memoirs how Britain's Edward VII and he himself at his visit in England had agreed upon issuing a common declaration of their consent to peace between the two (then) superpowers. Yet, the publication of their common statement, which was to appear in the press, was delayed by some unnamed officials - and after irrelevant pretexts for keeping it from publication that most important document never was published. Moreover, propagandists started instead a new round of warmongering and sabre-rattling, which eventually led up to the fratricidal World War I. The British propagandists created fears of a German invasion. Books were written, from children's books like P.G. Wodehouse's *"The Swoop"* (in which a boy scout foils an attempted invasion) to Erskine Childers' *"The Riddle of the Sands,"* and (in 1906) William Le Queux' *"The Invasion of 1910,"* whose publication was prodigiously and rewardingly advertised. In 1908 parliamentary concern was such that the Committee of Imperial Defence appointed a Commission of Enquiry on whether an invasion supported by Germany's new navy could succeed. Further-more, plays like Guy du Maurier's *"An Englishman's Home"* and Saki Munro's novel *"When William Came"* were playing up to the war scare with a easily duped public.

Yet, the problem for the leading warmongering plutocrats in 1939 was to keep the war (after "outbreak" in September) "warm," until they were able to provoke Hitler into the real thing: That is, "justifying" the transit from "phoney" to total war, in the eyes of the gullible goyim in and out of the Government in England (as their next step).

- Some years ago I read a very promising survey of British author Evelyn Waugh's diaries in William Grimstad's *"Antizion"*.¹ The quotations were not from the Diaries themselves, but from "Esquire" magazine, September 1973. Yet, when I got a copy of the Diaries, I could not find anything left of the revealing comments made by Waugh.²

We read in the preface to the Diaries, edited by Michael Davie, that he had omitted passages "intolerable offensive and distressing." It must then have been really harsh stuff left out.³

Let us read what Waugh wrote *Monday 4 September 1939*. At that time the Jews and their stooges in the British government worked overtime to keep the declared war going. From the first day there were air raid sirens - though not a single bomb was dropped by the Germans the first half year of the war. Yet, the population of London was forcibly evacuated, in order not to be present and demand a stop to the Jews' *"War of Survival"* (as Arnold Leese called it).

¹ The Noonside Press, 1976.

² The Diaries were published in 1976 and "edited" by a Michael Davie. See **Appendix**.

³ We read for example that Waugh the 12 June 1930, after a "small party", *"Went back and slept with Varda, but both of us too drunk to enjoy ourselves."* A note on the same page (p. 314) tells us that Varda was "The separated wife of Gerald Reitlinger, art historian". (Reportedly, Reitlinger, like "political scientist" Raul Hilberg, has dabbled into history, a subject he never had any prerequisite learning to write about).

Waugh: "*The evenings are very oppressive as we have to sit behind shutters, as, by all accounts, the police are interpreting the regulations with a minimum of good sense, bullying the cottagers for pinpoints of light that would be invisible from the lowest aircraft.*"

And so it continued (**Thursday 7 September 1939**): "*Further foolishness about lights. I spent sometime whitening the buffers of the car and blackening the lights.*"

In other words, "hysteria" would be an understatement, yet the proper term is *Chutzpah*⁴, committed by the Chief Jews in the government. Later, Waugh went to Chatham for training (**Tuesday 27 November 1939**): "*We spent endless time drawing various bits of equipment, going to poison gas-chambers, etc.*" He was thus prepared for what was to experience later.

I jump forward to **Sunday 31 March 1946**, in Nuremberg:

"We drove to the Sports palace which is intact but probably due for demolition ... now full of German Jews in American uniforms photographing one another in the act of giving the Nazi salute from Hitler's rostrum. About eighty per cent of the Americans in Nuremberg seemed to be Jews, for they alone speak German." "In England we talk of the trials as an injudicious travesty. Here they believe their work to be valuable and know it to be arduous. Close acquaintance with their briefs has aroused animosity to the Germans such as I have not heard expressed for five years I went to see the room where a French Jew keeps lampshades of human skin, shrunken heads, soap said to be made of corpses and so forth."

In a letter to Randolph Churchill we read⁵:

"*Obvious irony of Russian bullet-headed automata sitting on judges bench ... Whenever "Russia" is spoken they all start guiltily and their spokesman leaps up to say "I protest that that question is anti-democratic, irrelevant, fascist, cannibalistic & contrary to the Atlantic charter."* Yet, it was a *French Jew* who had robbed the museale specimens for the horror exhibition mentioned above.

⁴ An adequate expression. According to Leo Rosten, *The Joys of Yiddish* (Penguin, 1971) chutzpah can be defined by the following story: Chutzpah is that quality enshrined in a man who, having killed his mother and father, throws himself on the mercy of the court because he is an orphan. A *chutzpanik* may be defined as the man who shouts "Help! Help!" while beating up you.

⁵ *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*, London 1980.

Chapter 2

Now to Norway. In 1940 Great Britain threatened Norway with not selling coal if we did not rent our merchant fleet to them. The threat was full of Jew-inspired *chutzpah*, because in fact it was England which for a century had *pressed* their coal on us. We might have built out our waterfalls to get electric power, and coal we might have bought from other countries. Yet, "our" Government which was headed by Carl Joachim Hambro⁶ (a Jew) did nevertheless lease almost our entire fleet - at too low freights, to the audacious B'nai B'ritish cabal.

In the Norwegian State Archives⁷ there are still some rests of a grand documentation (planned to be edited in 10 White books of each about 200 pages) which the NS Government intended to publish⁸. All the machinations of the former Government were to be unmasked through documentation, i.e., first and foremost the manipulations that led up to the German occupation would be revealed. According to the Hague Convention a nation that does not defend itself against one party of a war, may be legally occupied by the other party, if the latter's interests are suffering under the lenience of the "neutral" state toward the first (aggressor) nation. When first the British attacked the German unarmed merchant ship "Altmark" in Jössingfjord 16 February 1940, and considering the British placing mines in Norwegian territorial waters 8 April 1940, then the Germans acted according to international rights when they did occupy Norway, whose own Government was just puppets for the Jew-ruled Allies.

The apologists for "our" traitorous government did all the time, from 1940 until nowadays, maintain that we "were to weak," etc. to repel the British aggressors. This allegation is no argument at all, because it was our Hague Treaty *duty* to resist the intruders⁹. Yet, the most important fact is that we *might have resisted the British* and, we might also have repelled a German invasion. What is then the explanation? Answer: The British wanted the Germans to occupy Norway! Thus ½ million German soldiers were transferred to Norway - instead of fighting at the continental West and - later - East fronts. Especially the French were keen at (a nice try!) transferring the "action" away from their own borders.

Here are some quotes from a telegram - dated 21 February 1940 - from the French Prime Minister Daladier to the French ambassador in London (a document of which the Germans later captured a copy in the secret archives of General Gamelin): "The occupation of the most important Norwegian harbours and the landing of the first detachments of the Allied forces will give *Sweden the first feeling of security*. This operation has to be planned and enacted independently of the cries of help from Finland, within the shortest time, moreover according to a scenario which the "Altmark"-*affair* does give the pattern for [...] Our main aim must not

⁶ Together with the usual gang of Shabbez Goyim.

⁷ Norsk Riksarkiv

⁸ The NS (Quisling) Patriot government did replace the official Norwegian Government, which fled to London in June 1940.

⁹ Moreover, why should we - then - fight when, after 9 April, the Germans had got a stronghold in our country?

be forgotten. It is to cut Germany off her source of iron ore. Every allied undertaking in Scandinavia has, within the frame of the general war planning of the Allied, only thence a *raison-d'être*, when it is aiming at that result." - Thus quoth the Frenchman, using partly a military and partly a vicarious motive to open a new front safely from the continent.

But what about the date 9 April, one day after the mine provocation of the Englishmen? Answer: The laying of mines was planned to happen already on 5 April, but because of protests from the French against a concerted laying of - airborne - mines in the Rhine¹⁰, which was consequently skipped, the action against Norwegian territorial water was *delayed* to 8 April. Moreover, the Germans knew about the scheduled mine-laying the 5th, and timed their own action accordingly. More of this planning later.

Here follows some quotes from documents from the archives of the French General Staff:¹¹

Paris, 21. February 1940, 15.45 p.m.

- The occupation [by the Allies (O.M.)] of the Norwegian ports shall be a surprise operation done either by the British fleet alone or with French marines support without using allied troops designed for Finland." (Edouard Daladier)

No. 926. S/C E.M. 1. Top Secret

London, 11 March 1940

[...] Mr. Churchill did consider using a cruiser and some destroyers which might land outside Narvik and set ashore troops (up to a battalion) before the arrival of the first convoy of transport vessels. It was a tacit understanding that this operation should be done by "British effectiveness". The War Cabinet did doubt the value of occupying Stavanger and Bergen. The committee did discuss in detail the prognoses for the Narvik campaign and could not see that there were some special difficulties involved. Yet the committee did maintain that it might create serious consequences *not* to occupy Bergen and Stavanger, where the airport easily might be captured by the Germans if we did not arrive firstly."

A note by General Gamelin 10th March 1940: "We shall therefore determinedly follow our plans in Scandinavia in order to at least save Finland, and capture the Swedish ore and the Norwegian ports ..."

18th March the Allied High Command determined to lay mines in Norwegian waters.

Reynaud: "The 30th March Darlan wrote to Daladier and Gamelin that the mines would provoke a German reaction which we must be ready to answer."

The French press was audacious enough to maintain that by admitting the export of iron ore over Narvik the Norwegians were guilty in the killing of every fifth French soldier on the West front! The mining operation, however, was delayed from the 5th April to the 7th April (in concert with the mining of German rivers.).

¹⁰ The eventual German retaliation of which the Frenchmen feared.

¹¹ See Stephen King-Hall, *Secret history of 1939-40. From the Archives of the French General Staff. The Norwegian Campaign*, London, 1946. Without page numbers, retranslated by me from a Norwegian translation.

Reynaud: "The entire operation (against Norway) was delayed to the 7th April, and this delay has made it possible for Hitler to get information of the plan and prepare his reaction."

Then came the laying of mines 7-8th April. And a special telegram was sent from Paris and was printed in Norway's biggest newspaper (*Aftenposten*) 9th April, headlined **"BIG FRENCH-BRITISH FLEET-FORCES ALONG THE NORWEGIAN COAST. - Only the beginning of the new war policy of the Western powers. New operation to be undertaken in the Southeast."** - Then the text itself:

"The French-British coup at the West coast of Norway is greeted with the greatest satisfaction by the French press and in political circles in Paris. As soon as the news were known, the friend of Reynaud met with him and congratulated him with this energetic initiative.

It is a common opinion here that the war now easily will spread to Scandinavia; one is convinced that Germany will retaliate. Such an escalation of the war, one here maintains, will give the Allies great advantages, and the chances of Germany to maintain herself is considered as minimal.

In the meeting of the War Committee today Renault did explain in detail the measures which had been undertaken, and he told also about details concerning the big fleet forces which are concentrated at different positions along the Norwegian coast. He assured that any Norwegian attempt to remove the mines be succeeded with a new and more encompassing laying of mines by the Allies. One is firmly determined to stop all sending of iron ore to Germany from Norway. At the same time it was said that this is only the beginning of the new French-British war policy. New steps will very soon be undertaken in the south-east of Europe, it is said, and the results shall cause, it is expected, the Germans to start an offensive at the Western front. The press is rejoicing tonight, and Renault is praised in high terms as the energetic man France has waited for."

The above ought to be read at least twice!

Already before the 7th April the British did send 5 transport ships with war materials to Bergen (the next largest city in Norway), which did arrive that day, and the 7th a British fleet went from Scapa Flow and Rosyth to land British troops in Norway (in Narvik and Stavanger). The fleet was forced to retreat by a German air squadron and had to return. The lighthouses at the coast of Southern Norway (where the conspirators thought the Germans would arrive) were alight, but in the North, where they waited on the British, the lights were put out the night to the 9th April.

As an example of "neutrality" the "Norwegian" government presumed to represent, the following facts may serve:

1.30 a.m. the 9th April, the cabinet was gathered in the Foreign Department. Here the government got information that unknown men-of-war were sailing at Norway from all directions. 3.30 a.m. a report from Agdenes arrived, that two war vessels had passed the fortress and went into the Trondheim Fjord. Between 3.00 and 4.00 o'clock reports about men-of-war running at Bergen arrived, and about the same time the government learned about a German ship at Stavanger.

"The government was thus for a considerable time in confusion as for the nationality of the ships involved. British or German or both? From Bergen the first confirmed report that the vessels which were running into the Oslo fjord were German. According to Mrs. Harriman the Government got a certain message that the vessels in the Oslo fjord were German. The government thereafter did resolve to mobilise the brigades in the *Southern part of Norway, but not in Trøndelagen (the middle part of Norway) and Northern Norway*. The government must have assumed that the ships which arrived into the Trondheim Fjord *were British*."¹²

According to a secret and personal note from admiral Darlan to the Minister of War in France (dated 12th April) the warnings of Darlan, that he had wasted time by the Norwegian campaign, was justified. He maintained that "because of lack of discretion in Allied circles," the German High Command "must have been acquainted with our decisions", and he pointed out that he the 30th March did urge the necessity of prompt action. He criticised the British who the 5th April made known suddenly that "the first convoy could not start before the 8th, and, as the port which was chosen in Norway might only take six vessels, the French contingent could not get ashore before the 26th April." (!)

The most important issue of the allies was to get Hitler to be convinced of the Norwegian government's unreliableness. Into such a warranted mistrust Hitler easily was led¹³. In other words: The task of the British was to get Hitler to see the *truth* about "our" traitorous government. - Still, there was a little problem: The Norwegian people themselves. If the British did provoke us too much, the Norwegians might start considering the Allies as enemies - and even join Germany. Accordingly our traitorous King Haakon VII did ask the British *to let the Germans come first*, according to a letter of "our" ambassador Colban in London. Furthermore, "our" "Foreign Minister"¹⁴ Halvdan Koht had reportedly talked about a Norwegian war participation "on the right side," and was worried that the zealous Englishmen might blunder and provoke us too much. Halvdan Koht even suppressed the British note he got about mines-laying the 5 April, in order not to unmask the overeager British, who, as said above, was hampered by the reluctant Frenchmen¹⁵.

The British had gotten information about the German (re-)action from their main spy in Germany, Major-General Hans Oster (who send his reports via Haag) - perhaps the most insidious traitor next to Canaris himself. And the Norwegian traitors not only had to rely on British intelligence, but were even warned by our own legation in Berlin the 7th April that the Germans were coming. There was even a telephone from Berlin to "Aftenposten", that "everybody there knew that an attack on Norway was forthcoming."¹⁶

The British agent "Eric Smith" was the liaison man at the Norwegian court, and the audacious Louis Mount batten, who was supervising the laying of mines 8 April, told an

¹² Harald K. Johansen, *The Norwegian Tragedy*, Federative, Stockholm 1943.

¹³ even by Vidkun Quisling, who thus unwittingly acted as an agent for the Allies.

¹⁴ i.e. the same as "Secretary of State" in the US.

¹⁵ As you know, the English have all the time been brave enough to fight until the last Frenchman has fallen.

overawed Norwegian naval officer to bring his best regards to his cousin, the King of Norway¹⁷.

In the documents in the Norwegian State Archives we find testimonies (affidavits) of the leading naval officers who 16 February did command torpedo boats in Jössingfjord. As you probably know, the British were going to "save" prisoners (survivors from the sinking British ship) which had been rescued by the German merchant ship "Altmark". The Englishmen complained about "400 starving British citizens" onboard of "Altmark". Yet, the Captain of torpedo boat "Teist", lieutenant Trygve John Johnsen, did get information from Captain Vian of "Cossack" that he came to liberate 303 prisoners "of whom 1/3 were English, the rest coolies." The witness Johnsen told further that he had a 100 per cent chance to hit "Cossack" with a torpedo, yet the commanding admiral Diesen (whose daughter was the mistress of above mentioned Foreign Minister Koht) had given orders to do nothing - in spite of the brazen British aggressions. Our leaders might have given orders to torpedo "Cossack" at least at two possible positions, yet "our" authorities did have no will at all to maintain our neutrality. "Altmark" had been told by "our" own leaders to go into Jössingfjord, like a sitting duck ("Altmark"s rudder was badly damaged). Furthermore, after the British aggression the Norwegians were impudently thanked for their co-operation by the haughty British.

Another affidavit (each of 8-14 pages) is from Finn Gunnar Finson-Halvorsen. He was divisionary chief of 5 torpedo boats. He told that he got orders *not* to escort (damaged) "Altmark" 16 February. He had observed British destroyers steering towards the coast. Later, 6-7 man-of-wars did interlude into our territorial waters. Finson-Halvorsen made a visit onboard "Cossack" (before the attack on "Altmark") and talked with Captain Vian, who told that he "had orders from the British Admiralty to liberate the (now alleged) 400 prisoners." He got a copy of the Norwegian neutrality precepts (in English) which did outlaw any attempt at boarding foreign vessels in our waters. Vian answered that he would get "his throat cut" if he did return to England without having done anything (this was 4.45 in the afternoon). Later, going into the fjord after "Altmark", Captain Vian said through megaphone to the witness that he "had got orders from the Marine Minister Churchill personally to rescue the prisoners at any price, with or without consent from the Norwegian government." Later, he added that he already had got a rebuke from Churchill and was threatened with punishment. Vian was very nervous and did maintain that he was sorry for the action.

Now to what actually happened: "Cossack" boarded "Altmark" - shots were fired - "Altmark"s crew panicked and tried to put a lifeboat on the water - the lifeboat turned and men did fall into the sea. Germans in the sea or on the ice were fired at from "Cossack," yet

¹⁶ Major O.H. Langeland, *Dømmer ikke*, Oslo 1948, p. 37. Langeland was earlier a leader of the Norwegian "Resistance" who, however, wrote two honest books about what really happened. The books were later seized by the censors in the shabbez goy government, though nobody could find a single fault in them.

¹⁷ Haakon himself was unpopular. He himself was a Mason (pledged to obey unknown superiors) and was married to a barren British princess, Maud.

nobody did fire from the German side. The Englishmen however fired wildly; - some bullets even hit the Norwegian vessel "Kjell". Afterwards the witness entered "Altmark" and saw 6-7 corpses. They had been hit in the stomach and had large upteared wounds *from dum dum ammunition!* The names of the dead: Otto Stender, Fritz Bremer, Ralph Steffen, Waldemar Path, Walter Roten and Fritz Schiermann, and some days later at the hospital in Kristiansand, the steward Ernst Meyer died. Hans Berndsen, who probably was shot in the sea, was missing.

The British of course also committed acts of more or less petty plunder onboard Altmark. They stole, in the rooms of the officers and the crew, clothes, stockings, linen, watches, silver plates and pen holders. The pictures of Adolf Hitler on the walls were pierced and torn.

The next day, the witness got a telephone from the Norwegian Staff of Admiralty - and was upbraided with two things: That he had acted like a representative of the Norwegian government and, that he had been "a little too active as for "Cossack"". The witness was threatened with examinations by Koht, but has answered that he did know about no other instance to act, on behalf of the government. Yea, anyhow he did not know about any other. Indeed he had acted according to instructions given by the government itself. Then he learned that "there were some technical things he did not know about - therefore he ought to have acted in another way."(!) Still the Admiralty was satisfied. "Everything had happened as it should".(!!) According to the witness, torpedo boat "Teist" might have torpedoed "Cossack", and he put up the following résumé:

- 1) "Altmark" should have no escort.
- 2) One should not use force.
- 3) Witness should not enter "Altmark"¹⁸.
- 4) Witness was upbraided for having acted on behalf of the Norwegian government.
- 5) Witness was upbraided for having acted "too actively" towards "Cossack".
- 6) "Teist" was not informed beforehand and, according to the order it was given, could not arrive as soon at Jössingfjord as she otherwise might have (8 instead of 22 knot velocity).

The witness Finson-Halvorsen maintained that the Norwegians ought to have applied force in Jössingfjord. It was a clear attack committed against legal transport in our waters by the other war party. "Altmark" had permission by the Norwegian government to sail in our territorial seas, therefore we had the duty to protect "Altmark".

Another witness, Ditlef Lexow, was member of a commission to find out what had happened, and learned about an order to fire in case of breach of neutrality (committed by the British) but, the order was recalled one hour later. Moreover, it was confirmed that it had been possible to torpedo "Cossack". Officers on board our marine vessels were furious because of the order against firing. Later the witness asked "Stortingspresident" Hambro about the "Altmark"-affair. Hambro who did not know about the role as a researcher, told him that this

¹⁸ Which did signify that the British had evil intentions with "Altmark".

"was only the beginning." Hambro was asked about what he meant by saying that, but gestured it away.

9 April Hambro tried to fabricate an unconstitutional "authorisation" from Stortinget (our National Assembly) allegedly given to the government (The "Executive") to act "on behalf of the Stortinget until the next proper assembly". That impudent text - which was never voted over - was later "interpreted" (twisted) and used as a "pledge" given to the exile government in London¹⁹ power to create new laws more or less *lex post factum* during the war, mainly condemning the followers of Quisling and our Waffen-SS-soldiers as "traitors". In Norway we have that old tripartite system, combined with "parliamentarism". And the "authorization" made by Hambro would imply the same as if the American president, from exile, had usurped the law-giving powers of Senate and Congress, just because a Jew had said so - without any real debate or vote in Congress.²⁰ In practise this meant that, after the war was over, honest Norwegians who had collaborated with the German Occupational Government were treated just if they had been traitors betraying their country during *war time proper* (as different from occupation after the final armistice 9 June 1940).

It is a fact that the Norwegian government did not actually declare war before the 11th April, because of the confusion. Our traitors at first did assume that it would be a photo finish between the Germans and the British in their race to Norway. As for the question of which nation we were at war with, the beaten Allies made the answer simple by their - premeditated backbending - "failure", and the framed-up Germans were set up as the sole culprits. Now, only the task to lead the Allies' confounded consorts in Norway on the track remained. The famous Chicago Tribune correspondent Donald Day was there and wrote about his experiences (informations he got from a Norwegian officer, Major Rod (should be either Röd or Rud):

"Major Rod told me that a few days after Germany invaded Norway the London government had solemnly promised Kong Haakon and the Norwegian government that British forces would capture Trondheim and make it the temporary capital of the country within three days if the King and the government would declare war on Germany. The Norwegian leaders agreed and issued the desired proclamation. The British were unable to keep their promise because the Germans had captured the three forts at Agdenes, at the mouth of the Trondheim Fjord, and had mined the entrance.

Major Rod further reported bad morale among the Norwegian officers, many of whom regarded the British as invaders and wished to take action against them. There was no real discipline among Norwegian troops and some of the conscript soldiers I interviewed said they did not know how to shoot the rifle they carried."²¹

¹⁹ Puppets-on-a-string for the Allies.

²⁰ In other words, *the reverse* of Parliamentarism, investing the Executive with power to create new laws singlehandedly.

²¹ *Onward Christian Soldiers*, The Noontide Press, Torrance 1985, p. 175.

Chapter 3

Back to 16 February 1940. Hitler was enraged. The warmonger Churchill - the tool of F.D. Roosevelt and the US Kehillah - had succeeded in the great provocation, which goal was the transformation into war, of a reasonable counter-Versailles recuperation committed by naive Germans. The goal of the Jews and their sycophant Churchill was not a British occupation of (entire) Norway. The British did not participate in a "rat race" together with the Germans to achieve a total occupation. Norway is - geographically speaking - so to speak divided on the middle, and the British planned to capture just the Northern part, including the important port of Narvik, where iron ore from Sweden was shipped to Germany. - That is, the British provos were interested in making the Germans *believe* that the British were going to take Norway entirely, and Hitler's invasion may indeed be called a *preventive* strike in this respect. However, Hitler was too rapidly advancing with his marine. It is a fact, as the same time a proof of Britain's design on Norway, that vessels packed with regular army troops had to return to Scapa Flow, and reembark for naval warfare, because the German fleet had advanced too fast. The British were not able to land their army soldiers comfortably (in Narvik) and therefore the original British plan was foiled²².

I shall not go into detail of what happened. I shall here just consider the political implications, and I shall quote an - in this context - "impeccable" source (which nobody can brand as "Nazi propaganda"): "*The Parliamentary Debates - Official Report in the Fifth Session of the Thirty-Seventh Parliament of the United of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Fifth Series, Volumes 359-60) House of Commons.*"²³

The final proof of the fact that Churchill did provoke Hitler is Churchill's own words in the House of Commons 11th April 1940. Churchill spoke of "*the strategic blunder into which our mortal enemy has been provoked*": which just was Hitler's invasion of Norway!! - Churchill was a war criminal filled to the brim with hatred toward the Germans. And on the 11 April he did not (as the usual hypocritical "distinction" promoted) distinguish between "German" and "Nazi". Spoke Churchill: "The Nazi Government, the German Government - I do not know how you can distinguish them; they seem all to be mixed up together, Nazis and Germans, Germans and Nazis", etc. As for the true attitude of the Government itself, Mr. Sorensen asked the Prime Minister, who answered (30 April) that "*the German people must realise that the responsibility for the prolongation of this war and of the suffering it may bring is theirs as well as of the tyrants who stand over them. This remains the attitude of His Majesty's Government*", he said with undiluted English hypocrisy. A modest question was asked 16 April 1940 by Mr. Stokes:

BANK OF ENGLAND.

46 Mr. Stokes asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will introduce legislation to alter the charter of the Bank of

England so as to enable the names of the bank proprietors, together with the capital holding of each of such proprietors, to be published?

Sir J. Simon: No, Sir.

Mr. Stokes: In view of the disastrous policy followed by the Bank after the last war and the part that they are believed to have played in the rearmament of Germany, does the right hon. Gentleman not consider it time that the people knew a bit more about the proprietors of this unique concern?

The last question was of course not answered at all by Mr. Simon.

17 April 1940: Bevan complained that the kept press 9 April knew the British invasion in (Northern) Norway as an accomplished fact. "Certain Norwegian ports" (possibly including Stavanger on the West coast) were the targets for the plan, which was foiled by the German Fleet sailing too fast. And the premature press-release was covered up with the following embarrassed red-handed whitewash:

British Troops, Norway (Press Reports).

9. **Mr. Aneurin Bevan** asked the First Lord of the Admiralty why permission was given, on April 9th, for the publication of false reports of the landing of British troops in certain Norwegian ports?

31. **Mr. G. Strauss** asked the Minister of Information whether he is aware of the serious effect on public opinion, in this and foreign countries, of the passing for publication on 9th April of the false news of the landing of British troops in certain Norwegian ports; and whether he can explain the action of the Ministry in the matter?

Sir V. Warrender: I have been asked to reply also to Question 31. The British Press, unlike that of the enemy, is not subject to Government control. The newspapers in this country remain individually responsible for the accuracy of the news they publish, and also for the prominence assigned to any items culled from the Foreign Press. The Admiralty is always willing to give unofficial advice, but if, as in this case, some of the Press choose to disregard the advice given, the responsibility does not rest with us.

Mr. Bevan: Was it not the responsibility of the Admiralty, while not suppressing this information, to issue a denial, so that false hopes would not be raised in the country with the result of unfortunate emotional reactions afterwards? Surely the hon. Gentleman realises that very high feeling.

Sir V. Warrender: Perhaps I may tell the hon. Gentleman that it is a very common dodge on the part of the enemy to spread abroad wholly or partially false reports, and that an official denial may well provide the enemy with information which he is anxious to get but cannot secure. It is for this reason, among others, that it is not the practise of the Admiralty to issue official denials of rumours.

Mr. Strauss: Is it not a fact that, on this occasion, the Admiralty were approached by some papers, specifically the "Daily

¹⁸ That infamous plan involved straight treason committed by Norwegian authorities who had virtually unarmed Narvik, by sending away big guns (which were just stored in the South without any pretext at all). The Norwegian traitors thus did not want to have any obstacles against a British occupation, benevolently anticipated by the Jews and the other insiders. The chief for the defence of Narvik, Colonel Konrad Sundlo, did reveal what was going on, but he himself was met with wild accusations from the real culprits in "our" government.

²³ In **Appendix:** Front pages.

Herald", and asked whether they might publish this, and that the Admiralty told them that they could publish it on that day?

Sir V. Warrender: It is perfectly true that the "Daily Herald" and certain other organs of the Press did approach the Press Department in the Admiralty. They were told by the officers of the Press Department that they should treat these reports with reserve. Bearing in mind the consideration which I gave to the House just now, I think that that was the high policy for the Admiralty to follow.

Sir H. Williams: Did the "Daily Herald" also approach the Admiralty in relation to the very comprehensive details published in yesterday's edition of that paper with regard to the sailing of an expeditionary force to Norway?

The last question was significantly enough not answered - not because of lack of time - for even more time was wasted on a Jewish boy arrested and (gasp!) fined in Palestine²⁴.

Boy's Sentence (Tel Aviv)

15. **Mr. T. Williams** asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, on 2nd March, after the proclamation of the curfew in Tel Aviv about 12 o'clock mid-day, a boy named Mizrachi, aged 15 years, was arrested and fined 100 mils for curfew-breaking; that three days later he was arrested, *etc. etc.*

7th May [1940]: Mr. Amery asked: "*Is it not a fact that the most direct warnings of Germany's designs against Norway were sent from both Stockholm and Copenhagen in the first days of April?*" - This question is a particularly good one. The British *knew*. Moreover, also the Norwegian government knew beforehand about the impending German invasion²⁵.

There were several options:

A) German occupation only of the South East of Norway, the West coast (West of the natural mountain barrier) reserved for the Allies.

B) The entire Southern Norway for the Germans alone - and the nation divided in Trøndelagen (about the city of Trondheim).

C) The preferred mini-solution of the British: only Norway from Narvik Northwards for themselves, and the rest for the Germans.

Our traitor government would have preferred option A and was promised at least B, but was betrayed by the British, who did not (because of incompetence) even manage to realise option C. (According to ordinary later history, about the battles about Narvik). Now we shall read the illuminating exposé of Mr. Amery. - He even reveals that there was no real engagement of the Allies to take Trondheim, and in fact, they only sent a bunch of - literally - toothless cockneys, who even, as an Establishment historian did admit, "were afraid of treading on the snow." ²⁶

²⁴ Douglas Reed pointed out that in 1940 much more time was used in Parliament on the problems of Jewish immigration than on the war - even during the so-called "Blitz"

²⁵ Traditional Norwegian revisionism does mainly consist in documentation concerning that information, which was not acted upon: because (told so by our British masters) *we were going to let the Germans in* (for the reasons in behalf of the Allies, mentioned earlier).

²⁶ Yet, the English scum did plunder small shops in Norway, furthermore Norwegian troops even fired at the British dregs (at Åndalsnes) because the cowards were fleeing too fast when the Germans arrived.

Mr. Amery:

On 8th April we laid our mines. That time happened to be just before Germany's zero hour. On the morning of that day a great German convoy sailed up the Kattegat and into the Skagerak on its highly dangerous mission. To cover this daring manoeuvre the Germans sent a large part of their fleet, 48 hours before, away up the West coast of Norway towards Narvik. That action was duly reported to us, and the Prime minister has told us that the Navy went off in hot pursuit after that German decoy. Rarely in history can a feint have been more successful. The gallantry of our officers and men in the blizzards of the Arctic, and the losses of the German fleet, serious as they were, do not alter the fact that the main German expedition to Norway took place without any interference from the Fleet, except from our submarines. With amazing courage and resolution, our submarines inflicted heavy losses on the Germans. How much heavier would those losses have been if the Fleet or any substantial portion of it had been there then, or, at any rate, on subsequent days. That raises very formidable questions to which answers will have to be given sooner or later.

However, let me come to the next stage. What was our reaction when we learned that Oslo and all the main ports were in German hands? If we had any hope of retrieving the situation in Norway even partially, or of relieving the Norwegian forces, our obvious move was to take one or other of those ports without a moment's delay. We know that the Germans seized them with only the tiniest handful of men. Only by seizing such a port would it have been possible to obtain landing facilities for our artillery, tanks and aeroplanes above all, without which no operation can now be conducted with any hope of success. The port clearly indicated by the circumstances was Trondheim, because it was farthest removed from the main German base at Oslo - which gave us time and the opportunity of maintaining railway connection with Sweden. We could have constructed a defensive line across the waist of Norway, behind which the Norwegian forces could have rallied, and from which we could have advanced, if necessary, to the reconquest of the country. That was the obvious plan.

The Prime Minister's statements, however, make it clear that such forces as we had were at once sent off to Narvik, and not to their original destination of Trondheim or Bergen. Why Narvik? If we had held Trondheim, the isolated German force at Narvik would have been bound to surrender in time, and it could have done no mischief to us in the meantime. If we had ever contemplated retaking Trondheim at the start, there could have been no more crass instance of the dispersion, the frittering away, of forces. It is clear, however, from what the Prime Minister said to-day that the decision to send troops to Trondheim to try and retrieve that position was taken only after a number of days, and only at the urgent request of the Norwegians.

Be aware that not all of the seemingly British "blundering" was planned (to help the Germans). Some of the failures were caused by incompetence and lack of military skill. However, everything was laid at the door of Prime Minister Chamberlain as a scapegoat: for the failures of Marine Minister Churchill. In this way the cabal obtained their goal: the removal of the basically honest Chamberlain - and the installation of Judas Churchill.

Anyhow, Mr. Amery Sr.²⁷ himself was a consequent warmonger and he was blamed for his stance by Commander Sir Archibald Southby. The old plan ("R4") read: March through Norway and Sweden ostensibly in order to "help" Finland. But that scheme was aborted, i.e., the *pretext* for a British (partial) occupation of both Norway and Sweden fell away, when Finland did capitulate to the Soviets.

Southby about Amery:

I listened to every word that the right hon. Gentleman said. He was full of general accusations of failure against the Government. It seemed to me that if he had been in charge of the affairs of the nation at the beginning of the war, rightly or wrongly, he would have considered that the proper action for us to have taken would have been to have gone into Norway and Sweden before Germany did. He may be right or wrong in that view. But if he was right in that view then we would, I presume, be doing right now to go into Holland and Belgium lest Germany should come in there before us.

Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon): We did go to Norway before Germany; we invaded territorial waters before Germany did.

Sir A. Southby: The right hon. Gentleman says that we did go there before Germany. We certainly mined what has been called the "rat run". I suggest that it was because neither Norway nor Sweden stood up for themselves at a critical time when by standing up for themselves they would have enabled us to give them adequate help that the position became so bad that help was impossible. It was not British incompetence which led to the British failure in Norway. It was Norwegian treachery. [HON. MEMBERS: "Shame."] Treachery of Norwegian officials. It is perfectly true, the Norwegian people are putting up a gallant fight but it was the Quislings who sold the pass. [Interruption.] I say it was the traitorous action of Norwegian officials which put Norway into an impossible position. It is not fair to say that the failure of the campaign was due to some unspecified action by Members of the Government. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman will certainly give great satisfaction in Berlin.

Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Boothby (Aberdeen, East): It will give greater satisfaction in this country.

Sir A. Southby: It will give great satisfaction in Berlin.

Mr. Foot (Dundee): As yours did at Munich.

Sir A. Southby: I understand that to-day we are fighting for liberty; liberty of speech is also what we are fighting for. The hon. Member will have plenty of time to speak. I do not interrupt. He might let me have my say without being interrupted. We have heard the story of events in Norway. I confess that during the last week or so I have been amazed at the attitude of some people. War for us has never been an unbroken series of successes. Operations have to be attempted which are ultimately found to be incapable of satisfactory prosecution. If every time an operation is attempted and found to be impracticable or undesirable a demand is made to find scapegoats either in the Services or politically we shall go a long way towards undermining the morale of our magnificent fighting Services. We have to embark upon adven-

²⁷ Mr. Amery was the father of John Amery, who sided with the Germans, but that is another story.

tures. What should be blameworthy would be, having embarked upon an adventure, to allow it to become a disaster through inefficient handling. That is just what has not happened in Norway. It was through no fault of ours that conditions were such as to make success entirely impossible. It was through no fault of ours that we could not get aerodromes in Norway from which to operate our forces. It was due to the action of Norwegian officials who allowed Germany to come in. Had our effort in Norway succeeded we would have been overjoyed. It was found impossible and through the magnificent handling of our forces the naval, air and military a disaster was averted. Do not let us through false sentiment or through fear of being thought cowardly fail to appreciate the real position in Norway.

Here we first read that old honest ("pro-fascist") Lloyd-George did admit that the British indeed did breach Norwegian neutrality before the Germans did! - Technically we ought thence to be at war with the Allies - moreover look upon the German "invasion" as a **liberation** - which that occupation virtually was. Also according to the excuse made by "our" leaders for not resisting the British: that we were "too weak" - therefore in fact *needing* a Big Brother - here Hitler! Please keep in mind that up to April 1940 the immediate Jewish aim was still just an extension - and thus a prolongation - of the war. Hitler presented several peace proposals which made the Kehillah shiver. The Jews wanted a World War, they wanted to crush Germany totally. As for this plan about "not only destroying Nazism, but also Germany," the case is simple. Many Germans (even revisionists) have made a "conspiracy theory" concerning the very reason for the Kaufman and Morgenthau plans. But that theory is fundamentally wrong. The Jews were not against Germany/the Germans *per se* - **but only insofar the Germans were race-conscious and genuine socialists**. - And, in my eyes²⁸ almost every German was! - And *therefore* the just and warranted identification: Germans = National Socialists! The Jews knew that they were, and could honestly declare: No intention of combating genuinely anti-Nazi Germans. That is, the Jews were afraid even of knowledgeable Germans (such as had learned about the Jewish power) and such a knowledge itself was enough for targeting the enlightened ones for destruction, in the same way as the Communists keelhailed Russians who had just tasted the fruits of forbidden information in the West.

In order to prove that I am right already as for the outcome of World War I, I shall quote from "**Politish-Anthropologiske Monatschrift**"²⁹ (my translation):

A REMARKABLE CALL AGAINST GERMANY. According to the Parisian "Figaro" the "Consistoire central" (i.e. the Central office of the *Alliance Israelite*) has made the following call to the Israelites of the neutral countries: "We israelites, for centuries victims of injustice and illegality, are more than all others, in the name of the eternal one, entitled to condemn the violation perpetrated against the laws declared by the prophets. The present war was pressed upon peaceful France. Faithful towards her ideal of peace and democratic labour, she has silently suffered the threats and challenges of

²⁸ I am myself proud to confess that I am a National Socialist.

²⁹ Vol. 1 (1915), pp. 497-498.

an implacable enemy, who wanted to eradicate her out of the ranks of the Great Powers. Savagely attacked, she now is struggling for her existence and for the freedom of all peoples which are fighting at her side. Jews of the neutral countries, can you without pain and anguish stand to look at the damaging of a country whose benevolences you have received? You know that France in the 18th century did break the barriers which for centuries had been created to suppress the Jews! Following the initiative of France, by the light of her genius, other peoples have succeedingly bestowed human and citizens rights to the Israelites. International customs are prohibiting you to participate in the defence of France. Yet the gratitude you owe to France makes it your duty to spread the truth about the origin and character of this terrible war, against the lies and violation of international right by an enemy to whom Might goes before Right ... Remember that the year 1870 did cost Jewry! In stead of the doctrines of emancipation and fraternity born of the French revolution, the victorious Germany did put up a doctrine of hatred and brutality. On the German universities a racial theory was preached which did lead out into anti-Semitism; the German, maintaining that he is the only Aryan, want to keep the purity of his blood by all his might. The Jews appears as an intruder who must be expelled at any price. From its place of birth anti-Semitism has spread itself over the entire world. In the West it has caused nothing. In the East it has in the beginning been able to incorporate itself, however already now hopeful symptoms are announcing new times. The victory of the Allies will liberate the rest of the Jews of Europe. It would have been a folly of the Jews to expect their liberation form the (fortunately impossible) victory of the joined forces of Pan-Germanism, anti-Semitism and militarism. Sons of the old Judea, we are expecting with confidence the triumph of Justice!"

(Written by the editor of "Figaro" Joseph Reinach under his pen-name Polybe, the president of the German-hating "*Alliance Israelite*", which is spread over the entire globe.)

Well, we heard above the hypocrite Southby constructing the Quisling-traitor-theory. "*Norwegian treachery (Shame) Treachery of Norwegians officials, It is perfectly true . . . It was by treason of Norwegian officials who allowed Germany to come in.*" And this line is still parroted by sycophants (with a professor Skodvin as the cheerleader) her in Norway. - yet, as you now have learned, they are somehow "right". Only that it was not Quisling, but "our" government who let the Germans in - at the behest of the Allies!

8 May 1940: Sir Stafford Cripps lets the cat out of the bag, though he does rationalise his otherwise admirable consistency by describing it as descending "*to the level of our enemy and meet him with his own weapons, with a complete disregard of all international standards of behaviour that has hitherto been accepted as reasonable and necessary for a civilised world.*"

Yeah, Albion just did *out-Hitler* Hitler himself! - Also spoke **Sir S. Cripps:**

There are two possible policies open to a Government fighting this war in the present circumstances. First of all, to observe strictly all neutral right and the obligations of international law, with a view to doing what they conceived to be right and in the hope that by so doing they will win the sympathy of the neutrals and perhaps gain their moral or, even, material support; and, second, to descend to the level of our enemy and meet him with his own weapons, with a complete disregard of all international standard of behaviour that have hitherto

been accepted as reasonable and necessary for a civilised world. The one thing that is impossible in the circumstances is to attempt to combine these two policies. If some half-way policy is followed then we miss the advantages of the first and fail to reap the advantages of the second. The Norwegian problem was one of Germany's most vital sources of supply - the Swedish ore. But just as we regard it as a vital matter to us, so obviously must Germany regard it as a vital matter to them that they should do their utmost to continue that supply. It was not a question of merely stopping up some small hole in the net of the blockade; it was a question of absolutely first-class importance to both sides.

Our Government after prolonged hesitation - and I would point out that the First Lord of the Admiralty, in his speech on 11th April, drew attention to our care for international obligations - came to the conclusion that they must abandon the first policy - that of observing strictly the rights of neutrals - and as a result decided to lay minefields in Norwegian territorial waters. That was a vitally important decision on a major question of policy as regards the conduct of the whole war and not as regards Norway alone. Whether it was right or wrong it is not at the moment material to inquire, but the laying of the mines was just as much an infringement of the neutral rights of Norway as the sending of ships into the Norwegian fjords, or landing guns on Norwegian soil.

It is quite idle to adopt the argument that it was only a little infringement, or that we were compelled to do it, or, as the First Lord said in his speech, that in the last war the Norwegians were persuaded to do it by the Allied Powers. As far as neutrals and the rest of the world are concerned it was an abandonment by Great Britain of the policy of observing strictly the rights of neutrals. That certainly was the view taken in America when I was there, and German propaganda, which is a hundred times more efficient than ours, especially in neutral countries, soon convinced people that this was the fact. The Prime Minister, in his speech yesterday, said that no one would suggest that we should have gone into Bergen or Trondheim. I suggest he could never have made that remark if he had prefaced his story of the account of the Norwegian incident by the decision of the Cabinet to infringe Norwegian neutrality. Apparently the Government must have thought that that degree of action, the laying of the minefields, would be sufficient to achieve their purpose and that they did not want to go further than they thought their purpose demanded. They tried to compromise between two policies and hoped that in the face of Hitler they would get away with the compromise. They must have failed wholly in appreciation of the sort of enemy they were up against. Hitler was not going to watch his vital supplies being cut off and do nothing about it. It was known that he had large forces available in the Baltic and in German ports. He was waiting until the need and opportunity came to use them, and the British Government gave him both.

Vice-Admiral Taylor (Paddington, South): Were not the operations by Germany started before the mines were laid?

Sir S. Cripps: No, the operations by Germany were started simultaneously with the laying of the mines. That was what we were told by the Prime Minister. [HON. MEMBERS: "No," and "Hear, hear"] The notice and the publicity as regards the coming intention was long

before. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman need not trouble about dates; Hitler does not trouble about dates.

Vice-Admiral Taylor: But the hon. and learned Gentleman is making a point about the matter.

Sir S. Cripps: Directly it became clear that we were determined to take steps to stop the Swedish ore supply getting to Germany, Hitler made preparations with which to counter our action. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman will never convince me and I shall not convince him. The fatal mistake was the indecision of the policy we were following. We tried to comprise and as a result landed ourselves and Norway in the present situation. Obviously, Hitler would not raise his standard to meet our compromising attitude. He would not content himself with merely counter-mining Norwegian waters. When he acted he acted thoroughly, because that was the only way we could safeguard ourselves and minimise the danger to Norway. Our ships should have been in Norwegian fjords before Hitler could get there, ready to meet him. If necessary, Bergen, Trondheim and Stavanger should have been taken under our protection for the time being.

Mr. MacLaren (Bruslem): In the event of the British going in and Norwegian forts opening fire on our ships, would we have been entitled to fire back, kill Norwegians and then take over the ports?

Sir S. Cripps: The hon. Gentleman does not get out of the dilemma by that. I have not suggested that it was a right policy to infringe Norwegian neutrality. All I say is that, having decided to infringe it, you should have infringed it properly and not exposed yourself to every danger that occurred, especially so in view of the particular difficulties of the terrain and the obvious danger of air bombardment. So far as not contemplating further infringements of Norwegian neutrality, as the Prime Minister suggests, are concerned, it was criminal carelessness to open up this situation of danger in Scandinavia without taking steps to guard against the obvious reaction of the Germans. It was the fatal confusion between the two policies which led to the defeat that followed. I do not intend to follow out what might have been done to retrieve the situation except to say, again, that there was apparently indecision and delay. It was apparently intended at the very beginning to use our surface ships to force the fjords at Trondheim and other points on the Norwegian coast, and also for the purpose of cutting off German reinforcements from getting to Oslo. I say this because of the internal evidence of that fact in the statement made by the First Lord of the Admiralty on 11th April. Whatever his intention may have been in making that statement, it is certainly the interpretation which was put upon it by many of the most skilled observers. Let me remind the House of one or two extracts from that speech. He said:

"Hitler has effected a whole series of commitments upon the Norwegian coast for which he will now have to fight, if necessary, during the whole summer, against Powers possessing vastly superior naval forces and able to transport them to the scenes of action more easily than he can." - [OFFICIAL REPORT, 11th April, 1940; col. 748, Vol. 359].

And finally he said:

"All German ships in the Skagerak and the Kattegat will be sunk, and by night all the ships will be sunk as opportunity serves." - [OFFICIAL REPORT, 11th April, 1940, col. 750, Vol. 359.]

Such claims could not be substantiated unless we were prepared at that date, 11th April, to risk our surface vessels as well as our submarines and make sure of the easy transport of our land forces by the action of surface vessels in the Norwegian fiords. I am certain that the First Lord intended such action at the time and that the British Navy was thoroughly capable of carrying it out. I do not believe that that speech was mere idle bombast. The situation has not developed as was then forecast, because, in my belief, there was a change in policy as to the use of naval forces, caused very likely by the fear that the loss of capital ships, if it occurred might tempt Mussolini to come into the war against us. If that were considered an overriding matter, the First Lord of the Admiralty should never have made the speech he did on 11th April. It is largely that speech, broadcast round the world, that has, in the light of our withdrawal from South and Central Norway, had such a damaging effect upon our prestige. The First Lord in that speech spoke of the need for

"unceasing and increasing vigour to turn to the utmost profit the strategic blunder into which our mortal enemy has been provoked" - [OFFICIAL REPORT, 11th April, 1940; col. 749, Vol. 359.]

I wonder if he realises the significance which will be given to that word "provoked".

Here Cripps, in his answers to Vice-Admiral Taylor, first did admit that "the operations by Germany were started simultaneously with the laying of mines." Yes, that Hitler in fact just "made preparations with which *to counter* our action" [my emphasis]. Further, answering Mr. MacLaren, Cripps spoke of "*the obvious reaction of the Germans*"! He then quoted Churchill's boast 11th April about "taking all we want off this Norwegian coast now," at the same time frolicking at the thought of "to fight, if necessary, during the whole summer."³⁰ The most important passage came at the end, "*the significance which will be given to that word "provoked".*" - It is a deplorable fact that just that selfsame *significance* the whole time, under and after W.W.II, has been suppressed and given the silent treatment. - Especially here in Norway, where the leading politicians and court historians have tried to explain Churchill's statement away as "just political"³¹.

I herewith do ask you, dear reader, *who is guilty?* The man who *provoked* his enemy to a military campaign, or the enemy who just *countered* an action, the result of which being his *obvious reaction*!! Ask the survivors of World War II; - a quite unnecessary war, which anyway should have been confined to countries in the area proper of the Versailles Treaty. I lay

³⁰ Courtesy the Cabal which paid Churchill's debts, and dragging him out of the gutter he was rejected into in the early 30's.

³¹ Moreover the honest historian Liddel Hart's reference to that sinister significance, in a major work, was whitewashingly "footnoted" away in the Norwegian edition. And, where the court historians did not manage to gush a cloud of red-herring-powder over Liddel Hart's frankest admissions, they tried to reduce him to just a "military man, understanding nothing about the history of politics".(!)

the blame for the Norwegian citizen killed in W.W. II at the door of conceited Englishmen, who let Churchill ruin Europe³²!

9 May 1940: Now to Colonel Alexander (nee Blimp): First he talks about an alleged German plan from 1926 - the whole time waiting for the First Lord's Coming. Then, in a fit of honesty, he speaks about "the counter-stroke by Germany" - their *surprise* expedition of 7th April. In other words, Alexander fancied that the provocative - belated! - laying of mines was intended to *stop the German counter-stroke itself*. That I call strategy, and it is no surprise that the First Lord was out to fetch more brandy for an encounter with such booze-heads³³:

In these circumstances I hope that the House will forgive me if I take a few minutes to direct some questions to the First Lord - if he is about. [Interruption.] Well, he ought to be here. Perhaps somebody will take a note of my questions so that he will be able to answer them. First of all, I ask: What was the position of Norway; that is to say, what information had we of German intentions, and what were our preparations in anticipation of those events? We have had a good many questions put from different parts of the House about our intelligence service, and I hope that I shall be answered in the light of those questions. I listened to my right hon. Friend and Leader yesterday, putting the point with very great relevance whether or not there was in existence as far back as 1926 a properly prepared plan by the German High Command for the invasion of Norway and Sweden, and whether that plan of the German High Command was known to the British Staff. We have had no answer at all to that question. The Source of our information is unimpeachable, and, if necessary, I am prepared to let the First Lord of Admiralty know what it is, but I do not want to say it here in the House.

If that was so, what was the plan of the War Cabinet and the staff, to counter those known German plans? We ought to have an answer to this question. Is the First Lord coming? Where is he? One wonder whether to go, in these circumstances.

The Prime Minister: My right hon. Friend will be here in a moment.

Mr. Alexander: Now that the First Lord of the Admiralty has come in, I repeat that I am putting very particularly to him certain questions based upon information which we believe to be unimpeachable and it is of great importance to ask these questions personally of him in order to do so effectively. The information is that the German High Command were known to have made plans long since for the invasion of Norway and Sweden and that those plans were known to the British Staff. What plans had we made to meet such circumstances? If necessary, I will tell the first Lord after the Debate the source of our information, but we are assured that the British Staff were aware of the German plans, and they therefore ought to have had some knowledge of how they would act if the Germans put their plans into operation. It would be extraordinary that we should have to develop a plan and that if we laid our mines in Norwegian territorial waters, they

³² Together with that infamous Empire of Jingoism thanks, "poetical justice".

³³ "*Britannia rules the waves*". Poor pure water waves - still "ruled" by such drunkards! - I mean, sheer horror that such crooks have been in a position to determine the run of world history.

would not stop the counter-stroke by Germany. The more one listened to the statements of Ministers, the more one must feel that the Government were taken completely by surprise when the Germans set off on 7th April for their expedition.

Back to sober honesty: Lloyd George had pointed out that Dr. Benes of Checho-Slovakia "had never kept his word." Neither to the Sudeten Germans; and I give the word to a Mr. Baxter who did deplore being a subject under poltroons, who (on behalf of the Jews) never did accept the just claim for Anschluss by the Austrians (from 1919 onwards) but OK'd the trickery of Benes:

Mr. Baxter: Once more there was encouragement to Hitler and Hitler went on. Yesterday the right hon. Gentleman was chief mourner -----.

Mr. Lloyd George: I must correct what the hon. Member has said, because this is very important. The Austrians were a German people and they wanted at that time to enter into an arrangement with Germany. I thought it was a great mistake that we stopped it. But Bruening was in at that time and not Hitler. With regard to the Sudeten Germans a promise of autonomy was given by Dr. Benes to the four men who drafted the Treaty, and I was one of them. That was not redeemed, and I think there is a good deal, I will not say justification, but of cause for trouble there. I think that if he had kept that promise Hitler would never have had the excuse for intervening, and I stand by that.

Mr. Baxter: I accept everything the right hon. Gentleman has said. My only objection to the Checho-Slovakian incident was the time chosen. At a moment when a friend of this country is in difficulties it is not the time to investigate his mistakes, but either to stand by him or forsake him. The speech to which I refer, which the right hon. Gentleman made, was when Hitler was in power. With his great experience of men and nations, and of public opinion and of international opinion, a name such as his counts too much. The people of foreign countries do not follow our politics too closely anymore than we follow the politics of theirs. But when the name of Mr. Lloyd George appears denouncing this Government at a critical moment as being poltroons -----.

Nevertheless the poltroons changed into vultures in their concerted effort to oust Chamberlain, preparing the way for Churchillian dictatorship. The sibling of old Marlborough³⁴ had himself conditioned the House with his insinuating rhetoric's, undermining Chamberlain's position, without any direct outspoken illoyal disavowing. Still Churchill's own military blunders were misused as a "reason" to crush Chamberlain who was accused of leading the country "from one tragedy and disaster to another," according to **Mr. Mander**, who, by the way, of course had "nothing but the kindest feelings towards (Chamberlain) as a human being, but to him as a statesman":

The First Lord of the Admiralty in the magnificent speech he made last night made it clear that he strongly disapproved, as we well know, of the policy of the Government up to the time when he joined

³⁴ Venal pimp for his own sister.

it. He referred to the Prime Minister's appeal to his friend and said that the Prime minister had friend when things were going well. I would like to know when things were ever going well under the present Prime Minister. I have never heard of any period during the time he has been in charge when we were not going from one tragedy and disaster to another. We ought to get this point clearly into the minds of Members who would like to see the Prime Minister remain in power. He cannot remain in power because, if he did, the party truce would come to an end. Things have gone too far and it would be impossible to continue it. There would be violent controversy and opposition in the House and in the country. It is clear what the country thinks, rightly or wrongly, and I hope that in the quiet consultations that will take place in the next few days the real peril in which this country would stand if it were to continue as a divided nation will be borne in mind.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Thomas Moore (Ayr Burghs): With whom or with what has the hon. Gentleman entered into a truce? I had not noticed any.

Mr. Mathers (Linlithgow): Would it not be better for the hon. Member to give it its proper name? It is an electoral and not a party truce.

Mr. Mander: I agree, but Members of the Opposition and of my party have done everything we can to encourage, stimulate and support the Government in the prosecution of the war. We are only too anxious to see the war won and greater vigour devoted to it. Personal matters ought not to be allowed to enter into the question at this juncture. It seemed to me last night that the Prime Minister was putting his personal position above the interests of the country. That is the way in which it will appeal to a great many people. I want the Prime Minister to go, not because I have any personal animosity to him; I have nothing but the kindest feelings towards him as a human being, but to him as a statesman I am very hostile indeed. It is purely in the political sense and for political reasons that we want to see him go. I hope sincerely that the position in which we are at this moment in this House, and the position of the parties towards each other in the country, will be realised, and that when we meet again after the Recess we shall find a new Government, if not in office at any rate well on the way to office, a National Government with representatives of all interests and all parties, not picked or selected by the party whips or anything of that kind, but composed of people for the job, and for no other reason whatsoever. I hope we shall find that we can then go forward in a great united national effort to win this war at the earliest possible moment.

To this I shall ask: Why not such a Government (also) in peace time? I mean, such an recommendable "united national effort" of course is preferable at all times!

Now **Lloyd George**: An extremely important admission of the criminal iniquities of the Versailles Treaty. He even stated that the *Allies alone* were to blame for the fact that they themselves did not disarm after Germany "*had been completely disarmed*"!! - Furthermore he pointed out that the Sudeten Germans were entitled to the same Minorities' Rights as for example the Hungarians and Slovaks. But, "*it was not carried out.*" The "powers who were the all powerful" did not exert their authority to compel the involved countries: To keep the pledges they had given. The new war was predicted, over and over again. It was inevitable be-

cause: *The victors in the late war (W.W. I) did not carry out solemn pledges which they gave in a Treaty which they themselves did dictate. Hitlerism - the new spirit of Germany - was formidable due to the fact that the Entente Powers did not carry out their pledges. The NS spirit was created by the fact that the dominating democracies in Europe did not keep faith*³⁵.

3.51 p.m.

Mr. Lloyd George (Carnarvon Boroughs): As a fellow journalist, I wish to say a word or two in answer to the very kindly and very friendly observations made about me by my hon. Friend the Member for Wood Green (Mr. Baxter). I have no reason to quarrel with the tone of his remarks, and I am hoping that he will extend to me some sympathy, because one of the difficulties when you have to write an article at a given date is, as he knows, that it is not always easy to find the necessary matter. I have had to earn my living exactly as he has, although it has not been as sumptuous a success. I only want to say that I would rather at this moment not go into particular instances, because if I did so, I should be guilty of the very deed that the hon. Member has admonished me for having done. If I were to go into all the things that have been done during the period between the signature of the Treaty of Versailles and the beginning of this war, the things I should have to point out would show that the faults were by no means all on one side, and I do not think I should be very helpful. He has provoked me to do so - very much so.

The Treaty of Versailles was not carried out by those who dictated it. A good deal of the trouble was due to that fact. We were dealing with Governments in Germany which were democratic Governments, based on a democratic franchise, with democratic statesmen, and it is because we did not carry out the undertakings we had given to those democratic Governments that Hitler came into power. There was a good deal that was done to Germany, more particularly with regard to disarmament. The solid promise that we gave, not merely in the Treaty itself, but in a document which I took part in drafting, which was signed by M. Clemenceau on our behalf, that if Germany disarmed, we should immediately follow her example, was not carried out, and that is more responsible for that than the present national Government which came into power in 1931. They had their opportunity. America was ready - it was a time when Herr Bruening was in charge - but we refused to carry out the terms after Germany had been completely disarmed. We had the certificate of the ambassadors to say that disarmament was completed, but in spite of that, we did not carry out our part.

The same thing applies to minorities. I repeatedly called attention to it. Mr. Benes, in the conference in Paris - I am sorry to have to go over this at the present moment, but I am not in the habit of failing to reply to attacks - was responsible, first of all, for giving a direct pledge to the conference that if Sudeten Germany were to become part of Checho-Slovakia - the same thing applied to Hungarians and to the Slovaks - the same autonomy would be given to them as in the Swiss Confederation of men of different races under the same flag and forming part of the same federal constitution.

³⁵ All these statements are ABC for historical revisionists. Still it is good to listen to these plain truths from just *that forum at that date!*

It was not carried out. The last conference I attended as Prime Minister was at Genoa in 1922, three years after the signature of the Treaty of Versailles. I begged that the promises which had then been given to the minorities, to the Hungarians and to the Germans - the same thing applies to Poland and to the Ukrainians - should be carried out. It was not my fault that they were not carried out.

I do not intend to apportion the blame at this particular moment, but ever since the signature of the treaty I did my very best, as Prime Minister, and I did not alter my policy in the least when I became an independent Member of the Opposition or when I was Leader of the Liberal party. Of course, as an independent Member of this House I could not bring the same pressure as I did when I was Prime Minister, but I urged the conquering powers who were then all powerful to exert their authority to compel these countries to carry out the pledges which they had given. I pointed out over and over again that if they did not do so, it would end in a great European war and that there would be trouble. My predictions, unfortunately, have turned out to be true, and when the history of the whole of these transactions comes to be written, if the hon. Gentleman will take the trouble to read it, he will find that most of this trouble has originated in the fact that the victors in the late war did not carry out solemn pledges which they gave in a Treaty which they themselves dictated. They had the opportunity. Germany was prostrate. The creation of this terrible power in Germany, the spirit which is behind it, and what makes it so formidable at the present moment is due to the fact that we did not carry out our pledges. What is the result? Democracy has been swept away in Germany; democracy has been attacked by Germany. The spirit in Germany was created by the fact that the dominating democracies in Europe did not keep faith. We are now confronted with the most terrible answer that has even been given to those who have broken faith and broken covenants. I do not apologise in the least for the fact that not only when I was Prime Minister but afterwards I did my very best to persuade them to carry out the pledges which they had given solemnly in writing to the world.

Lloyd George might have added that Hitler himself offered total and complete disarmament already - or as late as - in 1933-34. But the British were not interested at all . . .

13 May 1940: After the Cabal had ousted Chamberlain in a dishonourable way, their stooge Churchill (who was bribed already during W.W.I by the plutocrats) did start the sabre rattling in the most outspoken warmongering tone as possible. He asked for "*total*" victory - he thus demanded *total* war - without any optional possibility: thence: All of the subsequent peace-proposals made by Hitler were rejected, if they were answered at all. Churchill, significantly, in a knowingly sinister way spoke of, nay, did audaciously establish *as a fact* - which "*must be remembered that we are in the preliminary stage of one of the greatest battles in history*" [my emphasis]. He even descended to quote the pathetic Garibaldi in his bravado about "blood, toil, tears and sweat". - Which was an old well-worn trick to fool British imbeciles

into playing "heroes". You have surely heard of the slogan about making England "a country fit for heroes to live in."³⁶

Churchill branded National Socialism as "*a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime.*" - Only an individual such as Churchill could have said that. And only a drunken bastard would have had the impudence to get the British idiots to stomach the following pathetic Jew-directed Aryan-hating lambaste: "*You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: It is victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival. Let that be realised: no survival for the British Empire, no survival for all that the British Empire has stood for, no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal.*"

Nobody in that Parliament of idiots did even bother to ask Churchill just *what* the "goal" he speak about really was. *What* was "the urge and impulse of the ages," the alleged "goal" of mankind? It could have only meant one thing: The interest-slavery and global mongrelization we see nowadays, when the farmers and middle-class world-wide are reduced to the level of proletarians, when at the same time, the dregs of humanity, the Zionist scum is floating up at the top of the US-inspired global "melting-pot!"

HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

2.54 p.m.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Churchill): I beg to move,

"That this House welcomes the formation of a Government representing the united and inflexible resolve of the nation to prosecute the war with Germany to a victorious conclusion."

On Friday evening last, I received His majesty's Commission to form a new Administration. It was the evident wish and will of Parliament and the nation that this should be conceived on the broadest possible basis and that it should include all parties, both those who supported the late Government and also the parties of the Opposition. I have completed the most important part of this task. A War Cabinet been formed of five Members, representing, with the Opposition Liberals, the unity of the nation. The three party Leaders have agreed to serve, either in the War Cabinet or in high executive office. The three Fighting Services have been filled. It was necessary that this should be done in one single day, on account of the extreme urgency and rigour of events. A number of other positions, key positions, were filled yesterday, and I am submitting a further list to His Majesty tonight. I hope to complete the appointment of the Principal Ministers during tomorrow. The appointment of the other Ministers usually takes a little longer, but i trust that, when Parliament meets again, this part of my task will be completed, and that the administration will be complete in all respects.

I considered it in the public interest to suggest that the House should be summoned to meet today. Mr. speaker agreed, and took the

³⁶ If only the propagandists had said, "for brain-dead hooligans", the *slogan* would have been fit. Some years ago the "iron" lady Thatcher duped the brain-dead by *challenging* them, asking whether they would "have *stomach*" to accept the "supply-side" monetarism of hers. - On which system the stupid "Reagonomics" was founded, and implemented *after it had proved damaging for the British economy.*

necessary steps, in accordance with the powers conferred upon him by the Resolution of the House. At the end of the proceedings today, the Adjournment of the House will be proposed until Tuesday, 21st May, with, of course, provision for earlier meeting, if need be. The business to be considered during that week will be notified to Members at the earliest opportunity. I now invite the House, by the Resolution which stands in my name, to record its approval of the steps taken and to declare its confidence in the New Government.

To form an Administration of this scale and complexity is a serious undertaking in itself, but it must be remembered that we are in the preliminary stage of one of the greatest battles in history, that we are in action at many other points in Norway and in Holland, that we have to be prepared in the Mediterranean, that the air battle is continuous and that many preparations, such as have been indicated by my hon. Friend below the Gangway, have to be made here at home. In this crisis I hope I may be pardoned if I do not address the House at any length to-day. I hope that any of my friends and colleagues, or former colleagues, who are affected by the political reconstruction, will make allowance, all allowance, for any lack of ceremony with which it has been necessary to act. I would say to the House, as I said to those who have joined this Government: "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears and sweat."

We have before us an ordeal of the most grievous kind. We have before us many, many long months of struggle and of suffering. You ask, what is our policy? I will say: It is to wage war, by sea, land and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us; to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. That is our policy. You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: It is our victory, victory at all costs, however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival. Let that be realised; no survival for the British Empire, no survival for all that the British Empire has stood for, no survival for the urge and impulse of the ages, that mankind will move forward towards its goal. But I take up my task with buoyancy and hope. I feel sure that our cause will not be suffered to fail among men. At this time I feel entitled to claim the aid of all, and I say, "Come then, let us go forward together with our united strength."

The spittle-lickers then pressed on to hail Churchill's warmongering. Dishonest balderdash and parliamentary gobbledygook was poured out; yet, I shall not refer that shameless Jew-serving, anti-Gentile rabble-rousing. I shall confine myself to quote one interesting comment by Sir Percy Harris, who pointed out the fact that so-called "democracy" (*vide* the unlimited powers given to Churchill and, later, Franklin Delano Roosevelt) is far more effective than *true democratic* National Socialism in waging a *totalitarian* war!

3.11 p.m.

Sir Percy Harris (Bethnal Green, South-West): I rise, on behalf of my hon. Friends, to express our confidence in and to give our support to, the new Government. The Prime Minister has two qualities which are essential to win the war: vigour and imagination. The Government and the nation are going to prove to the world that a

democracy can, more effectively than its enemies, wage a totalitarian war.

Also on the home front the Jew did exercise their totalitarian tyranny. The British Union of Fascists wanted peace, therefore the undemocratic dictators and their spittle-lickers determined that the true Britons had to be silenced. Thus, "some 753 BUF [British Union of Fascists] peace advocates (and thousands of other innocent people) were rounded up and thrown into concentration camps. Robert Row, long time editor of "Action" writes: *H a b e a s C o r p u s* was suspended for the duration of the war, no charge, no trial by jury, no right of appeal to any court was allowed and unlike a criminal who knows the length of his sentence, we could be held to Kingdom come. The head of this operation was Sir Norman Birkett. When Mosley demanded to know why we had been detained, Birkett admitted it was not because we were fifth-columnists or security risk, but simply because of our campaign for a negotiated peace."³⁷ Further we read in the special edition of (BUF's) "Action"³⁸ a survey of what had happened:

The Fight For A Negotiated Peace.

Mosley had by no means given up the struggle for a peaceful resolution of the war. He immediately launched an all out anti-war campaign under the slogan - "**MIND BRITAIN'S BUSINESS.**" The Daily Mirror in July 1939 commented: "*There is no doubt that numerically the adherents to Fascism are increasing.*" The marches continued against the war and their numbers kept growing. Over 2 million anti-war leaflets were distributed throughout Britain. The overwhelming majority of the British people were still opposed to war. The week before the government's declaration of war Mosley spoke before the largest street meeting in British history at Ridley Rd. Huge throngs of people attending joined in the march which followed. Three nights later came another massive meeting in Leicester Square. In October, a month after the war had begun, Mosley spoke out for a negotiated peace before a huge audience at Kingsway's Stoll Theater and the Manchester Hippodrome. In January 1940 the land battles had begun in France and Mosley issued his booklet, "**The British Peace: How to Get it.**" Within 4 days 20,000 copies sold-out. Soon sales went over 100,000 copies.

Sir Winston Churchill took note of this opposition to his war on January 27, 1940 when he spoke in Manchester. He was interrupted by shouts of "*Mosley and Peace*". In Poole, Hugh Ross Williamson had been expelled from the Labour Party for writing a pro-peace article in "Action". He addressed a Mosley public meeting at Centenary Hall and took a vote on how many wanted peace - it was overwhelmingly **for peace!** A letter of good wishes from Dame Sybil Thorndike was read to the cheering audience. In March Mosley addressed a packed audience in the same hall. "Action" reported: "*To us have come more of the best of the British, more even before; and they keep on joining.*" In the Spring the number of anti-war meeting rose. In London alone the number grew from 41 in February to 137 in April, 1940. Churchill's cronies counter-attacked charging that supporting the BUF was backing the enemy. More and more young Blackshirts were being drafted into the army. Thus there became a shortage of leaders to keep the peace campaign going. Thus Oliwe Hawks and the Women's BUF section held a rally at Holborn Hall guarded and addressed by women only. Mrs.

³⁷ *The Truth at Last*, P.O. Box 1211, Marietta, Georgia 30061, USA. Issue No. 366 [1993], p. 13.

³⁸ *The Truth at Last*, Special edition, pp. 6-7, enclosure to No. 366.

Hawks said. "*Government demands youth shall die in defence of its blunders.*" Mosley later thanked them saying. "I could not have got a quarter of the way without the women of the BUF. They were, long before today's spurious ideas of "Woman's liberation", true liberated women."

Fighting For Peace - To The bitter End.

The last great peace offensive was launched on the annual "May Day" 1940 celebration (which they called "British Union Day"). A week before Action sales teams stood every 10 yards along London's West End main thoroughfares and made record sales. On Sunday morning the 5th of May 17 meetings were held in different parts of London. The afternoon 4 more were held and that night meeting at Victoria Park Square and Bethnal Green were packed to suffocation to hear Mosley demand nothing less than the resignation of the Government. He told the cheering crowd: "*Peace now before a million lives are lost in this alien quarrel. Peace, not on Hitler's terms, but by trusting in the might of Britain, a peace with honour.*" There was thunderous applause. A few days later on May 23, 1940, without notice, Mosley and 80 of his chief staff officers were arrested - never to be charged - **never to be tried - some were held for over four years in concentration camps - an outrage that never had ever occurred before or since in British history!**

They were held under the so-called "18b regulation" which provided for secret arrests and internment in secret concentration camps. Many suffered from starvation food rations and brutal round the clock interrogations. Still the BUF did not close down. The headquarters was still open and to Churchill's consternation Action was still being published! In June 1940, even after Mosley's arrest, courageous members of the BUF held 5 more peace rallies in London. Then the Government ordered the publication and organisation to cease all operations. The last issue of *Action* of June 6, 1940 wrote: "*Our conscience is clear. Be calm and be determined. Be loyal. Be true Britons!*"

The mass arrests under 18b were draconian. It was like Roosevelt's placing 120,000 Japanese of U.S. citizenship in desert concentration camps without charge or trial. (Along with hundreds of German and Italians - a story still not fully told). In Britain some 1,3000 anti-war activists were imprisoned including 753 BUF leaders. Also 22,000 German and Austrians along with 4,000 Italians were imprisoned.³⁹

³⁹ For an account of the dire conditions in the KZ-camps, see John Charnley, *Blackshirts and Roses*. Charnley was a BUF leader in Hull East. The book is an inside look at the operation of a BUF branch. A detailed, wrenching study of life in Churchill's 18b concentration camps.

Chapter 4

Here I shall pause for a moment and consider the unholy symbiosis between Jewry in Great Britain and in USA. James Forrestal, in his Diaries, did refer that, according to Joseph Kennedy, then US ambassador to the UK, Chamberlain himself did maintain that the Jews and the US did push England into war. In other words, the Jews in England together with the Jews in USA *did instigate a W.W.II*; as Hitler had warned against. Yet, seen from a purely propagandistic viewpoint, the relation cause-effect as for England and her former colonies, there has been the whole time an often complicated *interaction* - a perverse symbiosis - with dire results for the rest of the world. Let us therefore have a look at that infamous combine from the American viewpoint.

Porter Sargent in his treasury of a book, "*Getting US Into War*"⁴⁰, maintained that "*Propaganda has been Britain's best paying export. There has always been a demand for it. Americans lap it up, pay for it, and derive a sense of morality, religious exaltation and self-righteousness after gobbling it down. It was five or six years after the first World War before our university professors began to feel the first pangs of pain from their gullible gluttony.*"⁴¹

Porter Sargent quoted the famous leading American intellectual H.L. Mencken's articles in The Baltimore *Sun*. And here I shall refer some of Mencken's highlights, with dates (and page numbers from Sargent's collection of shining jewels). Already in 1939 Mencken foresaw it all:

"... But the United States, despite an occasional groan over the unpaid war dept, continued idiotically in the English orbit, and there it is today.

"Worse, we are now asked to strengthen our bonds with more money and more blood. Once again, it appears, the world is to be made safe for democracy. Once again the wicked Kaiser, in the person of his even more wicked heir and assign, is to be prevented from ravaging our coasts, burning our cities and selling our people into captivity. Once again we are to fall for the old hooey, and hail with hosannas a return engagement of the old bills. It sounds incredible, but there is the plain fact. Let it revolve a bit in your mind.

"I am the last man on earth to object to the English effort to preserve and extend their great empire. It is a magnificent edifice, and no rational people, having once erected it at large cost and made it pay, would willingly let it go. To be sure, a great deal of sharp dealing and worse went into its erection, and it is maintained today only by a constant resort to brigandage and false pretences. But it is clearly absurd to hold great states to the simple morality of private men, beset alike by the police and the fear of Hell.

"But why should the United States dedicate itself to the dirty work of another country, traditionally our enemy and only transiently, and for revenue alone, our contemptuous, patronising and dead-beat friend? Why should we convert our own country into a mere client and goon of England,

⁴⁰ Boston 1941.

⁴¹ *Getting US Into War*, p. 44.

and waste our men and money protecting and augmenting England's empire and fighting England's rivals? Why should we denounce and threaten the Germans because they object to being hedged in and ruined by English bribery and intrigue, or the Italians because they rebel against living in an English lake and under English guns, or the Japs because they believe that the affairs of China, which lies at their very gates, are of more concern to them than to the English, 10,000 miles away?

"The answer we get is that England is a great Christian nation, the guardian of civilization, the consecrated fosterer of "morality and religion," radiating a special and incomparable virtue, and with a special mission to protect the Unites States.

"That answer is buncombe. England is a country like all the rest, no worse and no better. Its one aim and purpose is to promote its own interest; it has no other whatsoever. It was willing and eager, only six weeks ago, to embrace Comrade Stalin as a brother, and it is trying to buy him back even now, just as it is trying to by Mussolini, Franco and the Turks."⁴²

Sargent quotes Mencken's "sermon":

"A president of the United States like any other citizen, has a plain right to an opinion about the rights and wrongs of this or that foreign war, and in his official capacity he may also have a right, and even a duty, to indicate that opinion to the people, thought on this point learned counsel are far from unanimous. But neither he nor any other man has any right to pretend to neutrality when he is in fact bitterly partisan, nor to talk loftily against war when he is notoriously planning to promote it. Of the first of these improprieties the Hon. Mr. Roosevelt proved himself guilty in every one of the notes he addressed to Hitler, Mussolini and company before the war actually began, and in all his speeches on the subject after his Chautauqua speech. Of the second he convicted himself in the very message to Congress which contained his pleas for peace."⁴³

And, as for the English, Mencken pointed out that "*No Englishman of any sense actually believes in democracy. If he gabbles about it, as all English politicians do, it is only as a means of hoodwinking the vulgar.*"⁴⁴ Yet, the very brazenness of lying in England could never descend to the levels of Roosevelt himself. Here you can read about the US president's management of the Chicago Convention and his acceptance speech:

"The Great Croon of Croons proceeded early Friday morning, on the dramatic contrast between its pious denunciation of dictators and the hard reality that stared them in the face. They had spent the whole week flat on the ground, with the aforesaid steam roller bumping over them. Every sign of opposition, however rational, was instantly slapped down - or anticipated and circumvented. All orders came from the White House, and from nowhere else.

"The Croon of Croons made many things plain. It not only elucidated at length the theory of the Indispensable Man; it also indicated clearly the program of the campaign. The program will have the one end of keeping the boobs alarmed. They will be terrified and lathered by an endless series of nightmares. One day Hitler will be coming by air from the eastward, and the next day the Japs will be coming by water from the west. And on all days

⁴² October 13, 1939, p. 140.

⁴³ Sunday October 1, 1939, p. 141.

⁴⁴ July 7, 1940, p. 211.

Fifth Columns at home will be carrying on a sinister war upon religion, morality, and all the rest of it, and only the ceaseless vigil of One whose soul is all sacrifices will be potent to save.

"This, of course, is the buncombe that demagogues have ladled out at all times and everywhere since the earliest dawn of human society. First set up a bugaboo - and then give chase to it with loud yells. First scare the boobs out of their pants, and then rush up to save them . . .

"The Croon of Croons was, on all accounts, a masterly document. It established firmly - at all events, for vote getting purposes - the dogma that the long and devious campaign for the third-term nomination was never made at all, and that the candidate had to be drafted in the end. And it launched the theory that the conflict now joined is not one between the usual gangs of politicians, eager only to grab places at the public trough, but one between the hosts of Heaven, sweating innocence and righteousness, on the one hand, and the scabrous rabble of Satan on the other . . ."45

This was written before Roosevelt was given unlimited powers, after provoking the Japanese into Pearl Harbour. - Mencken was silenced, but not rounded up as other American Patriots, who, like 2.000 Englishmen under *Regulation 18B*, were put to court during the "sedition trails." In the meantime Mencken lamented that:

"Once the war that the Hon. Mr. Roosevelt is now carrying on *de facto* becomes war *de jure*, all that remains of free speech will vanish as certainly as it vanished under Wilson, and the rights of the citizen in that department will be reduced to the right of the howling "Ja."46

The hypocrisy of Roosevelt was unsurpassedly blatant:

"Roosevelt himself has promised categorically, on at least a dozen occasions, to keep out of the war, and with the most pious and eye-rolling solemnity, but . . . no one, in fact, believes Roosevelt any more, no matter how hair-raising his oaths, save only when he promises to pour out more money. In that department he is still quite reliable . . . His foreign policy, however it may be defended as Christian endeavour, has been unbrokenly devious, dishonest and dishonorable. Claiming all the immunities of a neutral, he has misled the country into countless acts of war, and there is scarcely an article of international law that he has not violated."47

Everything of course in the name of "democracy", in plain contrast to the real sentiments of the people:

"The question whether the plain people really itch to save democracy all over again is not to be decided by Gallup pools, for, no matter how adroitly their questions on the subject are framed, they put reluctance at a disadvantage. When a poor boob is approached by a brisk stranger on the street, or at his house door, and asked whether he is willing to fight for his country, he is almost certain to answer yes again, for he has heard about the FBI's heroic pursuit of fifth columnists, and he is well aware that anyone is a fifth columnist, by the official definition, who is not willing to serve in the English fifth column. My guess is that the majority of plain Americans . . . are a great deal less eager to sacrifice their legs or lives for England than the

45 July 21, 1940, pp. 142-143.

46 September 29, 1940, p. 276.

47 October 20, 1940, p. 511.

editorial writers of the newspapers appear to think. This issue, to such poor folk, is not one between embracing Hitler on the one hand and fighting for "religion and morality" on the other, but simply one between barging into a bloody quarrel and staying out. They are all ready enough to defend this great Republic if it is ever actually attacked, but they are very far from convinced that pulling England's chestnuts out of a very hot fire is the same thing as defending the Republic."⁴⁸

In his Diaries Mencken could still write freely, and we even find some revealing statements in the published parts of his diaries⁴⁹. Here Mencken's evaluation of the situation in November 1944⁵⁰:

"If any war effort were made to report the war objectively and truthfully there would be a public sensation, and a great deal more denunciation than approval. The American people are now wholly at the mercy of demagogues, and it would take a revolution to liberate and disillusion them. I see no sign of any such revolution, either in the immediate future or within the next generation. When the soldiers come home, it will become infamous to doubt - and dangerous to life and limb.

And here we can read his frank statement about the situation in the "democracy" - the ostensible guarantee of "freedom of the press" and other Jewish shenanigans:

Under date of March 26 I had a curious letter from Charles Honce of the Associated Press, proposing that I do some articles for the A.P. [Associated Press] on the coming international conference at San Francisco. "The running spot story," he said, "will be handled by a large spot staff, so that you will be able to write your own ticket as to when, how often and on what subjects you will write." I had to decline, of course, as I had already declined to cover the conference for the *Sun*. It would be simply impossible for me to cover it, or even mention it, and no American newspaper would dare to print what I wrote. I was wise to quit writing for the *Sun* back in January, 1941, for it was obvious by then that Roosevelt would horn into the war soon or late, and I knew by bitter experience in the last war that I'd be throttled at once. Since then I have thought out many likely articles, but not one of them has been printable. In these days, indeed, my very vocabulary is prohibited. I couldn't so much as mention Roosevelt, or Churchill or any of the other frauds without having to face a savage official onslaught, with all the blows directed below the belt.

The common notion that free speech prevails in the United States always makes me laugh. It is actually hedged in enormously both in peace and in war. All the ideas with which my name is associated had to be launched during the interval between 1925 and 1940, and even in that interval there were several attempts to silence me - for example, the "Hatrack" episode. Twice in one lifetime I have been forced to shut down altogether - first in 1916 and then in 1941. Even during the interval I have mentioned I was constantly menaced by censorship's of a dozen different varieties, and they greatly incommoded me while I was editing the *American Mercury*. The American people, I am convinced, really detest free speech. At the slightest

⁴⁸ October 20, 1940, pp. 422-423.

⁴⁹ Edited by philosemite Charles A. Fecher, who cowardly joined the howling choir of detractors of antisemite Mencken, after he unavoidable included some plain truths in his censored edition of his Diaries, New York 1989.

⁵⁰ Sargent, p. 335.

alarm they are ready and eager to put it down. Looking back, I sometimes marvel that I managed, despite this implacable hostility, to launch some of my notions. Looking back, war, in this country, wipes out all the rules of fair play, even those prevailing among wild animals. Even the dissenters from the prevailing balderdash seek to escape the penalties of dissent by whooping up the official doctrine. From that ignominy, at all events, I have managed to escape. I have not written a line in this war, and I wrote none in the last, that I am not prepared to ratify today. There has been no acquiescence in my enforced silence.⁵¹

Yet, after the war was - officially - over, conditions became even worse. Eisenhower began murdering 1.000.000 + + + German soldiers, and the Soviets did murdering 3.000.000 German civilians during the forced expulsions. Journalists (and others) were not welcome to travel freely on the continent. They should not be allowed to learn about the devilish massacres perpetrated in 1946-1947. The Satanic Kaufmann- and Morgenthau-Plans were implemented, though delayed, after Stalin in 1947 turned *antisemite* (the *real* reason for the "cold War"). And Mencken is one of our witnesses to the total press-curfew in the first postwar years⁵².

Mencken, Baltimore, February 28, 1945⁵³:

Paul Patterson wants me to go to San Francisco with him in April. Some sort of international conference is to be held there, with all the chief politicians on the Allied side in attendance.⁵⁴ Patterson proposes that he and I go as what he calls "observers." I certainly don't want to play any such footling part, either there or anywhere else. When I see such a show I want to write about it - and it is obviously impossible, in these days, for me to do any writing for publication about public affairs. My point of view is wholly hostile to that of the *Sun-papers*, and my very vocabulary is under interdict. I could not write five lines without getting beyond the bounds of the permitted.

Patterson plans the San Francisco junket simply because his job bores him beyond endurance. He reaches out eagerly at every excuse to get away from the office. If he could get a passport he'd set off for London tomorrow. Unfortunately, there seems to be opposition in Washington to letting newspaper publishers go abroad. I have heard much speculation as to the reasons for this, but none of it is convincing. The most plausible theory is to the effect that Roosevelt fears an applications from Joseph M. Patterson, and maybe even Colonel Robert R. McCormick.⁵⁵ In order to bar out these enemies, it is said, he has shut down on the whole fraternity. Patterson believes this. I remain in doubt.

⁵¹ Baltimore, April, 1944.

⁵² As for the newspapers in occupied Germany it can be proven that they were not even allowed to write about terrorism going on in their own areas; - the Jews were afraid that the outside world, by obtaining copies of such newspapers, then should learn about what was actually happening.

⁵³ Sargent, p. 353.

⁵⁴ The occasion was the founding conference of the United Nations, at which the UN charter was drawn up and signed by representatives of some fifty countries.

⁵⁵ **Joseph M. Patterson** (1879-1946) was the founder and publisher of the *New York Daily News*; **Colonel Robert R. McCormick** (1880-1955) was editor and publisher of the *Chicago Tribune*.

We had the same conditions in Europe. Evelyn Waugh, for example, could not freely travel through France in 1946, even though he was invited as an official guest at the Nuremberg kangaroo court. Christopher Sykes, in his biography "Evelyn Waugh"⁵⁶ rationalised the forbidding French attitudes as just governmental resistance towards relinquishing "war time powers." Yet, that is total meaningless as for recently "liberated" France. Sykes know nothing about the problematic aftermath with the murdering of 120.000 Frenchmen by the French "liberators" and their brotherhood of Communists, Jews and other "good Democrats".

Wrote Sykes:

In March 1946 Evelyn was officially invited with many other writers and professional men to attend the trials of Nazis being held at Nuremberg. He went at the very end of March staying in Paris on the way with Duff and Diana Cooper. At that time travel outside Britain was forbidden unless proof of the official necessity of a journey abroad could be furnished. Government, in Great Britain and even more in France, having acquired a novel extension of power through the necessities of war was loth to relinquish it, as happens. Many people found themselves acquiring new skills in the composition of dubiously honest letters of request and invitation. While an official invitation to Nuremberg excused Evelyn's journey to Germany, a formal invitation to the British Embassy was needed for his passage through France⁵⁷.

⁵⁶ Glasgow 1975.

⁵⁷ Sykes, p. 295.

Chapter 5

Now back to **13 May 1940** in the House of Commons. The honest gentile representative Mr. Maxton criticised the way Chamberlain was ousted - and compared the ugly sight of the Jewish mob in the commons' house with the gentile Scottish assemblies.⁵⁸ Yet, the brazen Jews-behind-the-scenes had the nerve to promote Churchill who, more or less *willingly*, sabotaged "the Norwegian business," which (in the words of Mr. Maxton), "had not been such a success as was expected." - The main point here is *the contrary* of the line of *bogus* "criticism". That is, that the make-believe, intended by Churchill & Co., was creating an impression of a belligerent Germany, which could only be withstood (or defeated) by *total* powers given to the Government. Though, logically, the blame - even if the make-believe-scenario had been true - should have been laid at the door of Churchill himself. Instead, now the "weakling" Chamberlain as a ("sole-responsible-for-everything") superior of Churchill was blamed for the (more or less arranged) Norwegian failure! - But Mr. Maxton stood steadfast against mob in the House. He warned against the future wholesale slaughter; and he spoke on behalf of the cannon-fodder who were going to be unnecessary killed in another fratricidal war in which Nordic humans were murdering others of their own stock. **Mr. Maxton:**

I watched the fights of last week in this House from some considerable distance. I was 400 miles away. I do not think it was a pretty spectacle. I do not think that that has happened since makes it any prettier. It is very easy for the right hon. Gentleman above the Gangway to say that last week was fine and that this week was fine, and to whitewash the whole business. Last week was not fine. I was taking part in a by-election in the West of Scotland facing audiences of all different kinds and complexions, and the one thing that struck me last Tuesday and Wednesday was the calm, serious, sober way in which the electorate listened even to points of view that were obnoxious to the majority. They were calm and serious because _____

Earl Winterton (Horsam): Wait until the bombs fall and then they will take a very different attitude.

Mr. Maxton: I am quite satisfied that my fellow citizens in the West of Scotland will not get the wind up either. We were calm and serious while the right hon. Gentleman was making hysterical speeches of the Floor of the House of Commons. It does not require any great courage to attack the Prime Minister. He was in an awkward spot and the jackals gathered around. It was their night to howl, and they howled, and now we have a new Government - a Government of all the talents - [An HON. MEMBER: "And you are howling"?] I put it to the House whether my utterances here can be described as howling.

⁵⁸ Members of Parliament in B'nai B'rithannia did even set the standard for the evil mob in Israeli Knesset. They consider civility as "an ordeal", and the Jewish rabble-rousers in England, together with their alcoholized Shabbez Goyim have never been considered as fit for Television, symptomatically enough. The animals in the Zoo of Commons had to be tamed and instructed, before being presentable in the very revealing medium which television really is, for *semi-professional* hypocrites.

[An HON. MEMBER: "We might say "whining""] No, I do not think even that is a decent decription. My hon. and right hon. Friends above the Gangway are a little bit nervy today. The excitement started over the fact that the Norwegian business had not been such a success as was expected. The Government came under serious criticism. [HON. MEMBERS: "No"] I heard it from behind me. And so we make the First Lord of the Admiralty into the Prime Minister, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Hillsborough (Mr. Alexander) First Lord of the Admiralty, so that in future there shall be no dubiety about the pugnacious, belligerent nature of the first Lord.

I cannot see what has happened to justify any change of attitude on my part. We are in this position today because of 22 years of wasted opportunity, 22 years of time, when this country was practically, for 20 years out of those 22, under the control of Governments not essentially differing in position or personnel from this one, and now you say this is going to create an entirely new orientation. The only difference is that the Prime Minister cuts out of his speech any reference to the possibilities of peace short of wholesale slaughter. I and my hon. Friends believe that the overwhelming mass of the people of this world, Germany included, are against the slaughter method of life, and I believe that that great force, mainly a working-class force, throughout the world _____.

Mr. Logan (Liverpool, Scotland): Surely you do not see that in Germany?

Mr. Maxton: I can see people in Germany today, people that were my comrades and the comrades of hon. and right hon. Members above the Gangway, and I do believe that they have deserted their principles.

Miss Wilkinson (Jarrow): They have gone to the concentration camps.

Mr. Maxton: The function of a political working-class movement is to mobilise that anti-war opinion throughout the world and make it effective in the affairs of humanity. [*Interruption.*] I could make, if I were sitting there, all these cheap, irrelevant interruptions as well as anybody else, and I regret to say that I have frequently done it, but the fact remains that shouting about Hitler will not kill a single German, nor will it save a single Britisher. I admit today all the difficulties that face the people who hold democratic beliefs, and the difficulties that face the efforts of the people who believe that the world must be reconstructed on a different social basis, but I stand by those principles of freedom and social equality. Principles are not any better for being thrown overboard, and although I admit all the difficulties, can we not have freedom without the young men of Europe being slaughtered _____.

Continuation 13 May 1940, 4.40 p.m.: Enter Mr. S.O. Davies. He did challenge the warmongers; he pointed out that a war would not "end the devastating economic crisis." And he attacked "*the present unconscionable profiteering that is going on in the manufacture of arms, in the food supplies, and in the essentials of the very life of the people of the country.*" He rejected the Jews propaganda line "*that the only thing that matters is that the war should be won.*" And he would not "*accept anything approaching voluntary totalitarianism.*" He declared that intolerable capitalism would remain, "*wars or no wars, until those conditions will have been removed.*" But

that was too much for the plutocrat, warmongering and profit craving Jews. The Jew Marcus Samuel interrupted him, impudently referring to *an unanswered question* put forward by Mr. Sorensen (who had defended the Germans in his questioning April 30). Samuel had the chutzpah to try to stifle Mr. Davies' critique just by questioning Sorensen's list of desirable things ("*development of our social services, the progress and benefits of democratic trade unionism*" etc.) as if just listening to a (totally uncommitted!) survey of those goodies would be enough for the gullible Goyim to forget their plight - and their demands! Yes, in that list even "*preservation of religious, political and literary freedom, especially in comparison with totalitarian and other States*" was included, and parroted by the sly Jew. Not long time afterwards, England's finest patriots were imprisoned by the Jews and their tools: Arnold Leese, Oswald Mosley, Sir Barry Domville, Sir Archibald Ramsey and thousands of others were put into jail just because of their opinions (and love of peace). Yeah, they were punished for not obeying the ruling tyrants (whose descendants still are ruling Britannia)!!

However, Mr. Davies was not fooled by the interruption. He continued pointing out that the economic conditions (usury and exploitation) could not "be destroyed or removed by any magic." Moreover, he censored organised profiteering and "*the patriotism of high finance, of the money changers and gamblers on our stock exchanges,*" which he wanted to have "*completely eliminated*"!! The address to the Plutocrat Jews could not possibly have been clearer. Furthermore he stated that ***these are the powers - and we have no illusions about this - which brought Nazism into power.*** Here he clearly "belled the cat" - and, justified National Socialism, by showing that the NS movement was a reaction to the capitalist stranglehold by International Finance. Moreover he even prophesied that National Socialism would be brought "into being in this or any other country" if the Capitalist domination should "*last much longer.*" The last sentence is the most important one in the entire text. It brings hope for the future. National Socialism will, as Hitler himself did say, *triumph at last*, although Overnational Jewry temporarily had won - because of the Jews' *arrogance*, which shall cause their downfall; Because of their insatiable greedy, continued exploitation of us all. - But (like for example Douglas Reed) Mr. Davies thought that one could get rid of the Jewish usurers without applying National Socialism. Here he was at fault. He wanted to "*fight Nazism*" . . . "*whether that Nazism is partially concealed in this country or blatantly open elsewhere.*" Yet, he thought that he *at the same time* might upheld the very "*principles which have ever been dear to us, namely the interests of our own [the Gentile] people.*" He did not understand that true anti-Capitalism cannot be effective without orthodox National Socialism! Furthermore, Mr. Davies joined the boobs in declaring total war-mongering commitment - rejecting any sound peace solution, thus involving themselves in *unconditional warfare* - at the Jew's behest - only for the benefit of Monopoly Capitalism, Usury, Speculation, Swindle and Jews' Greed ---- just have a look at Little Britain nowadays.

The synagogue (the formerly "House") voted: "Ayes, 381; Noes, 0." *Finis Gentile Spirit of Independence - Finis Britannia! Homage á honest gravedigger Mr. S.O. Davies:*

Frankly, I do not envy the step that my right hon. Friends have taken, and I have a strong suspicion that that step will not add to their happiness. We shall await to see whether the injustices of this form of society will continue. No change of personnel will affect them unless a radical change in viewpoint is adopted by the Coalition Government. I shall probably be told that this is only a temporary expedient, determined by the exigencies of the war, but we must question, and we shall continue to question, how our resources in this country, human and material, are to be mobilised with a view to winning the war. We regard with considerable anxiety the fact that if the war is to be continued on the basis of a form of society in this country that is decrepit, and that is divided from top to bottom, once you step outside this House, with its class domination, with its inhibitions and its contradictions, if these are to be perpetuated during this war, we at any rate must dread the appalling consequences. If this is a war for democracy, it can be wage and won only when democracy is experienced by our own people, for a mere change of personnel will not end the devastating economic crisis that we know so much about. It will non in itself end unemployment and insecurity or bring greater comfort to the old age pensioners and veterans of industry.

I should like to ask whether this change will remove from the Statute Book of this country the Trade Disputes Act. [HON. MEMBERS: "Oh!"] I am entitled to ask that before I support the Motion on the Paper, I want to try and get a line on the implications of the step that has been taken, and so far I have very little guidance as far as what we call the home front is concerned. I must repeat, it is to be understood that that instrument, placed on the Statue Book with the deliberate intention of crippling and destroying the political power of the great trade unions of this country, is to be removed? Is that part of the bargain that has been struck? I am entitled to an answer to that question, if anything like co-operation across the Floor of this House is expected. I am also entitled to ask whether the present contemptible Workmen's Compensation Bill which is before the House is to be withdrawn, or whether it is to be imposed upon the crippled workers of industry, who are represented by most of us on this side. A mere Coalition will not necessarily end the present unconscionable profiteering that is going on in the manufacture of arms, in the food supplies, and in the essentials of the very life of the people of the country. Have the Government started on a reorientation as far as those demands are concerned? Can there in fact be anything approaching co-operation in the political arena while all the present economic and social injustices prevail? My answer to that question is "No".

I shall be told that the only thing that matters is that the war should be won. We are of the opinion that this war will not be won by stultifying and hamstringing opinion in this House of Commons, and we shall most strenuously fight against any attempt to stifle fair and constructive criticism from these benches. We shall not willingly accept anything approaching voluntary totalitarianism, if that is the price of Coalition that has been established. I draw some consolation from the fact that the working-class movement of this country has not been

built up by a few individuals, however distinguished their service might have been. This movement of ours, which we will protect and fight for with all the strength and the jealous regard of which we are capable, was ushered into being by barbaric and intolerable conditions, and it will remain in being, wars or no wars, until those conditions will have been removed. We have never believed that those conditions can be destroyed by any magic, such as _____.

Mr. Marcus Samuel (Putney): Might I ask the hon. Member whether he read the Question put last Wednesday by the hon. Member for West Leyton (Mr. Sorensen) to the Minister of Information "whether he will arrange for the fuller world appreciation of the best British characteristics by the dissemination of facts concerning the development of our social services, the progress and benefits of democratic trade unionism, political associations and local government, and the preservation of religious, political and literary freedom, especially in comparison with totalitarian and other States where this does not prevail or has been substantially destroyed - [OFFICIAL REPORT; 8th May 1940; col. 1218, Vol. 360]

Mr. Davies: I shall express no opinion upon the profound contribution which the hon. and gallant Member has just made to the Debate. As I was saying before I was interrupted, we have never believed that the conditions to which I have referred can be destroyed or removed by any magic, such as by walking 12 feet across the Floor of this House. We shall watch this Government critically and anxiously. Their task presumably is to mobilise the men and resources at our disposal; but will they be able to do it? I am confident that they will not be able to do it unless the dead hand of the past is removed, and until the crippling weight of organised profiteering is lifted and the patriotism of high finance, of the money changers and gamblers on our stock exchanges is completely eliminated. These are the powers - and we have no illusion about it - which brought Nazism into being and the powers which will bring Nazism into being in this or any other country if their dominion is to last much longer. We on these benches are as prepared to fight Nazism as is any representative in any part of this House, whether that Nazism is partially concealed in this country or blatantly open elsewhere. We shall do so, but not at the price of sacrificing the principles which have ever been dear to us, namely the interests of our own people who have placed us in this House.

Question put,

"That this House welcomes the formation of a Government representing the united and inflexible resolve of the nation to prosecute the war with Germany to a victorious conclusion."

The House divided: Ayes, 381, Noes, 0.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ The entire last page included (together with front pages) in **Appendix B**.

Chapter 6

The above happened 13 May 1940. But already 11 May, Churchill started his terror against civilian German targets. In the following I shall quote from "*Bombing Vindicated*"⁶⁰ by J.M. Spaight, C.B., C.B.E. - Late Principal Assistant Secretary, Air Ministry. - It is a fact that Hitler had proposed that only military objectives should be attacked, but the Englishmen or the Jews⁶¹ decided otherwise. Spaight about Hitler:

So little did he relish the idea of long-distance raiding that he initiated no attack of this kind in the first ten months or more of the war (see the following chapter for the facts). The German air force was then the most powerful in the world. Its bombers may not have been, individually, as good as ours, but there were more than twice as many of them; and our anti-aircraft defences were notoriously weak in the early part of the war. Then, if ever, would have been the time to launch massed air attacks on Britain. No such attacks came. After Poland had been crushed, we fully expected the weight of the German blow in the air to fall on us. It did not fall.⁶²

Spaight of course tried to explain away the German reluctance as "strategic considerations" etc. and he tried even harder to defend the fact that "our Government regarded itself as freed from the restrictions which it had imposed on itself when the war began." On pages 68-69 we read:

Action followed swiftly on the warning, and it was action *from our side*. We began to bomb objectives on the German mainland before the Germans began to bomb objectives on the British mainland. That is a historical fact which has been publicly admitted. The way in which the bombing began was explained by Captain Harold Balfour, the Under-Secretary of State for Air, in reply to a question in the House of Commons on 28 January, 1942.

[.....]

In an article contributed by Air Chief Marshal Sir Arthur Harris, Air Officer Commanding-in-Chief Bomber Command, to the American periodical *Flying* ("Special Royal Air Force Issue") for September, 1942, he wrote: "The first British bombs fell on the soil of the German mainland on the night of 11 May, 1940, when a force of 18 Whitley bombers attacked railway communications behind the lines of the German advance across Flanders and the Low Countries. Light bombers of the Command, at that time Blenheims, also endeavoured to stem the onrush of the attack by desperate and costly sorties against immediately threatening enemy concentrations." That even then our action was taken in the teeth of strong French objection is evident from what is stated in the official booklet, *Bomber Command*.

Max Hastings wrote a book with the same title as the brochure mentioned: *Bomber Command*.⁶³ In his honest book Hastings commented upon the blather of "the lyrical Mr.

⁶⁰ London 1944.

⁶¹ ... or the Jewish Englishmen or the English Jews ...

⁶² Spaight, pp. 41-42

⁶³ Subtitled: *The Myths and Reality of Strategic bombing Offensive 1939-45*, New York, 1979.

Spaight"⁶⁴, and he criticised Americans justifying their bombing policy by "moral hair-splitting", with which "British official historians have little patience." Still the most "sophisticated" of all of the USA apologists never reached the heights (or depths) of the "Extreme apostles of air warfare such as Mr. J.M. Spaight."⁶⁵

Let us have a look at the lyrics of Spaight, a poem which might be titled "For Comrade Stalin's Sake." It is taken from a subchapter with the famous heading, "Our Great Decision," yet, instead of having "shouted it from the housetops" they kept silence about it - failing to give it "the publicity it deserved." In Spaight's book⁶⁶ we thus can read about the "*splendid decision*":

Yet, because we were doubtful about the psychological effect of propagandistic distortion of the truth that it was we who started the strategic offensive, we have shrunk from giving our great decision of May, 1940, the publicity which it deserved. That, surely, was a mistake. It was a splendid decision. It was as heroic, as self-sacrificing, as Russia's decision to adopt her policy of "scorched earth." It gave Coventry and Birmingham, Sheffield and Southampton, the right to look Kiev and Kharkov, Stalingrad and Sebastopol, in the face. Our Soviet allies would have been less critical of our inactivity in 1942 if they had understood what we had done. We should have shouted it from the house-tops instead of keeping silence about it.

Be aware that Spaight never did maintain any inevitability of that decision. On pages 72-73 he had written:

A Might-Have-Been

In Chapter II I have given my reasons for thinking that the Germans did not want to start strategic bombing and that they would gladly have called it off when it did start; and what I have recorded in the present chapter is further evidence to support my argument. Suppose that it had not been started; suppose that the view of the French General Staff had prevailed in the counsels of the Anglo-French alliance, which, let us again suppose, had continued to exist until now; and suppose that, in consequence, the air arms of all the main belligerents had been reserved for tactical employment: what would have been our position now in that event? Certainly our cities would have escaped the grievous scars which they now bear, honourably and proudly. Thousands of innocent persons who are dead or maimed would be alive and vigorous today. We should have been saved much suffering and loss; but should we not have lost something, too?

The "loss" he here wrote about was "our national honour."⁶⁷ But did Spaight really know what he was talking about? - He wrote his book before *Dresden*, yet *after Hamburg*. On pages 88-89 we read:

Not even Essen itself experienced so terrible a period of tribulation as that through which Hamburg passed in the last week of July, 1943. The great port had been bombed repeatedly during the three years that were gone, but the storms and trials which it had to endure were all surpassed by its

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 43.

⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 124.

⁶⁶ Spaight, p. 74.

⁶⁷ Which the British already did lose when they gave citizens' rights to Jews some two hundred years before.

sufferings in the cyclone which swept it in those seven days and nights of fire and flame. It was raided six times by night and twice by daylight in that week, and of the raids by night three were mammoth affairs in each of which 2,000 tons of bombs were dropped. The total weight dropped on the city in the seven days was 7,500 tons - a weight as great as that dropped on London during the whole period of the German air offensive in 1940-41. The Maximum tonnage ever deposited on London in a night was 450. No city in the world has ever endured such a colossal, concentrated battering as did Hamburg in that week. What the effect was may be inferred from the ejaculations of one German radio commentator (Dr. Carl Hofman): "Terror . . . terror . . . terror . . . pure, naked, bloody terror."

We know that Hitler, after Dresden, did regret his sin of omission at Dunkirk in 1940.

We read [my translation] in Hermann Gieseler's book "*Ein anderer Hitler*"⁶⁸:

With a petrified face Hitler listened to the reports, he read the accounts, he bowed himself over the table, supported to the fists, knit around the papers. He was silent. He did not speak before late in the night, after the second strike, now only on the rand areas of Dresden. He said:

"This new attack is against those who could flee out of the hell - after the terror of the day, the night of the recognition follows: the total extinction is threatening!

"What was possible after the terrorist attacks against Hamburg, against Köln, Berlin - and everywhere still, the numbers of the victims to compute - as for Dresden it will be impossible. We do not know how many refugees it were in the city. The figures will differ at hundred thousands from each other.

"In spite of everything one might find back to Europe, after Dresden nevermore. Like I did after the terrorist attack on Hamburg I now once more think back to the situation in 1940. The defeated English-French armies were rounded up in the Flanders plain about Dunkirk. At that time I did act thoughtfully, to the point and with responsibility, as a soldier and as a politician. Shall I confess that in my recognitions perhaps there was also an ethical principle involved? - It is not easy to decide upon the extermination of hundreds of thousands.

" My decision is today explained as fault, stupidity or weakness. Of course - after the years of the perversion of warfare into acts of cruel extinction - today, after Dresden, I would have acted otherwise!"

No, we are not dealing with humans. We are dealing with a group of Individuals of a Certain Persuasion and their stooges.

Back to Albion, back to Spaight. He would not have been a complete Englishman if he had not tried to excuse the glorious mass murder by pointing to something *even worse*.

Spaight was employed by the Air Force Ministry - and, of course, he then pointed at . . . *the Navy*⁶⁹:

Lamentable as is the killing of non-combatants proper when an industrial center is bombed, the tragedy must be viewed not in isolation but against the sombre background of war. Some critics of bombing policy appear to lose perspective in this matter. They discuss the question without regard to certain other incidents of war and almost as if it were one which

⁶⁸ Leoni, 1982.

⁶⁹ Spaight, pp. 119-120.

could be decided according to the standards applicable to preventable disasters in peace. That is to misconceive the whole situation. War is war, and it is horrible. The loss of civilian life which bombing causes is almost trivial in comparison with that due to blockade. In the war of 1914-18 the excess civilian mortality, as compared with the normal, amounted in Germany to about 700,000, while the deficit in the birth-rate in the four years was about 2,900,000. The figures compared with an excess mortality of 250,000 and a decrease in births of 600,000 in Britain during the four years. The difference between the German and the British figures must be attributed in large part to the action of the blockade. History seems to be repeating itself in the present war. Some very significant statistics were published in Germany and summarised in *The Times* of 24 May, 1943. They showed that in the large towns of Germany, containing a population of 24,500,000, infant mortality per 1000 births was 59 in 1941 and 69 in 1942; the rate for England and Wales was 49. That difficulties of 20 per 1,000 births between the two countries must be attributed mainly to the strangle-hold of our blockade. The mortality for the whole population of Germany was 24 per cent higher in 1942 than in 1939. Deaths from tuberculosis and some other diseases rose substantially. The birth-rate showed a dramatic fall; there were 80,000 fewer births in the large towns of Germany in 1942 than in 1940. For the whole of Germany the drop in the birth-rate indicated a loss of approximately 550,000 live births in 1942 as compared with 1939-40. It is hardly too much to say that these dry statistics are the tragic sign of a nation dying in the grip of sea power. Air power could never reap such a terrible harvest. Do those critics who devote so much attention to our bombing policy ever think of this other accompaniment or consequence of war?

These figures in themselves are most interesting and revealing. But only a British hypocrite would use them as Spaight did⁷⁰.

Still, as for the bombing terror, Spaight *did* have a "justification" - at least in his own mind. *Look to Norway!* On page 150 we read:

Even if Warsaw is left out of account on the ground - *vide* German propaganda - that the city was invested and had refused to surrender, it is still undeniable that the Germans bombed undefended towns in Norway before we ever dropped a bomb in Germany

"Kristiansund, an open and absolutely defenceless town where there have never been any military establishments whatever, was bombed for three days; only one house remained . . . 15,000 inhabitants were left without shelter. In the same way Molde was bombed, and Reknes, the great sanatorium for tuberculosis, was bombed and set on fire."*

That the Germans, having so set the pace in Norway, should protest in the name of humanity than we, having caught them up, stiffened the going for them in the Ruhr, is an indication of the amazing obtuseness of the Teutonic mentality. Have they then forgotten what happened in April, 1940? Those raids in Norway could not be explained away as reprisals. And why, given those raids, was it such a shock to the righteous Germans when we bombed the Ruhr? Why was it a "Churchill crime"? Why should Essen or Duisburg or Dortmund be inviolate when Elverum and Kristiansund and Reknes were not? It is cheap and easy to ask rhetorical questions in a book

⁷⁰ He might have had even more revealing figures at his disposal, one year later. Not only the forced expulsions and Eisenhower's and Stalin's extermination camps took their millions, but as the honest General Patton pointed out, milk for starving babies in Germany was poured out in the ditches, and we know that an incredible high percentage of all who were *born in Germany in 1945* did never live up.

published here about the enemy's apparently inconsequent process of thought, but this really is a puzzle.

* Carl J. Hambro, *I Saw it Happen in Norway*, 1940, p. 96. Halvdan Koht, *Norway Neutral and Invaded*, 1941, p. 111, says that not a single house was left in Kristiansund.

To make a long story short, even our own court-historians are still embarrassed by this brazen lying. One Ole Kristian Grimnes⁷¹ I confronted the above statements with, brushed it away as "wartime propaganda," that is, as "*usual* wartime propaganda." You know, if *ones own* are caught red-handed, then what they have done are of course something that "everybody" does now and then, ... *just forget it!* However, it is true that the Germans did bomb the *evacuated* town of Kristiansund. And there are reports that *nearly half* of the (mostly old wooden) houses burned down, because of fire let loose. Yes, there are even accounts that 4 persons were killed during that bombing raid in Kristiansund, yet, in Molde the damages were less (not to speak of Elverum, where only a limited area of the town was hit at all). But the Norwegian towns did at least partly burn down, didn't they? - Was not Spaight's brand new form of warfare *vindicated* after all? Innovations from old perfidious Albion, thus justified? - Spaight never heard about Copenhagen during the Napoleonic wars, I say. No, let us rather look to Africa. I just read about Jack Driberg, who reluctant to burn villages in the Southern Sudan in 1921, had merely reported that he had done so; the truth emerged, and his career in the Colonial Service ended (and he instead became an "academic"). And as for terror bombing, I just found an old magazine clipping about an American Jew named David C. Besbris⁷² who had been shot down on a raid over Norway; - at *Knaben*, 16 November 1943. Some Norwegians playing anti-German "resistance" had picked up the man and hid him, instead of sending him to jail⁷³. But, here Besbris boasted that he also had participated in a raid (in B-17 bombers) against Herøya, 24 July 1943, when 90 Norwegian citizens were killed. There were some half-built factories there, yet, the bombing (like the "allied" bombing of civic passenger vessels along our coast, was indeed *that* unnecessary, that even "our" puppet-government in London did protest (with the American reply, that the attack "was necessary in order to defeat Germany").

"Bombing vindicated". Well, not everyone of the allied goons have been participators in the Zionist complot. As for the Atom bomb against Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Fleet Admiral William D. Leahy in his "*I was there. The Personal Story of the Chief of Staff to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Based on his Notes and Diaries Made at the Time*,"⁷⁴ told the truth at last. Firstly: Chemical and bacteriological weapons were considered:

A few months after I took over as Chief of Staff to the President, I became acquainted in general with the status of both these projects. In November, 1942, at the request of Dr. Ross McIntire, I discussed with Presi-

⁷¹ The leader of the new generation of Establishment sucophants and co-author of a book together with Jo[sef] Benkow[it], the new Hambro.

⁷² In "Hjemmet" - the biggest weekly family magazine in Norway (copy of page: **Appendix C**).

⁷³ The reportage is about a rendezvous between Besbris and the Norwegians many years later.

⁷⁴ With a Foreword by President Truman, London 1950.

dent George Merck, of the well-known chemical firm bearing his name, the possible use of bacteriological warfare. Merck was then studying, with a considerable number of scientists and in high secrecy, both offensive employment of and preventive measures against germ warfare.

At intervals this subject came up in my conversations with President Roosevelt and later with President Truman. I recall particularly that, as we were sailing for Honolulu for the MacArthur-Nimitz conferences in July of 1944, there was a spirited discussion of bacteriological warfare in the President's cabin. By that time the scientists thought, for example, that they could destroy completely the rice crop of Japan. Some of those present advocated the adoption of such measures.

Personally, I recoiled from the idea, and said to Roosevelt: "Mr. President, this [using germs and poison] would violate every Christian ethic I have ever heard of and all of the known laws of war. It would be an attack on the non-combatant population of the enemy. The reaction can be foretold; if we use it, the enemy will use it." Roosevelt remained non-committal throughout this discussion, but the United States did not resort to bacteriological warfare.⁷⁵

Some backroom boys involved "advocated" use of that infamous devilry, but in the end atom bombs were decided upon. There has been much desinformation about an alleged "shortening of the war" by the atom bombs. But such whitewash is just cover-up. Leahy wrote:

It is my opinion that the use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender because of the effective sea blockade and the successful bombing with conventional weapons.

It was my reaction that the scientists and others wanted to make this test because of the vast sums that had been spent on the project. Truman knew that, and so did the other people involved.⁷⁶

Think of it: untold human suffering "because of the vast sums that had been spent." Leahy commented further:

"Bomb" is the wrong word to use for this new weapon. It is not a bomb. It is not an explosive. It is a poisonous thing that kills people by its deadly radioactive reaction more than by the explosive force it develops.

The lethal possibilities of atomic warfare in the future are frightening. My own feeling was that, in being there first to use it, we had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. I was not taught to make war in that fashion, and wars cannot be won by destroying women and children. We were the first to have this weapon in our possession, and the first to use it. There is a practical certainty that potential enemies will develop it in the future and that atomic bombs will some time be used against us.

That is why, as a professional military man with a half-century of service to his Government. I come to the end of my war story with an apprehension about the future.

⁷⁵ Leahy, p. 512.

⁷⁶ Leahy, pp. 513-514.

The new concepts of "total war" are basically distasteful to the soldier and sailor of my generation. Employment of the atomic bomb in war will take us back in cruelty toward non-combatants to the days of Ghengis Khan.

It will be a form of pillage and rape of a society, done impersonally by one State against another, whereas in the Dark Ages it was result of individual greed and vandalism. These new and terrible instruments of uncivilised warfare represent a modern type of barbarism not worthy of Christian man.

Perhaps not worthy of Christian man, I agree. But surely worthy of what, aptly, nowadays is termed "Judaeo-Christianity"! Leahy's book was published in 1950. Up to then the American Government forbade information about their satanic massacres of the populations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And the atomic bomb survivors could not make themselves heard freely until 1949. Scientists were prohibited publishing of research on the effects on human beings and environment. Doctors were not allowed to print reports, which would have enabled them to better help their patients, struck by radiation and illnesses. Newspaper articles and books were censored, even if they only described personal experiences of the bombings. The fledgling peace movement was scrutinised. Any criticism against the United States for having used the horrifying new weapon was suppressed. The official Japanese protest containing the words "a bomb having the most cruel effects humanity has ever known . . . a new crime against humanity and civilisation" was only acknowledged as "received" after more than two months and then with no comment. Monica Braw wrote a doctoral dissertation at Lund University in Sweden: "*The Atomic Bomb Suppressed. American censorship in Japan 1945-1949*"⁷⁷ Here I shall only quote the abstracts of that work:

This study investigates American censorship in Japan during the occupation years 1945-1949. The planning and introduction as well as the practice of the elaborate censorship operations are presented as an undertaking not only aimed at demilitarizing and democratizing Japan, but also controlling and isolating the country.

The main focus is the censorship of one particular subject, the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This included suppression of physicians' reports which would have enabled further studies of illnesses, caused by the atomic bombs, and their treatment. Certain Japanese reports were released in the United States; for Japan none were declassified until 1949.

One stated reason for censorship was "public tranquillity", particularly in connection with atomic bomb material. Non-stated reasons, of which the preservation of American reputation for being human was one, are also analyzed.

The American censorship in Japan as a decisionmaking process is seen as not sufficiently supported by an aim-directed bureaucracy with a clear mandate. Yet, in the case of the atomic bomb, it served as a means to extensively suppress facts, which thereby remained unknown not only in Japan but in the rest of the world.

These words put on a sinister significance when we consider all the hullabaloo about the phantasmagoric fiction, which the Zionists have Judaeo-christened "Holocaust".

⁷⁷ Lund Förlag. Printed in Japan 1986.

In Admiral Leahy's book is a clear admission of the fact that, vis-à-vis Germany, Roosevelt was *the* aggressor. Hitler's decision (*de jure*) of war against the United States was made only after years of Rooseveltian provocations. I have even read somewhere that Roosevelt boasted that he already - as Marine Minister-Vice - during W.W.I broke American law hundreds of times, without any scruples. Yet, as for Churchill - when he was Minister during W.W.I - we know that he blundered terribly, causing thousands of unnecessary deaths of British soldiers. He therefore tricked England into W.W.II, only to get an opportunity *to settle his personal record*. In other words: The Empire and the rest of the world as playthings for a notorious fake and cheat, and for a revengeful and ambitious drunkard; - who also declared that he liked war *for its own sake!* Leahy wrote:

On Navy Day, 1941, the President made his boldest defiance of the Nazi programme up to that time. The first we heard was that he had announced that the shooting had started and America's Navy was at battle stations. The re-broadcast came through later over BBC. It was a stirring address informing the world that American ships would carry supplies to the Allies and that they would be protected by the Navy. "It can never be doubted that the goods will be delivered by this nation, whose Navy believes in the tradition of 'damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead.' ... To-day, in the face of this newest and greatest challenge, we Americans have cleared decks and taken our battle stations . . . "

To me this was as nearly an open declaration of "undeclared" war as it would be possible to formulate. I had felt that we became some kind of belligerent on the day back in March when we began to send supplies, free, to be used to kill Germans. Professional soldiers of my generation had a concept of war based on formal declaration of intentions. The various legislative and executive actions that had followed in rapid succession during the preceding six months caused me to wonder if the President really thought he was fooling anyone about our not being at war.

Only hypocrites could then later sit at Nuremberg and brazenly accuse the Germans for *instigation of war*.

I am sorry that Leahy himself (if he here did not just try to be ironic) seemed to agree on what in Churchill's brain "was in accord with the long-established Anglo-Saxon understanding of justice" - *vide* the circumvention of the selfsame justice, in order to not infringe on the ex-post-facto prohibition! Or, perhaps that somewhat insane sophistry is in agreement even with that perfidious double-morality of hypocrite Britons!⁷⁸ Leahy:

The Prime Minister next presented the question of war criminals. He said that the "great war criminals" should be executed without formal trials. This would obviate any necessity for bringing them before a formal court, which he at that time considered unwise.

He insisted vigorously that traditional English practice would not permit trying before any British court any person accused of an offence that was not legally a crime at the time it was committed. I was in full agreement with

⁷⁸ Asking for *Judge Lynch*, in order to not "soil" the Anglo-Saxon fool's-honour.

Churchill on this point, and felt that his contention was in accord with the long-established Anglo-Saxon understanding of justice.⁷⁹

The establishment of a Kangaroo-court at Nuremberg was however declared "legal" by the "Allies", "including Justices of (the US) Supreme Court." And Churchill even went along finally with this point of view. - It is more impressive, as for the imagination of the populace, to see an albeit *show* trial, compared with summary executions. Summary executions might later be considered as murder in darkness, thus being *more* "unwise" than the trials, which Churchill at first shrank from setting up.

But not only the leading followers of Adolf Hitler were targeted for destruction. The entire *Nordic spirit* was to be extirpated. It is not true that the Balfour Declaration was the main reason for the Jewry's support for the Entente. It is a fact that *racial thought* - racial *consciousness* - was on the rise in Germany in the beginning of this century. Of course there indeed were many knowledgeable persons also in other countries⁸⁰, yet, the fact that German ideologists and scientists were at *the forefront* made the decision for the Synhedrin easy: *Germania delenda est!* The Germans - that is *too many* of them - knew too much - therefore: Two World Wars and the brainwashing ("reeducation"), which still is pouring forth from the TV-sets every day in Germany. Yea, the Germans have become a nation of masochists who only are supposed to condemn themselves, pay, and be contrite, and pay again - for ever. Therefore Leahy could present individuals like "Dr. Forster":

Later in June Robert Bliss invited a small group to hear a Dr. Foerster, a prominent Bavarian professor, discuss the problem of post-war Germany. Dr. Foerster said that the Nazi philosophy was not of Prussian origin, but that it had been accepted and developed by the entire German people. His only useful suggestion for corrective action was that there should be close Allied control of any post-war government and that Germany should be broken up into separate states. Foerster was positive that there were in Germany no political groups with which the Allies could work in establishing a friendly government, and that it would be necessary for us to impose on the defeated German people a government acceptable to us.⁸¹

This was in June 1944, and in February 1945 the consequences of the hatred against Germany was drawn up at Yalta. Leahy:

At the conclusion of this momentous Crimea meeting of the three nations that expected to administer in the near future a total defeat to Germany, I was deeply impressed by the amicable agreements of the President, the Prime Minister, and the Marshal on the action that should be taken to destroy Germany as a military power.

These three men who together controlled the most powerful military force ever assembled, sitting with their military and political staffs at a round table in a palace that once belonged to the Czars of Russia, agreed to destroy completely the existing German Government, to disarm and dismember Germany, to destroy any of its industry capable of manufacturing war material, to transfer territory from Germany to Poland that would necessitate the

⁷⁹ Leahy, p. 369.

⁸⁰ Later, USA could even boast of a Madison Grant and a Lothrop Stoddard.

⁸¹ Leahy, pp. 285-286.

deportation of between 7 million and 19 million inhabitants (if that many survived), and to exact reparations in kind and in forced labour that would practically reduce the existing highly industrialized Germany to the status of two or more agricultural states.

I felt sorry for the German people. We were planning - and we had the force to carry out the plans - to obliterate a once mighty nation. I had an uneasy feeling that those 80 million Germans somehow or other would survive to fight again.

While the German nation had in this barbarous war of conquest deserved all punishments that could be administered, the proposed peace seemed to me a frightening "sowing of dragons' teeth" that carried germs of an appalling war of revenge at some time in the distant future.

I did not know of any other way to punish for their war crimes this nation of highly intelligent, highly reproductive, and basically military-minded people, but the prospect of some future reaction in desperation hung like a dark cloud over my thoughts.⁸²

However, an important segment of the British population did protest *during the war itself*, although their voices were not heard because of the media-control. In "*The Journal of Historical Review*"⁸³ we read in Charles Lutton's review of Max Hasting's "Bomber Command":

Civilian opponents of Bomber Command comprised an articulate, though tiny, minority. One group, The Bombing Restriction Committee, distributed leaflets headlined "STOP BOMBING CIVILIANS." George Bell, Bishop of Chichester, was probably denied elevation to the Archbishopric of Canterbury because of his opposition to area bombing. Hasting goes on to discuss the opposition by Britain's leading military theorists, J.F.C. Fuller and B.H. Liddell Hart, but emphasizes that these distinguished critics had no impact upon policy.*

* For a useful discussion of the opposition to area bombing in Britain and the United States, see James J. Martin's essay, "The Bombing and Negotiated Peace Questions - in," *Revisionist Viewpoints*, Colorado Springs, Ralph Myles Publisher, 1971, available in pb. at \$4.00 from the Institute for Historical Review.

It is almost impossible for people opposing all this to do anything at all, as long as Jews are owning/controlling the mass media in such a degree as we experience today. Moreover, subversive organisations like the Zionist *Anti Defamation League* are constantly harassing the intimidated individuals who have not already practised poltroonish self-censorship all by themselves. The Jewish press is so mighty that they even managed to brainwash entire populations. One example is England after Munich. The appeasement policy of Chamberlain was in fact *approved* by the entire Non-Jewish population in Great Britain. Only after a - very gradual - propaganda during month after month, with induced "scepticism", "critique", "hostility" etc. leading up to open "condemnation" of Munich, the entire population were led to believe that this indoctrination by shameless journalism was an expression of "real change" of public opinion. Still the audacious court historians have not even bothered setting the

⁸² Leahy, pp. 378-379.

⁸³ *The Journal of Historical Review*, Volume one, Number Three (Fall 1980), p. 251.

actual record straight, i.e., they have even presented the whole as if "Munich" had been generally unpopular from the outset on!⁸⁴ The court historians have even promoted the obsolete and absurd "doctrine of *balance-of-powers*", allegedly needfully carried out by Britain. Yet, already in the middle of the 18th century the meaninglessness of that "doctrine" was pointed out by English authors. That completely unwarranted "parole" has for, at least, the two last centuries been used only as a *pretext for war* - and thus, profits for the Jewish armament contractors, speculators and the plutocrats who operate as creditors of the British State Debt. Yes, propaganda *for the debt itself* ("money we owe ourselves," as *only* the Jews might say) as something "natural" or as a "status symbol" of civilised nations, has with the greatest possible audaciousness been pushed all the time - the Jews thus keeping all Non-Jews in a perpetual interest slavery. Especially the unmasking of *how* the debt-money system worked. (see especially the works of Gottfried Feder) was the main reason for International Jewry's war against Hitlerism.

National Socialist Germany was a worker's paradise, and under National Socialist rule great achievements for mankind were carried out. And, in addition to inventions and improvements, the National Socialists were the first to recognise natural and holistic methods of healing - in co-operation with traditional school medicine. Whole-grain bread (different from what usually passes for whole-grain bread in the United States) was promoted, and certain materials (suspected of even being dangerous to the genetic material) were scrutinised. Robert N. Proctor write in his book "*Racial Hygiene. Medicine under the Nazis*"⁸⁵:

Nazi concern for racial health was also associated with efforts to improve the quality of the environment. The Nazi government provided extensive funds for research into the effects of environmental toxins on the human genetic material. Scientists documented the hazardous effects of radiation and established elaborate classifications for the kinds of diseases one might expect from exposure to irritants such as asbestos or to heavy metals such as lead, cadmium, and mercury.* German medical journals in the 1930s and 1940s warned against the ill effects of artificial colorings and preservatives in food and drinks, and stressed a return to organic or "natural" ingredients in pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, fertilizers, and foods. Advertisements in popular magazines boasted that their products were free of genetic poisons (*erbgiftfrei*) or that they helped strengthen the genetic material (*erbmass-stärkende*).** Government officials took the matter of genetic poisons seriously: Hitler's personal physician Theodor Morell declared the pesticide DDT both useless and dangerous, and prevented its distribution until 1943 on the grounds that it posed a threat to health.***

* See *Reichs-Gesundheitsblatt*, 12(1937): 40; also Martin Nordmann,

"Der Berufskrebs der Asbestarbeiter," *Archiv für Gewerbepathologie und Gewerbehygiene*, 8(1938): 288-302.

** *Volksgesundheitswacht*, July 1936, p. 5

*** Hagen, *Auftrag und Wirklichkeit*, p. 182.

⁸⁴ You can read about these things (and an extremely accurate description of "Anschluss" and the Sudet crisis and other important happenings in *Years of Reckoning* by the excellent British journalist Price C. Ward (London 1939).

⁸⁵ Cambridge 1988.

And, of course the National Socialists were not only pioneers in drastically limiting the misuse of tobacco and alcohol, but were also laying emphasis on a return to natural procedures as for example midwifery (as different from institutionalisation in gynecologic birth-clinics) thus anticipating similar movements today.

Chapter 7

A Tribute to Barnes

As for the most cogent of all revisionists, Harry Elmer Barnes, he of course - as on all fields of revisionism - also made an unique contribution to the bombing question. I shall include it here because it has not got the attention it does deserve. In the "Festschrift" to Barnes: "*Harry Elmer Barnes - Learned Crusader*"⁸⁶ we read in Murray N. Rothbards essay about Barnes as "*Revisionist of the Cold War*" the following:

One of Barnes' most important contributions to Cold War Revisionism came in the spring of 1958, when he published what is still the best single article on what might be called "Hiroshima Revisionism" - the real reasons for dropping the A-bombs on Japan.* Barnes was here the only writer - and, remarkably, remains the only writer to this day - to make use of the highly significant MacArthur memorandum to F.D.R. of January 20, 1945. This forty-page memorandum explicitly set forth the terms of an authentic Japanese peace offer which were virtually identical with the final surrender terms that we accepted from the Japanese seven months later - at the cost of countless needlessly expended lives, Japanese and American alike. The proffered terms included: complete surrender of all Japanese forces and arms; occupation of Japan and its possessions by Allied troops under American direction; Japanese relinquishment of all territory gained during the war, as well as Manchuria, Korea, and Formosa; regulations of Japanese industry to prohibit any production of war implements; release of all prisoners of war and surrender of any war criminals so designated by the United States.

This MacArthur memorandum, the details of which were later fully confirmed by the general, was leaked in strict confidence to Walter Trohan of the *Chicago Tribune* by Admiral William D. Leahy, chief of staff to the President, who was alarmed lest Roosevelt might fail to follow through on the Japanese proposal, which proved to be the case. As soon as the war with Japan was ended, Trohan was free to publish these revelations, which completely established the American knowledge of what were later to be fully acceptable Japanese peace terms. An yet, apart from Harry Barnes, no Hiroshima Revisionist to date has made use of them.** They are equally indispensable to those who have presumed to write on the last year of the war between the United States and Japan and on Roosevelt's conduct at the Yalta Conference, but they have been ignored by all such writers to the present time. Nothing has annoyed Barnes more than the timidity or dull-wittedness of those historians who call themselves Revisionists but have consistently and deliberately refused to make use of the MacArthur memorandum after Barnes had not only repeatedly called their attention to it but had also furnished several of them with copies and all the related documentation required fully to authenticate it.⁸⁷

* Barnes, "Hiroshima: Assault on a Beaten Foe." *National Review* (May 10, 1958).

⁸⁶ Colorado Springs, 1968.

⁸⁷ Rothbard, pp. 327-328

** Walter Trohan originally published his disclosures in the *Chicago Tribune* of August 19, 1945. Trohan's most recent article, setting forth the latest knowledge on his and other disclosures of Japanese peace feelers, may be found in the *Chicago Tribune*, August 14, 1965. Barnes is understandably incensed that such left-wing writers as Gar Alperovitz, in his otherwise definitive revisionist book, *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965), totally failed to use the Trohan material - an obvious example of leftist parochially refusing to pay heed to "Right-wing" sources. Consequently, Alperovitz unnecessarily weakens his own case by asserting that "the real effort to end the war [by Japan] began in the spring of 1945." *Ibid.*, p. 107. In some cases of failure to use the Leahy-Trohan revelations, Barnes had personally made sure that the historian had been sent copies of the material.

As for the organised cover up, and the conspiracy to suppress the historical truth, I will use some quotes from Barnes' great predecessor Charles A. Beard, revealing the subversive work of Jew-run organisations as the *Rockefeller Foundation* and *The Council on Foreign Relations*. The following is taken from Conrad Grieb's goldmine of information: *American Manifest Destiny and the Holocausts*:⁸⁸

In 1947 the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant of \$139,000 to The Council on Foreign Relations to prevent, if they can, a repetition of what they call "the debunking journalistic campaign that followed World War I."

Charles A. Beard, the well known historian remarked that this historic project means

"... the Foundation and the Council do not want journalists or any other persons to examine too closely and criticize too freely the official statements relative to our basic aims and activities during World War II. In short, they hope that, among other things, the policies and measures of Franklin D. Roosevelt will escape in coming years the critical analysis, evaluation and exposition that befell the policies of Woodrow Wilson and the entente allies after World War I." (Saturday Evening Post, October 4, 1947).

With scholarly restraint Dr. Beard observes:

"... Instead of promoting liberty of research ... subsidized histories of this kind, prepared to serve a purpose fixed in advance, are more likely to perpetuate errors than to eliminate them."

Many West European revisionists have very often been very disappointed with what might be interpreted as cowardice on the part of the Germans after W.W.II. The Germans have - collectively - seemingly being "bending over backwards" facing Jews and Allied subject all the time since W.W.II - an attitude aptly called "National Masochism". - This in stark contrast to what should be the most important of the spiritual qualities supposed to be prominent in human beings of Nordic stock (according to the classic German race theorists) namely: *love of truth and courage to truth*.⁸⁹ And if the race theorists (or the patriots) should be right in their assumption, then there cannot be many Nordics (or true Germans) left. Or, is there an explanation - does any justification exist which will save the German honour? - As we know, many maintain that the Jews are using "the Protocols" as a guide for their global dictatorship And one of the paragraphs there does recommend *criminalization* of political

⁸⁸ Colorado Springs, 1968

⁸⁹ Some even did maintain that "to be German is to be truthful" ("Deutsch sein heißt wahr sein").

opponents as the most expedient method to silence the non-Jews. Gentile politics are branded as "criminal" - and thus the Jews can suppress us all, without even needing to engage themselves in plain *political struggle!*

The following is taken from Barnes' essay "*Revisionism and Brainwashing*" (1963) reproduced in "*The Barnes Trilogy*"⁹⁰ and in "*Selected Revisionist Pamphlets*".⁹¹ Barnes himself was not only a revisionist historian, but also a criminologist, a sociologist and an economist - therefore he was in a position to analyse what we might term "metahistorical circumstances" in the aftermath of W.W.II. Firstly I shall quote from page 11, from a chapter titled "*The Great Contrast between the Attitudes of the German Government, Scholars and People with Regard to War Responsibility under the Weimar Republic and the Bonn Government*":

The glorification of crime has been interpreted to include saying anything favourable about the National Socialist regime, which is officially presumed to have done nothing except commit crimes, culminating in the greatest of all crimes of the twentieth century, starting the second World War. To question this guilt could well be alleged against any resolute revisionist effort to question the doctrines and policies of those who vigorously maintain Hitler's responsibility for 1939. The leader of German Revisionism after the second World War was actually sentenced to a short prison term mainly for describing frankly the anti-revisionist attitude of the Bonn Government. A school teacher was brought to trial for demanding more proof of the authenticity of the famous *Diary* of Anne Frank, and was suspended from his teaching post for alleged unfitness to instruct German youth. In Weimar days, the government itself would probably have appointed a commission to investigate the *Diary*.

Barnes also re-counted how benevolently he himself was welcomed in Germany during his visits in 1926 and 1927, and pointed out:

All this stands out in sharp contrast to the anti-revisionist attitude of the Bonn Government of today with respect to the facts of 1939, despite the far more harsh treatment of Germany after the second World War, which has been based upon a much greater historical fraud and swindle than the war-guilt clause of the Versailles Treaty, namely, the myth and travesty that Germany was solely responsible for the outbreak of war in September, 1939.

The attitude of the Bonn Government is not only a cause for great surprise in the light of German attitudes and policies in the 1920's, but it also provides one of the major political paradoxes of modern history. The Bonn Government apparently assumes that extremely harsh treatment and cruel slanders growing out of the second war-guilt lie - that related to 1939 - can be redressed and righted by perpetuating this very lie and menacing those who seek to expose and refute it on a factual and non-partisan historical basis.

The Weimar Republic and its scholars worked hard to establish historical truth, in the effort to free Germany from the burdens and evils of Versailles. The government gave every possible encouragement and support to its scholars and intellectuals who wought to discover and proclaim historical truth about 1914. The Bonn Government, on the other hand,

⁹⁰ Torrance 1979

⁹¹ New York 1972 (Arno Press & The New York Times).

appears, even to many friendly outsiders, almost to vie with its former enemies in opposing the search for truth about the responsibility for the second World War and in refusing to accept the facts already established by scholars who have no national, personal, or party axes to grind.⁹²

Then he went on to describe the new "German" historical scene itself, where revisionists have suffered persecution:

Several friends of mine interested in Revisionism and historical scholarship have travelled widely in West Germany during the last two years and have visited most of the German scholars and journalists who are promoting the effort to establish and disseminate the truth relative to the causes of the second World War. They have reported to me that many of these German Revisionists tend to exude an air of apprehensiveness, if not fear, although they seem fully convinced of the accuracy of their facts and the soundness of their convictions. They are conscious of working in opposition to popular opinion and with the disapproval of public authorities.

This I find shocking because, when in Germany in 1926 and 1927, I observed that the men who were working hard to overthrow the Versailles war-guilt lie were full of assurance, pride and self-confidence, and felt certain that they had the warm support and encouragement of both the government and the German people. There was then no fear whatever that if a man endeavoured to tell the Germans the truth with respect of being thrown into jail. An equal contrast is that between the reported sense of collective guilt, shame, and self-pity on the part of the majority of Germans today*, and the attitude of pride, self-assurance and innocence of unique guilt for 1914 which dominated the citizens of the Weimar Republic.

* See Eugene Davidson, *The Death and Life of Germany*, Knopf, 1949, pp. 402-403; and Alfred Werner, "Germany's New Flagellants," in *American Scholar*, Spring, 1958, pp. 169-178.

Turning back to the American scene, we shall not find much relief from the (supreme) *victor* Nation. We read in Barnes' essay "The Public Stake in Revisionism":

When the conflict was over, the American public warmly supported the exposure of the anti-German propaganda of the first World War, such as the Bryce Report, by Mock and Larson and others, but there has been no public or historical demand for an equally honest and searching investigation of the far more sweeping and debatable propaganda relative to alleged German barbarism during the second World War. Even to suggest the desirability of any such project would place the sponsor in professional, if not personal jeopardy.

Nor do we get any assistance or encouragement from the masochistic West Germans who, if anything, in their own blackout distortions and smotherout exceed the indictment of wartime Germany by their former enemies. This is the result of the German self-flagellation and self-immolation, in sharp contrast to the ardently Revisionist proclivities of the Weimar Republic. Nevertheless, but perhaps fittingly, the West Germans get little credit even for this craven attitude. There are surely abundant reasons why all of us who lived through the barbarities of the second World War and its aftermath should be ashamed of being members of the human race but certainly there is no sound basis for any unique German shame or self-flagellation.⁹³

⁹² *The Barnes Trilogy*, p. 25.

⁹³ *Journal of Historical Review*, Fall 1980, p. 228.

Then we turn back to "Revisionism and Brainwashing":

It would require naive and almost uncontrolled optimism to imagine that this vast complex of myths, dogmas and emotions could be readily dissipated by any number of disconcerting and contrary historical documents of the most assured authenticity. This is especially true when one reflects that historical writing itself was one of the first and most complete casualties of the War, and has since remained a docile servant of those who desire to perpetuate the distortions of wartime. Few groups in the entire populace have been more completely brainwashed than the historical guild. For example, in the United States, instead of being instructed in the historical field by a Fay, Tansill or Millis, as we were after the first World War, we now find the American public pleasantly and docilely - almost enthusiastically - accepting arrogant brainwashing by a Shirer, Kohn or Snyder. In Germany, great scholars like Hans Delbrueck, Hermann Oncken and Erich Brandenburg have been replaced by anti-revisionists zealots, such as Walther Hofer, Hans-Adolf Jacobsen, Hans Rothfels, Gotthard Jasper, Golo Mann and others, who resist the truth and appear to wish to demean the record and honor of their own country.⁹⁴

The next chapter is headed by the apocalyptic question: "DOES WEST GERMANY FEAR A THIRD PUNIC WAR?" - And Barnes gives the word to an here unnamed, learned historian, sympathetic with Revisionism, and in close contact with German intellectuals, both those sympathetic with revisionist ideas and those highly hostile to them. Barnes did ask himself if this correspondent could supply him with any reasonable explanation of the perplexing situation. Here is the answer he got:

A return to freedom and independence on the part of (West) Germany is the last thing that the West German "Establishment" and the majority of German intellectuals desire. A recovery of freedom would expose the remaining fragments of Germany to a "Third Punic War," the final annihilation of both the country and the people. This must be avoided at all costs. Realizing the intense hatred which has been built up against Germany by war propaganda and the subsequent torrent of malicious atrocity tales, the only protective coloration that offers any assurance of survival is indefinite political, intellectual and moral subserviency. So long as the assumption of the utter depravity and criminality of the German past, especially in the present century, appears to be accepted and cherished by the Germans there is no danger that they will be free again. Writers like Südermann are regarded as dangerous Don Quixotes who do not see that Germany can no longer afford freedom and independence.

Personally, I cannot blame them. The dominant feeling toward Germany in America today, and also in Great Britain and the Soviet Union, is one of unconditional hatred. The atrocity literature has seen to that. As a free and independent country, West Germany would not have any reasonable chance of survival. No matter how intelligent their leadership, they would face total annihilation. The Carthaginians might have escaped some of the effects of 146 B.C. had they asked permission to join Rome as a province after the defeat of Hannibal. Even this avenue of protection is no longer possible for a divided Germany, with the eastern portion already swallowed up in the Soviet system. The present West European Economic Community

⁹⁴ *The Barnes Trilogy*, p. 38.

is controlled largely by France. politically, West Germany is our ward, its constitution having been written by an American professor.

The West Germans welcome this servitude, for as long as it exists the last remnants of their people will not be annihilated. As Oswald Spengler once asked: "Freedom for what?" The West Germans do not want to be slaughtered any more. They know that American Revisionists have absolutely no public influence here in United States, since nothing is more anathema to the American Establishment than Revisionism. Revisionism cannot be of any practical value to West Germany until it is triumphant in American scholarship and public policy, of which there is no prospect in any foreseeable future. The few American Revisionists are regarded by the West German Establishment as peculiar and erratic misanthropes. The Establishment and its supporters oppose freedom and independence as too great a risk to be borne. For the West Germans publicly to resent their treatment since the War would invite the destruction of the remnants of the German people. I must say that I can appreciate their way of looking at it in the light of their experience since 1945.

My own view, of course, remains unchanged. The truth must be served, first and foremost, regardless of the cost. But I do think that it is important for us to understand, privately, that our opponents among the West Germans anti-Revisionists have at least an intelligible position, as one might properly infer from what you have written. I do think, however, that the point of view and procedure taken in your treatment is justifiable. Since they smear us, why should we admit publicly that their position is intelligible, and even expedient and wise, in view of existing world realities? I trust and hope that American Revisionists will never have to advocate an end of truth on behalf of mere survival. An understanding of the actual attitude and policy of West German anti-Revisionists should help and encourage us in our own work.⁹⁵

The situation has of course been altered considerably since the above was written. The Soviet "threat" has evaporated, if there ever was any. In the beginning of the 70es Henry Kissinger did threaten Europe that the U.S. would withdraw into isolation (and thence let the USSR capture the non-nuclear nations) if we - as some did advocate - abolished the U.S. dollar as "reserve currency." - Later we experienced the fake "double agreement" (as for the production of Cruise and Pershing II) countering the alleged Soviet middle distance rockets (scaringly baptised by the Americans, SS-20).⁹⁶ - And Russia today is ruled by plutocrats like the Jew Konstantin Borovoi, who (according to "The Jewish Chronicle", February 28, 1992, p. 2) is funding stooges like Yeltsin & al. - Still the neo-capitalist Russia will not go to war against a hypothetically revisionist Germany. Therefore German coward who do no dare to protest like Otto Ernst Remer and Thies Christophersen, are without any excuse. That is, if they are not sure that the U.S. herself shall annihilate a new Germany where there is freedom of speech as for the big holocaust lie.

At last I shall quote from pages 43-44, where Barnes told about the reception of David Hoggan's epochal study "*Der erzwungene Krieg*" in Germany; where the upheavals and furore

⁹⁵ *The Barnes Trilogy*, pp. 40-41.

⁹⁶ The creator of the neutron bomb, the Jew Samuel Cohen, later maintained that the SS-20 had never existed at all!

were great indeed - and accompanied with the *Katzenjammer* of the German government. And I shall close with a letter to Barnes (from an English historian's evaluation) whose last paragraph is deplorably still an adequate description, I am sorry to say. - For many years I have subscribed to almost every German periodical, albeit if only slightly revisionist. And, the sum of my impressions are the same as the Englishman's account 30 years ago. - One can say that the very crux of the matter is the *quest of publication* - of access to the public through mass distribution, which again is a question of money sufficient to finance a campaign through all of the media, especially designed to reach the most important target group: the *Youth*:

The furor created by the articles and editorials in *Der Spiegel* in the autumn of 1962 would appear to give considerable validity to the theme set forth in this section of my brochure. Certainly, the behaviour of the Adenauer Government in its handling of the case demonstrated obvious inconsistency. The official line has been to smear revisionist publishers and authors as "Neo-Nazi," but there seemed no hesitancy in employing Neo-Nazi methods in handling the case of *Der Spiegel*. Further evidence of West-German subserviency was provided by the almost incredible grovelling of President Eugene Gerstenmaier of the West German *Bundestag* in an address in Israel of November 21, 1962, and the sending of a penitential West German work corps to Israel.

We may leave the matter here, quite content if it stimulates some serious consideration of the evidence presented, whether it produces any substantial agreement or not. It deals with facts and problems which are bound to have an increasing relation to the security of the human race.

Before I leave the subject of opposition to revisionist ideas in Germany today it may be desirable to say a word on the matter of the German publishing situation since the War, in so far as it bears on this topic. I sent the manuscript of this brochure to a leading English publicist and scholar who had just returned from a considerable visit to Germany where he had given special attention to this very question. While he agrees heartily with my critical remarks in relation to the attitude of the Bonn Government and anti-revisionist writers, he feels that I should be a little more charitable to the German public at large with respect to their apathy or allergy in regard to revisionist history and its bearing on the war guilt problem:

You must recognise the unique and unfortunate position of the reading public in Germany. After 1945, nothing could be published there without a license issued by the military governments of the victors. This meant that the editors and publishers who had flourished under Hitler went into retirement - generally into concentration camps. Following in the wake of the Allied armies came most of the pre-1933 publishers who had fled when Hitler came into power. They were the only ones who could obtain licenses to publish. They took over and firmly entrenched themselves in every publishing and newspaper establishment. Hence, when the military government was finally terminated, the publishing houses and newspapers were all staffed by the "Remigrants," as they are called. Most of them were violently anti-National Socialist and anti-revisionist when the latter issue arose. The only way to combat their bias was to launch new publishing houses and newspapers, but very few of their opponents had the resources or courage to do this.

The result has been that the German people, for the most part, have heard only the endless repetition of propaganda myths. It is easy to condemn the apathy of the German public today - especially of the younger generation - as compared with the attitude of those living in the

1920's, but you must remember that for nearly twenty years they have heard only one point of view - that officially approved. The only challenge and contradiction has come from small and obscure publishers with very restricted financial resources, a weak organisation, and very little support. Few Germans have heard of them or read what they out. Suppose you were a young man and had never heard any challenge or opposition to the statement that the earth is flat, would you feel impelled to take the trouble to search out obscure publishers and books - unadvertised and not reviewed - in order to ascertain the facts for yourself?

But then there is also the outright *prohibition* against historical truth in Germany. The traitors in Bonn have outlawed revisionist works, and now⁹⁷ they have even started searching public libraries; thought-control police-squads are raiding the shelves to demolish all books containing information about race differences or regarded as revisionist and national in general, including books about the forced expulsions costing 2,7 million Germans lives. Political parties which existed before W.W.I were *not outlawed* by the Weimar regime. But, symptomatically enough, all forms of National Socialist activity in Germany after W.W.II has been forbidden at the behest of the Synhedrion. Prominent revisionists have been persecuted continually. And professional liars like Elie Wiesel have even been impudent enough (at a so-called "Anti-hate-Conference" in Oslo) to exhort to legislation outrightly forbidding Revisionism in all European countries. "Our" own government - though indoctrinated enough - shrank nevertheless back from the suggestion. The authorities had been informed of Wiesel's own infamous recommendation for Jews to set apart in their hearts a segment exclusively designed for *eternal hate* against everything German! But, of course, some lackey law makers did obey their masters. Nowadays French patriots will be fined a years wages' or more, if they put up a little poster; saying that Professor Faurisson is right!!! Similar laws exist today in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Italy and Austria.

Conditions are much worse at this day than they were in August 1979, when Faurisson was interviewed by "Storia Illustrata". I quote here a part of his answer to a question about the reason for the opposition and silent treatment concerning the hoax of the "gas chambers":⁹⁸

The result of the conspiracy of silence surrounding the Revisionist works is that these works are for the most part "samizdat" ("underground literature").* In regard to the authors who do succeed in breaking the walls of silence, they are treated as Nazis, which in turn ostracises them to an intellectual ghetto. The procedures utilized against the non-conformist historians or individuals range from pure criminality to judicial prosecutions, without forgetting the disgusting conduct of the police. All sorts of lobbies are active in attempting to establish a dominant atmosphere of terror. I am aware of that personally. I can no longer teach at the university. My life has become difficult. I am up against enormous power-blocs. Some young people support me. The light will eventually shine through. Some Jews are on my side; they themselves wish to denounce deception and persecution.

⁹⁷ This was written in June 1993.

⁹⁸ From *The Journal of Historical Review*, Volume Two, Number Four, Winter 1981, pp. 355-345 and (note) p. 372.

I believe rather less in conspiracies and rather more in the force of conformity. The victors of the last war needed to make us believe in the intrinsic evil of the vanquished. Soviets and Westerners, whatever their differences, had found common ground of agreement there. Hollywood and the apparatus of Stalinist propaganda have conjugated their efforts. What a fracas of propaganda! The principal beneficiaries of the operation have been the state of Israel and international Zionism. The principal victims have been the German people - but not its leaders - and the Palestinian people as a whole. But today there is dissension in the air. Zionists and Poles already present us with a divergent version of Auschwitz.

* I can only refer here to the cases of Maurice Bardèche, Paul Rassinier, Manfred Roeder, Thies Christophersen, Wilhelm Stäglich, J.G. Burg (a Jew), Hellmut Diwald, Udo Walendy, Arthur R. Butz, and to my own case. No persecution is overlooked: imprisonment, physical violence, fines, arson, careers destroyed, incredible unjust legal decisions, pure lies, enforced exile. Not one association defending freedom of expression, not one single group of writers, has raised the least protest in regard to either David Irving or to the university professor Hellmut Diwald. In this field of persecution, Germany is incontestably to the fore. France occupies second place, and South Africa is not far behind.

Of course, everybody knows that one of the motives for the constant promotion of the holocaust myth is to achieve continued *tribute*, paid by the Germans to the *only true victors* of both World Wars (not to speak of a score of other, lesser, wars). According to official statistics (presented by the Bonn government) over 4,2 million "survivors" have got (individually paid) "reparations", mostly from German taxpayers born *after* W.W.II. In addition to that gigantic blackmail, the terrorist organisation named "Israel" has also received over 100 billion DM. In order to have it from their own mouth, I quote one more note to the interview with Mr. Faurisson: fetched from an interview of Nahum Goldman himself, in number 624 of "Nouvel Observateur":⁹⁹

Pages 120-122, 125, 128, 136, 141, 149, 157, under the title of "Nahum Goldmann: au nom d'Israël" ("Nahum Goldmann: in the name of Israel"). Nahum Goldmann says that those colossal reparations "constituted an extraordinary innovation in the matter of international rights." They were not in accordance with the German constitution. He dictated his conditions to Adenauer in 1950. He obtained DM 80 billion; that is 10 to 14 times more than the sum he first expected. He says, "Without the German reparations (...) the state of Israel would not have the half of its present infrastructure (1978); every train in Israel is German, the ships are German, as well as electricity, a big part of industry ... without mentioning the individual pensions paid to the survivors (...). In certain years, the amount of the money that Israel received from Germany would exceed the total amount of money collected from international Jewry - multiplying it by two or three times."

The young German taxpayer of 1979, who has no responsibility in the war of 1939-1945, pays of course his share.

As you surely know, USA is also squeezed, still at the tune of 14 billion dollars per year. That is, 3+ billion ("the Gentiles did not do enough to save the Jews" [they only fought a World War on behalf of the Jews]) + 11 billions paid to Zionist Usurers, who have *lent* the money, which is an *accumulating part* of the US National debt! The gullible and complacent American dupes do not even dare to go on a tax strike (not to speak of an *armed revolution*) which they should have began a long time ago. Perhaps the reason is this: the spiritual dark-

⁹⁹ Page 373 in *The Journal of Historical Review*; - see footnote 98.

ness, induced by the sewer religion which is called Judaeo-Christianity. I shall recommend people in USA who read Yockey and his mentor Spengler, instead to read philosophers like Paul de Lagarde, Eugen Dühring and *Julius Langbehn*, whose *Rembrandt als Erzieher* is the work which Spengler did plagiarise (superadded by a watered out Nietzscheanism). - But the best works existing (next to the Bible itself) are the writing of Emanuel Swedenborg. (By the way, Swedenborg did also write some treatises on currencies and exchanges, where he (over 200 years ago) did unmask the Jewish system of international Monopoly Capitalism. I also recommend the works of Friedrich List, the best antidote possible against Jewish free-trade propaganda, from Adam Smith, Ricardo, Say & al.)

We here in Europe know that we can do nothing at all alone, trying ridding ourselves of the Zionist yoke. And today it is more dangerous to be an outspoken Anti-Semite (= an Anti-Racist struggling against Jewish racism and dominion on all fields of society) than it was, when Hitler rebelled against the Jewish dictatorship. All the presidents the American have had the last century have been more or less poodles-on-a-string for international Jewry. Roosevelt was perhaps the worst of them all, because he "was the first American to penetrate to the real depths of vulgar stupidity. He never made the mistake of overestimating the intelligence of the American mob. "He was its unparalleled professor".¹⁰⁰

All knowledgeable historians now acknowledge the documents contained in the German White book on Poland as genuine. And Mark Weber wrote a very illustrating article in "The Journal of Historical Review" entitled "*President Roosevelt's Campaign to Incite War in Europe: The Secret Polish Documents*".¹⁰¹ In his article Mr. Weber also called the attention to other documents of an equally great significance, concerning the British Ambassador to Washington, Sir Ronald Lindsay:

On 19 September 1938 - that is, a year before the outbreak of war in Europe - Roosevelt called Lindsay to a very secret meeting at the White House. At the beginning of their long conversation, according to Lindsay's confidential dispatch to London, Roosevelt "emphasized the necessity of absolute secrecy. Nobody must know I had seen him and he himself would tell nobody of the interview. I gathered not even the State Department." The two discussed some secondary matters before Roosevelt got to the main point of the conference. "This is the very secret part of his communication and it must not be known to anyone that he has even breathed a suggestion." The President told the Ambassador that if news of the conversation was ever made public, it could mean his impeachment. And no wonder. What Roosevelt proposed was a cynically brazen but harebrained scheme to violate the U.S. Constitution and dupe the American people.

The President said that if Britain and France "would find themselves forced to war" against Germany, the United States would ultimately also join. But this would require some clever manoeuvring. Britain and France should impose a total blockade against Germany without actually declaring war and force other states (including neutrals) to abide by it. This would

¹⁰⁰ Mencken's "*Diaries*" (op.cit), Baltimore, April 15, 1945, p. 360.

¹⁰¹ Vol. 4 (1983), pp. 135-172.

certainly provoke some kind of German military response, but it would also free Britain and France from having to actually declare war. For propaganda purposes, the "blockade must be based on loftiest humanitarian grounds and on the desire to wage hostilities with minimum of suffering and the least possible loss of life and property, and yet bring the enemy to his knees." Roosevelt conceded that this would involve aerial bombardment, but "bombing from the air was not the method of hostilities which caused really great loss of life."

The important point was to "call it defensive measures or anything plausible but avoid actual declaration of war." That way, Roosevelt believed he could talk the American people into supporting war against Germany, including shipments of weapons to Britain and France, by insisting that the United States was still technically neutral in a non-declared conflict. "This method of conducting war by blockade would in his [Roosevelt's] opinion meet with approval of the United States of its humanitarian purpose were strongly emphasized," Lindsay reported.

(Dispatch No. 349 of 20 September 1938 by Sir R. Lindsay, *Documents on British Foreign Policy* (ed. Ernest L. Woodward), Third series, Vol. VII (London 1954) pp. 627-629. See also: Joseph P. Lash, *Roosevelt and Churchill 1939-1941* (New York: Norton, 1976), pp. 25-27; Arnold A. Offner, *American and the Origins of World War II* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), p. 61.)¹⁰²

"Harebrained scheme"? - Here Mr. Weber is in great error. Old Mencken knew: Roosevelt did assess the intelligence of the American Mob quite correctly. Indeed Roosevelt was its unparalleled professor.

Roosevelt's warmongering in 1938 is extremely revealing. Moreover, a proof of the American war guilt! - As for later developments, the guarantee to Poland, half a year later, was never asked for by the Poles. The Jew Masters in the British Government did arrange a Hitler scare (in concert with faked charges by the Rumanian Ambassador to Britain) thus pressing that infamous guarantee on the reluctant Poles. - The further development is too well known that I shall say more here. Everybody knows about how the Anglo-Zionist-Americans persuaded and pressed the Poles into the hostile, ignoring attitude against the Germans and towards the latter's proposals and just demands.

Later you got Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Nixon, and now Clinton, who has appointed an administration only containing a handful of token Nordics. Still the Jews are as "sensitive", i.e. paranoid as before.

In the foreword to a Norwegian translation of a sophomoric book against Germany ("*But England slept ...*", written by Kennedy (the above mentioned son of the Ambassador)) concocted by C.J. Hambro¹⁰³, the latter ranted that Kennedy had understood what *everybody* "ought" to have understood about the alleged inborn bellicosity of the Germans. Hambro wrote that Heinrich Heine once had warned against what would happen with the Germans when they sooner or later would rid themselves of Christianity. Then, they would scare the eagles to "drop dead from the skies and the lions in the uninhabited deserts of Africa will bite their tails and crawl into hiding in their caves Still there is silence, but the hour will arrive

¹⁰² *The Journal of Historical Review*, Vol. 4 (1983), pp. 154-155.

¹⁰³ See p. 3.

... etc. etc.⁷ There, maintained Hambro, had everybody been warned beforehand. You see, *Heine had predicted the arrival of Hitler himself.*

Chapter 8

But, who said "*Look to Norway*"? - Roosevelt, of course! At public school we learned that Roosevelt praised Norway as "a social workshop" etc. We were supposed to be proud of such a recognition by the brave Hitler-slayer, who (together with Winnie with the cigar and the bottle) saved us all. But why that benevolent statement by an American president? - Here is a quote from Henry Ford's "*Jewish Influence in American Life*",¹⁰⁴ where you will find an explanation:

To indicate how blind the public has been to the inter-allied Jewish character of much of the world's important international financial activity, note this from the *Living Age* earlier in the year:

"According to the *Svensk Handelstidning*, the recent American loan of \$5,000,000 to Norway was really the outcome of an agreement between the Hamburg firm of Warburg & Company and the New York bankers, Kuhn and Loeb. It is regarded as a significant sign of the times that a German firm should be responsible for an American loan to a neutral country. The conditions subject to which this money was borrowed, are not regarded as very favorable to Norway, and no marked effect on the rate of exchange between the two countries has followed."

Note, in the light of all the statements made about Kuhn, Loeb & Company, and the Warburgs in particular, the assumption in the above quotation that the transaction was really between a German and a American firm. It was principally an arrangement between the Warburgs themselves in family counsel. But the loan will pass in Norway as "*an American loan*," and the fact that the terms of the loan "are not regarded as very favorable to Norway" will react upon Scandinavian opinion of this country. It goes without saying that "*no marked effect on the rate of exchange between the two countries has followed*," for that would not be the object of such a loan. The dislocation of exchange is not unprofitable.

It would be most interesting to know in how far Kuhn, Loeb & Company has endeavored to readjust the rate of exchange.

During the war, Kuhn, Loeb & Company made a loan to the city of Paris. Considerable German comment was occasioned by this - naturally. And it is very well worthy of record that in the city of Hamburg, where Max Warburg does business, the chief of police issued this order:

"Further mention in the press of loans made by the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Company to the city of Paris, and unfavorable thereon, are forbidden."¹⁰⁵

You surely remember Mr. Stokes' question (page 13 above) about an audit or an assessment of the "Bank of England" (then a *private* corporation) which impudently was rejected by Mr. Simon. On page 256 in Ford's work we read the testimony of T. Cushing Daniel before a committee of Congress. (And, be aware that the main function for a Central Bank is to befuddle the public as for quite *unnecessary* loans to the State and Communes from Jewish High-Financial Institutions, creating perpetual debt, and sucking interest through Merchant Banks' drainpipes.)

¹⁰⁴ Vol. III of "*The International Jew*", Dearborn, 1920, reprinted 1976 by *Liberty Bell Publications*.

¹⁰⁵ Ford, pp. 240-241.

"When going through the Bank of England I present a letter which I had from Secretary Hay, and the official of the bank was very polite. He took me through the bank and when we got back to the reception room I asked him if he would allow me to put a few leading questions to him. He said he would, and I asked him if he would give me a statement of the Bank of England. "We do not issue statements." "Does not the House of Parliament sometimes call on you for some statement as to the condition of the bank?" "No, sir; they do not call on us." "How is it that some of these revolutionists, so-called, do not get up in the House of Commons and raise to the devil to know something about what is going on down here?" "*Oh, most of them are large borrowers from the bank, and we have no difficulty with them*" (laughter.)"

"Norges Bank" (= "The Bank of Norway") was also such a merely private corporation, which did act in concert with High Finance. The Chief of the "Norges Bank" was in the know, and he even managed to transport to USA and England half of our gold reserves already in 1939! More was sent during early springtime, and (only) the rest was sent out in April 1940. It was speculated freely with our gold (allegedly stored within Fort Knox). Interests was sucked through the principal (lent out at the gold markets) before we got it home, only a few years ago. Thus we were more lucky than nations like Albania (which gold was stolen by the British), not to speak of the gold in Germany. Hjalmar Schacht has written that Germany's gold allegedly "deposited" in Fort Knox in the 20'es *had disappeared*, when Schacht once was going to see it on a visit he made.

In "*The Rotschild Money Trust*" (1940) by George Armstrong we read on page 82 an accurate assessment, except that "President" Hambro was not just the "head", but the *supreme* (Overlord) head of the "Kingdom of Norway." Behind the scenes he (though himself a "conser-vative") did rule Norway when with the compliant help of the "socialists". And even the court historians in Norway do not reject the German White Book, which must have been the source of George Armstrong. Our "historians" simply give it the silent treatment.

It has been conclusively shown by official papers which fell into the hands of the Germans when they captured Oslo, as well as by other facts, that the British through the Jew Hambro, head of the Norwegian government, had previously arranged to send troops to Norway and to take charge of all her strategic ports. They appear to have been actually en route when Germany, having a shorter distance to travel, and superior generalship, landed her troops in Norway first. She "beat them to the draw." Norway capitulated and is now under the control of Germany.

But this is the cause of revisionism: *to breach the silent treatment, to deprogram the brainwashed ones and to present the truth - at last!*

Epilogue

Hitler ought, in 1940, to have attacked and conquered England immediately. He should have had no remorse or respect for any "national honour" of the British. - Instead he ought to have been filled with Pan-Nordic responsibility, to liberate all the nations which were thralling under the Jewish yoke. Any country which has let the Jews enter the ruling position, is no longer worthy of any regards as for honour. And never should Hitler have behaved as if responsible Gentile politicians were in power in such nations. He ought to have compared those nations for example with Germany before 1933. He should have learned his lessons as those nations for the decision making process during the "System time", and considered how the leading plutocrat-lackey-politicians would have acted on "honourable" peace offering in case such were against the will of the plutocrats themselves! - One might think that Hitler himself did not believe the facts he himself did know. Sometimes a human being may just have a *belief* in something, and *no knowledge* about the subject. Yet, sometimes the opposite is happening: One *knows*, but *does not believe one's own knowledge* - one is acting against one's own better estimation. Hitler did just that - and therefore he lost the war.

Later, after the dragging on and extension of the war, it was too late. Germany and her allies had no chances to win, fighting the rest of the world, which was tyrannised by Purim-crazed Jews. - But Hitler was superstitious enough to believe that Germany was protected by providence, considering the achievement of the first 7 years of National Socialism. Hitler maintained that he having obtained so much success, Providence would or could not let him down. His reasonings was very naive and too pious, thus in fact he was just the opposite of a fanatic. His greatest fault was that he indeed *lacked* hatred, wrath or zeal. On the other hand he was not prudent enough to understand what is written in the Bible:

"Or what king, marching to meet another king in war, does not first sit down and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand troops to cope with the one that comes against him with twenty thousands. If, in fact, he cannot do so, then while that one is yet far away he sends out a body of ambassadors and sues for peace."¹⁰⁶

And when the adversary includes our world's majority of gullible and indoctrinated crusading goyims, led by blood-lusting talmudists, resistance and heroism is futile and irresponsible foolhardiness, and unconditional surrender would anyway have been the - temporary - outcome. Still, the war against plutocracy has to be continued by everyone of good will, as a struggle with political means henceforth.

¹⁰⁶ Luke 14: 31-32

Appendix

Here is the text in Grimstad's "Antizion":¹⁰⁷

WAUGH, EVELYN. 20th c. British novelist. *Decline and Fall*, *Black Mischief*, *Vile Bodies* and *Put Out More Flags* portray the Jews as objectionable characters. In his recently published *Diaries*, Waugh speaks ironically about the Jewish claim that they prohibited capital punishment 2,000 years ago, in the light of the Zionist "murder" (Waugh's word) of Lord Moyne and others, which were justified by Jewish propaganda as executions by a sovereign state. He mentions Rufus Isaacs (Lord Reading) as having "lied to the House of Commons in a personal statement on the Marconi case and ascended to high office" (the lord chief justice-ship). Jews are very sensitive on the Isaacs role in the sensational Marconi stock swindle: Waugh obviously believes the Jew culpable.

(The Private Diaries of Evelyn Waugh)

Excerpts From the Diaries of ..., *Esquire* magazine, September 1973.

Michael Davie writes in his preface (dated March 1976) to the "edited" *Diaries* the following excuse for his mutilations (unnumbered page):

Publication of the verbatim text will not be possible for some years, because of the English law of libel. In this edition, twenty-three libellous references have been altogether excised. Another twenty phrases have been omitted, not because they are libellous, but because I have concluded that their publication would be intolerably offensive or distressing to living persons or to the surviving relations of persons recently dead. To the delicate problems raised by these offensive, though not libellous, references, no general solution can be applied; each instance has required a separate decision; and each decision has been, necessarily, subjective. I have, however, attempted to distinguish between passages capable in my opinion of causing lasting distress, and those - again in my opinion - likely to cause only temporary embarrassment, irritation, or anger.

Thus it must have been fear of "lasting distress" of the Zionists that made Davie skip the references which were printed in "Esquire".

Here I quote from page 284 in Martin Stannard's fresh biography, *"Evelyn Waugh - No Abiding City"* (London 1992). Waugh must have had mostly Jewish or Jew sycophantic "friends":

'Both Jerusalems are full of cars flying UNO flags', he wrote to Laura, 'while both countries starve. Here there are half a million absolutely destitute & hopeless Arab refugees from Israel. Israel, starving & houseless, is importing 25,000 Jews a month from ... everywhere ... All are stark mad & beastly & devoid of truth.

Waugh's 'anti-Semitism' is notorious. Sykes draws attention to his companion's racial prejudice, and other friends become worried about this as a sign of incipient madness.

¹⁰⁷ Pp. 145-146 & 200.

Only Jews and their likes are impudent enough to brand everybody who has the guts to criticise Jewry, as "insane", "mad" etc. - Not to speak of calling even the mildest form of criticism "prejudiced"

Here are some quotations from Waugh's war time diary. **Saturday 15 May 1943:** "*The Poles are generally blamed for minding about the murder of 8.000-odd officers by the Russians.*" Myself minding about the current genocide committed by the Serbs in (now) former "Yugoslavia," I refer the following from the diary of Waugh, who (partly together with Randolph Churchill) was there.

London, Wednesday 9 June 1943: "I read a report in the New Statesman of an interview with returned Serbian guerrillas - anti-Mihailovic propaganda. It read like an official interview and my first thought was, "How has this been allowed to appear?" That, on second thoughts, showed how used one has become to governmental tyranny."

Topusko, Croatia, Saturday 16 September 1944: "Topusko is a town laid out for leisure and suitable to our habits. The woods are full of ornamental walks, there is one pretty garden kept fairly tidy, with the arch of ruined abbey in it and a little shelter, another garden with a weeping willow and overgrown paths near the bath. Many buildings are ruined and the shops are all guttered and put to other uses. No inhabitants except soldiers and Jews awaiting evacuation who give the Communist salute and write illiterate appeals to Randolph. Permission has been granted to take them to Bari. Plane trees down the street, pretty cobbles in centre, plinth without statue (king?). Baths brand new, clean and still working. We go and take them most days, no charge. The evidence of elaborate therapeutic machinery in surroundings buildings. A few callers - local Communists whom Randolph rags in a salutary way. He is absorbed in electoral possibilities and undeterred by language limitations. Shouts them down.

Note on Yugoslav soldiers: simple blue eyes, fair hair, cheerful and respectful, always singing and joking. After the sulkiness of British troops it is extraordinary to see the zeal they put into fatigues.

Note on Yugoslav policy: they have no interest in fighting the Germans but are engrossed in their civil war. All their vengeful motives are concentrated on the Ustashe who are reportedly bloodthirsty. They make slightly ingenuous attempts to deceive us into thinking their motive in various tiny campaigns is to break German retreat routes. They want Germans out so that they can settle down to civil war. Communist leaders are all out for United Front. "The people will vote for Communists not for Communist." The two local bosses, Gregoric and Hebrang, have spent the years before war in prison. Gregoric has a kind of holiness; not so Hebrang.

Typical Partisan action. Day before yesterday, 5.000 Partisans attacked 500 Ustashe at Cazin (near Bihac) saying their aim was to hold it in order to attack German road communications. Successful liquidation of Ustashe. Yesterday same party made a half-hearted attack on neighbouring Ustashe village but fled before reinforcements. Today they evacuate Cazin."

Monday 23 October 1944: Every evening last week Major Clisshold has hoped for an aeroplane and has been disappointed, sometimes on the airfield itself. On Friday we took fifty-six Jews out in intense cold and sent them back to their straw after two hours' wait. There are also fifteen American air crews, three of them injured in their jump, waiting to get away.

Randolph send petulant signals 'personal for Air Vice-Marshal' believing they will cause consternation at Bari."

Bari, Sunday 4 March 1945: Bloggs looked after me very kindly. I took an afternoon aeroplane and, after a cold, rough flight in which I was despondent and nervous, arrived at Bari. Everything smooth here. Room in hotel, good mail, report from Bishop of Sibenik. Bad news from Yugoslavia. Forty-five priests murdered at Mostar. Gross discrimination shown by Partisans in food distributions; British collaboration assumed for attack on Trieste and Istria."

Later, Waugh wrote much about the genocide against the Croatsians - and the allies coddling the Jews. And in his novel "*Unconditional Surrender - The Conclusion of Men at Arms and Officers and Gentlemen*" he revealed that only Jews were considered as "displaced persons," that the Jews reckoned on Winston Churchill to send them all the goodies they wanted - through the setup organisation UNRRA - including air lifted "relief supplies" out of the reach for ordinary soldiers. The Jews got new boots, overcoats, etc., when partisans got nothing. Furthermore Waugh told about "a convoy of new Ford trucks, shipped them to Trieste, driven through the snow of Croatia and, leaving the trucks as a tip for the partisans, brought the exiles to Italy. It was as though the Red Sea had miraculously drawn asunder and left a dry passage between walls of water." Still one could not term that very special service just "racist." It was indeed political - it was Zionist. Waugh told about the dire end of a Jewish family which wanted to go to Australia and not to Palestine. Instead they "were tried by a Peoples' Court. You may be sure justice was done", one of the insider officers told. All in the novel, of course

In "*The Journal of Historical Review*"¹⁰⁸ we find an article by the eminent historian Peter H. Peel entitled "*The Great Brown Scare: The American-Deutscher Bund in the Thirties and the Hounding of Fritz Julius Kuhn.*" The "Bund" was just patriotic, on behalf of both USA and Germany, and had no real affiliation to National Socialism. - The Bundists did criticise the dictatorship of the Jews, however - and that was enough to get the American authorities to hound them. Kuhn was persecuted by individuals like the Jew LaGuardia, the Mayor of New York, and gentile gob Tom Dewey on totally faked charges presented at American Kangaroo-courts:¹⁰⁹

Introduced as evidence were two notes by Mayor La Guardia and Tom Dewey written before Kuhn's arrest —

La Guardia: "Dear Tom: You can have him."

Dewey: "I don't want him either. I guess the ashcan is the best place for him."⁶⁰

Kuhn entered Sing-Sing on December 7, 1939. The penultimate mention of him in the files of the *New York Times* is almost ten years later, in June 1949, but that is a passing reference in an extensive article, cited and quoted below. For Kuhn's personal ordeal in the intervening years, we are largely dependent on that journal. On the day that Kuhn entered Sing-Sing, the *Times* reported without explanation that he would be barred from most of the prison's recreational diversions such as movies, football and baseball games, the gymnasium and the fellowship of the prison yard.⁶¹ A later story reported that Kuhn was allowed no gifts or other packages.⁶²

In May 1940, the House passed a \$1,111,754,916 relief Bill for the next fiscal year, with \$975,650,000 allocated to the W.P.A. from which Bund members were specifically to be denied benefits. No explanation was offered for this selective discrimination

¹⁰⁸ Volume 7, pp. 419-492.

¹⁰⁹ *The Journal* ..., pp. 436-439.

In the same month, Representative Leland Ford of California asked the House to revoke Kuhn's citizenship on the grounds that he had "mental reservations" when pledging his allegiance in his naturalization proceedings in December 1934. In October, 1940, Kunze, Klapprott and two other Bundists were indicted in Newton, New Jersey for "promoting hatred and hostility against people of the Jewish religion contrary to a 1935 New Jersey statute."⁶³ In December, an annual convention of 600 delegates of the American-Jewish Youth passed a resolution calling upon Congress to declare the Bund outlawed. It should be borne in mind that outlawry permits anyone to kill the outlaw without penalty and one might reflect on certain events half a century later.

In June, 1941, with Pearl Harbor still six months in the future, the New York State Parole Board turned down Kuhn's parole appeal on the grounds that he was a "hazard to public peace and security." The warden of Sing Sing is quoted as testifying to Kuhn's good behavior.⁶⁴

In the following year, a small item in the *Times* reports leniency (a suspended six-month sentence for illicit possession of narcotics) for Mrs. Virginia Cogswell "whose testimony helped send Fritz Kuhn to State prison..."⁶⁵ In March, 1942, the Justice Department announced that it would deprive Kuhn of his citizenship and that as soon as he was released from Sing Sing he would immediately be interned in a camp for enemy aliens for the duration of the war. In June, 1943, therefore, Kuhn was taken directly from prison to an interment camp in Texas.

An item, peripheral to our subject perhaps but worth noting as casting light on contemporary attitudes, appeared in the *Times* in 1944. It concerned a complaint by the "chief investigator of the Dies Committee" that Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau was impeding investigations of subversive by refusing to release information about their tax returns. Referring to such suspects (clearly *not* of the "Right") Morgenthau denied that many of them could be considered subversive or "un-American."⁶⁶

In April, 1945, Kuhn's wife Elsa and his teenage daughter Waltraut were arrested by American army authorities near Nuremberg, where they had been living quietly since before the war. On September 17, Kuhn was deported from New York to Germany along with "500 undesirable Germans."⁶⁷

But Kuhn's ordeal was far from over. A photograph of Kuhn in the *Times* in November is captioned: "Learning About Internment Camps: Fritz Kuhn, former German-American Bund Leader sitting it out in the interment camp at Augsburg, Germany, where he is confined."⁶⁸ The next story is datelined February 1946. A Lieutenant Roselinsky (*sic*) from Brooklyn, in charge of the internees in the cells of the Heidelberg *Schloss*, describes Kuhn as "a beaten, broken man" who "walks with his head bowed, eyes downcast and murmurs 'I beg your pardon' every few seconds." Kuhn is reported as hoping some day to return the United States. He is said to feel guiltless. He claims to have established the Bund to promote German-American friendship but admits that he failed. He says he would have undoubtedly dissolved the Bund the moment that America went to war.⁶⁹ Two days later as reported in the *Times* a U.S. army spokesman said that there was no plan to release Kuhn as:

He is one of the greatest security threats in the American zone. We can't possibly release Kuhn as long as there are occupation forces in Germany, for he might gather together his henchmen and threaten our security.⁷⁰

Anyone who has any concept of the condition of Germany in *Jahr Null* (Year Zero) or has comprehended the mental and physical condition of Kuhn from what has been said above, may be excused for wondering if the "spokesman" quoted was afflicted with a very unpleasant sense of humor or was mentally deranged.

Nevertheless, Kuhn was released on April 25, 1946 and entrained for Munich where Elsa, Walter and Waltraut were then living. A *Times* reporter noted with unconcealed satisfaction that "he will now, like other Germans, have to live on 1,275 calories per day."⁷¹ On November 29, a small item reports that Kuhn is living "drably" with his wife and children and two other families in a sparsely furnished Munich house. The item, referring to Thanksgiving Day, is headed "No Turkey for Fritz Kuhn." The gloating tone is unmistakable.⁷²

In the following Spring, Kuhn was again jailed. This time he was to be tried before a Bavarian "denazification" court. The *Times* published a photograph of an emaciated Kuhn talking to a guard in the German prison.⁷³ In February, 1948, eight months later, while still awaiting trial, Kuhn escaped from Dachau by simply merging with a crowd of visitors and walking out. The prison director was promptly dismissed. In April a Munich "denazification" court sentenced Kuhn, *in absentia*, to ten years imprisonment and forfeiture of all his property except a small sum of money. The evidence presented against him by the public prosecutor, one Julius Herf, consisted of 23 orders from Kuhn to Bund members concerning uniforms to be worn or American political candidates, such as Alf Landon, to be supported. In Kuhn's absence, no defense was offered, nor could be.

Kuhn was recaptured on June 16, 1948, in the French zone where he had filed a permit to open a chemical laboratory. He was returned to Munich in custody. The *Times*, reporting this, said, "He wept as he was escorted back to a cell here."⁷⁴

Kuhn finally obtained a hearing before a German appellate court on February 14, 1949. He continued to maintain that the Bund had never been affiliated with the Third Reich. Except for two brief interludes, he had now been incarcerated since 1939. The court reduced his sentence from ten years to two years and he was released for the last time on February 22, 1949. When news of his release reached the United States, the insatiable sadism of certain elements was once more aroused. The "Non-Sectarian" Anti-Nazi League petitioned the United States Senate to make "comprehensive investigations of army and civilian authorities in the government [they meant "governance"] of Germany."⁷⁵

The penultimate reference to Kuhn in the columns of the *New York Times* is in a feature article quoted *in extenso* below.

Ambassador Dieckhoff sent a series of messages during 1938 pointing out the harm done to German-American relations by the activities of the German-American Bund.... His warnings seem to have been largely instrumental in the ultimate disavowal of Kuhn and the Bund by the German government.... Speaking of the possibilities of revolutionary activist conspiracies of U.S. Nazis, Dieckhoff, who exempts Kuhn from such charges, continues that such ideas are ludicrous in the United States and reminiscent of Balkan intrigues in which latter they might be mildly efficacious. In the U.S., says Dieckhoff, the undercover men of the Justice Department would have complete lists of names almost immediately such a conspiracy was formed.⁷⁵

The last sentence implies an indication of what is in store for us, when we shall organize. - But, I say: an Aryaman who does not begin hating the Jews and their tyranny when he has read the above, does not deserve to be present and enjoy: our future victory over Jewry.

NOTES :

59. *Time*, December 4, 1939, p. 18 (see note 5).
60. *Ibid.*
61. *New York Times*, December 7, 1939, p. 23.
62. *Ibid.*, January 29, 1940, p. 32.
63. *Ibid.*, October 11, 1940, p. 12.
64. *Ibid.*, June 19, 1941, p. 10.
65. *Ibid.*, March 17, 1942, p. 10.
66. *Ibid.*, September 19, 1944, p. 11.
67. *Ibid.*, September 17, 1945, p. 7.
68. *Ibid.*, November 29, 1945, p. 8.
69. *Ibid.*, February 19, 1946, p. 8.

70. *Ibid.*, February 21, 1946, p. 27.
71. *Ibid.*, April 26, 1946, p. 6. The caloric figure given was the official entitlement. Few Germans, in fact, were able to obtain it and in any case it was mostly carbohydrates.
72. *Ibid.*, November 29, 1946, p. 32.
73. *Ibid.*, July 26, 1947, p. 5.
74. *Ibid.*, June 18, 1948, p. 11.
75. *Ibid.*, July 17, 1949, p. 24.