

CHAPTER 17

Negroes face a three-fold prejudice in England: in employment, housing and social relationships. But procuring living accommodations is especially acute, as it is extremely difficult for a Negro to find a furnished flat or room in England. Distinguished Negroes have little trouble finding living space, especially if they come from abroad. But the average local black meets rigid colour bars at nearly every turn....Thus poor blacks are relegated to slum corrals.

—Roi Ottley

Lies & Bias in Third Reich History.

Veronica Clark & Luis Muñoz

Angle-American and English historians do not tend to think of themselves as biased, but they are. They like to invoke the old saying “*the pot calling the kettle black*” when an unorthodox historian – meaning an historian who challenges Anglocentrism in history – tells World War II history from a Germanic viewpoint. Why is this? Is not the German perspective just as valid and justified as the Anglican perspective? A real problem with Third Reich and World War II history is that it is inherently Anglocentric and therefore Judeocentric; it is history seen through the eyes and collective consciences of Angle-Saxons and Jews. The historiography of that era is, dare we say, nothing more than “*might is right*”: the Angle-Saxon race prevailed over its enemy Germany, therefore the Angle-Saxon worldview and race was correct, is correct, and will always be correct—at least, until one of the Angle-Saxons’ enemies crushes them so soundly that *that* enemy’s worldview then becomes the new bias. *Implicit Anglocentrism*: this is the problem with Third Reich and World War II history. Thus when an Angle-Saxon historian screams that World War II revisionists “*apologise for Nazism*” or “*glorify Hitler*,” what they are really screaming is that it is still unacceptable to challenge implicit Anglocentrism in history.

Back in black

We begin with Edwin Black, a Jewish journalist-cum-historian who upholds implicit Anglocentrism in Third Reich history. Like Jim Marrs, Edwin Black¹⁴ condemns Western corporations for trading with the "Nazi enemy." He purports that U.S. multinationals' interaction with the "Nazis" resulted in the holocaust, such as that of IBM. He wrote, for example:

Rockefeller funded Hitler's chief raceologist Otmar Verschuer and his insatiable twin experimentation programmes. Twins, it was thought, held the secret to industrially multiplying the Aryan racial type, and quickly subtracting biological undesirables. Verschuer had an assistant, Josef Mengele. Rockefeller funding stopped during WWII. But by that time, Mengele had transferred into Auschwitz to continue twin research in a monstrous fashion. Ever the eugenicist, he sent precise clinical reports weekly to Verschuer.



Who took Hitler off the horse and put his killing armies into trucks to wage Blitzkrieg or lightning war against Europe? It was General Motors which built the Blitz truck for the Blitzkrieg. As the Reich's largest car and truck maker, GM became an indispensable partner in Hitler's war. From the first weeks of the Third Reich, GM president Alfred Sloan committed the company and its German division, Opel, to motorising a substantially horse-drawn Germany, preparing it for war. Prior to this, Germany had been a nation devoted to leg-

endary automotive engineering but only one vehicle at a time built by craftsmen. GM brought mass production to the Reich, converting it from a horse-drawn threat to a motorised powerhouse.

Um, really? This is flawed from the start since Black relies on IMT "evidence" to substantiate his illogical claims against NS doctors and Josef Mengele in particular. All IMT drivel aside, Black, who is quoted by Jim Marrs in *The Rise of the Fourth Reich*, seems not to understand that compa-

nies are not obliged to discriminate against *any* clientele, whether enemy or friendly. (What about Lend Lease?) Banks do not discriminate unless ordered to do so by a government or administrative body, so why would multinationals? The term *multinational* defies international borders and challenges the sanctity of *sovereignty* (which itself is a product of *nationalism*).

Icebreaker

All peoples, including Jews and Anglo-Saxons, have always done business with their so-called 'avowed enemies.' Let's study Hitler and Stalin for just a moment. Stalin armed and trained Germans for *his* benefit. The Soviets hoped that Germany would break the dominion of the plutocracies (France, England and her satellites, and America). According to Viktor Suvorov, Stalin counted on Germany's progressive occupation of Europe to halt Brit penetration and other resistance, thereby eliminating Bolshevism's potential future enemies and the groundwork that would otherwise have to be undertaken by Russians and their fifth-columnists in Europe. He did not count on an equally ambitious German foe. He also did not count on so many non-Germans joining NS ranks (well over two million). He thought he was going to wipe German collaboration governments out, one by one, taking over what Germans had already put in place throughout Europe during the war. Since the Germans had eliminated or locked up their avowed enemies, Stalin imagined it all the easier for his fifth-column apparatus in Germany and France to take over what was already in place (e.g., concentration camps, occupational government administrations, etc.) As we see, Stalin was not Hitler's partner or ally, but simply used Hitler and the Germans via collaboration for his *own* benefit. (Hitler did the same thing to Stalin.) The same rule applies to multinationals like IBM, individuals like Rockefeller, central banks like that of Rothschild, *et cetera*.

Suvorov explained all of this in detail in his two books *Icebreaker* (Stalin called Hitler "Icebreaker") and *The Chief Culprit*. Stalin had not counted on Hitler putting up such an intensely fierce resistance against his carefully planned imperial ambitions for Europe, which had the full and unbending support of Hollywood and the American President, Franklin Roosevelt. Not even the Brits understood that Stalin had one up on them, contrary to what Guido Preparata wrote in *Conjuring Hitler*. Preparata argues that the British created and used Sovietism, which is correct, but his thesis discounts the political aims and deceptive strategies of *Stalin and the Communists* as well as those of the French, Germans, Italians, Hungarians, Americans, etc. Stalin assisted Hitler to thwart Britain. While Britain and Wall Street helped create the U.S.S.R., they lost control of it which even Marrs concedes. The same may be

said of German National Socialism: the Brits had a hand in financing it after 1933, but they had not counted on Hitler becoming such a formidable foe. He rivalled Britain's continental hegemony via circumvention of the Sterling bloc.

The push that sent Albion into a rage

What exactly did Hitler do to rouse the angry hydra-head of Pan-Anglicanism? H. W. Koch:

To take an example: was predominantly agrarian Austria in fact an industrial asset after the *Anschluss*? Certainly it provided some help in the agrarian sector, but industrially it had to be opened up first, and that required large sums for investment to build an industrial infrastructure. If attention is concentrated on the industrial sphere then one conclusion is clear, namely that Austria emerged after 1945 with an industrial base which had hardly existed before 1938. In an overall German context investment in the Austrian provinces between 1938 and 1945 was many times larger than the value of industrial output of that region over the same period.

Austria also facilitated Germany's access to the economies of the countries of south-eastern Europe from which she derived great economic benefits in terms of agricultural produce and scarce minerals such as crude oil. It has been argued by the German economic historian Bernd Jürgen Wendt, that Germany's economic policy in this area of Europe must be viewed in the context of the long-term strategy of National Socialist foreign policy. Although he does not go as far as others have done in asserting that German policy was one of exploitation, in his view it reduced these countries to a state of dependence on Germany. South-eastern Europe, organised in economic terms as the '*Reichsmark bloc*' was to become a self-contained economic hinterland, over which Germany exercised a kind of '*informal empire*' which would absorb German industrial goods in exchange for agrarian produce and raw materials. *Based on bilateral trading and bartering agreements, the system excluded recourse to the international market, thus eliminating any drain on the foreign currency reserves of which Germany suffered an acute shortage.*

Alan Milward's essay soundly contradicts this view by a detailed examination of the '*Reichsmark bloc*'. Milward demonstrates that the economic policy of the Third Reich in this area of Europe, or for that matter in other parts of the world such as the major countries of South

America with which the same sort of bartering arrangement existed, was not a novelty but had already been introduced during the days of the Weimar Republic. As far as South America is concerned, these agreements did not establish a German '*informal empire*'. Nor can this be said about south-eastern Europe. *Here it was a question of gradually pushing out French and British influence and replacing it as far as possible by that of Germany.* As far as the degree of dependency, or the lack of it, is concerned, Bulgaria provides a telling example. Although it was one of the major members of the '*Reichsmark bloc*', and in 1940 joined with other countries in the tripartite pact, it still conducted its foreign policy independently of the Third Reich and in the Russo-German conflict from late June 1941 onwards actually remained a neutral power, a status which the Soviet Union in the summer of 1944 failed to respect. Milward also convincingly demonstrates that what the *Anschluss* with Austria did for her in the industrial sphere, the '*Reichsmark bloc*' did for many south-eastern European countries: it provided a major impetus for the industrialisation of south-eastern Europe (emphasis added).¹⁶

England could not have this going on in Europe! She had no choice but to demonise Hitler and declare unjust, aggressive warfare—what was she supposed to do in the light of Hitler's growing economic success? The Brit strategy has always been to support every side in any given conflict, or tension-ridden atmosphere, and to deceive every side by offering each false promises in order to be the ultimate beneficiary of the resulting situation. The Brits call this "*divide and rule*." Of course, if this does not suffice the Brits are only too quick to resort to lies and false flags to incite the world's masses against their enemy of the moment. In the case of World War II that enemy of the moment was Hitler and resurgent Germania.

Blame game and dupes of hazard

Many historians and researchers, like Preparata, have tried to boil World War II and the creation of Bolshevism and National Socialism down to a single factor. Any thorough reading into these three topics reveals that such simplified theses cannot withstand critique. All have serious flaws, including theses that blame Jews alone for any of these phenomena, or for all three. Blaming Jews ignores the fact that Britain, and by extension the Anglo-Saxons the world over, have long served as Jewry's force multiplier. Without Anglo-Saxons, Jews had little to no power. Dr. Springborn's work validates this observation. The reality is that every side and "*ism*" tried to outwit the other; every side was looking out for their own interests. The banks and corporations

were simply in it for the money. Since banks and multinational corporations had no national or ethnic allegiances, they lent to or supplied all parties involved (as long as those parties paid and did not pose a major risk to their bottom line), just as they had in World War I and continue to do today.

Stalin was no more Britain's dupe than was Hitler Stalin's dupe. And lest we forget Hitler's declaration of war against America forced the Anglo-Saxons into a two front war, which they would have lost had it not been for the immense sacrifices and fierce resistance of the Pan-Angles' millions of Slavic allies. Albert Weeks, Viktor Suvorov and Joachim Hoffmann have all shown that Stalin was preempted by Hitler by a matter of weeks. Newly declassified information suggests that Stalin was willing to come to the plutocracies' aid against Hitler, at least for a while, if they agreed to it in 1939.¹⁸⁷ Stalin appears to have feigned surprise at Hitler's move in 1941: he ignored his own intelligence network about a planned preemptive strike. Though, this answer is incomplete. Suvorov's argument that Stalin had prepared *only* for an offensive war and was therefore thrown back by the German first strike must be accounted for. Germany had prepared for both to the greatest possible extent after December 1940, and she nearly defeated the U.S.S.R. No 'dupe' could have delivered such a deathblow to such a heavily fortified, prepared and concentrated enemy as the Red Army, had he truly been the 'dupe' Suvorov suggests he was. Suvorov, like Preparata, underestimates Hitler and overestimates his Russian foes. As for *blitzkrieg*, that too is an Anglican myth of epic proportions.¹⁸⁸

Fade to black

Let's look at Black's research one more time. Black indicts IBM for complicity in a systematic, 12-year extermination campaign against the Jewish people in Europe. But what does he offer in the way of actual facts?

....As it did with any other customer, IBM simply asked the Hitler regime what result was desired. Then company engineers devised custom-tailored punch card systems to deliver the results. First, who was Jewish and where did the Jews live—exactly. IBM solution: a customised racial and religious census designed and tabulated by the company. Second, once identified, systematically expel Jews from all segments of society. IBM solution: create databases cross-tabulating ordinary organisational and community directories from association membership rosters to lists of marriages, deaths and births. [...]

Third, confiscate Jewish assets. IBM solution: all banks and financial institutions were run by IBM cards which could be programmed to

seek out the Jewish names and their accounts for seizure. Fourth: ghettoise the Jews. IBM solution: cross-match families from their existing residences into crowded dilapidated slums so that in a single day, thousands of people could be efficiently transferred from point A to point B. Fifth, deport the Jews to camps. IBM solution: most of the railroads in Europe were routed by IBM punch cards. Create special depots to ensure that trains with cattle cars were made available to transport Jews to camps. Inbound, these trains were crowded with helpless human [*sic*]. Returning, they were empty. [...]

Sixth: the Jews were to be systematically and industrially murdered. IBM Solution 1: establish different codes for each classification of concentration camp prisoners. Prisoner Code 8 designated a Jew. Status Code 6 designated killed by gas chamber. In this way, the Reich always knew how many Jews it was killing. In extermination camps, almost all Jews were murdered upon arrival in an IBM-aided system that metred victims from ghettos to train to death camp in murderous synchrony. IBM Solution 2: create the "*Extermination by Labour*" programme using custom IBM punch card programmes that matched the skills of Jewish prisoners wherever they were to Reich labour needs wherever they were. Once moved to the labour site, Jews were worked to death. There was an IBM customer site in every concentration camp. [...]

First of all Black argues here that IBM is guilty because it performed tasks that were requested by the German leadership. If this is a crime, then every corporation that has ever participated in making even gun shells must be put on trial, its executives indicted for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Since most people are loath to do such an absurd thing and accept that war is a part of human nature as much as birth and death, we will just ignore it. One cannot contest this issue since it rests in philosophy about human nature and the morality of warfare. Black then argues that IBM and the German government, without any proof at all, intended to "*exterminate Jews via labour*." What was their motive for doing such an absurd thing when starvation was free? (Stalin simply starved his victims.) The Germans needed people of as many races and nationalities as could be gathered for work, not to die on the job. At the Wannsee Conference some officials present remarked that some Jewish people would undoubtedly die under the circumstances, but they did not ever claim that this was their intent.¹⁸⁹ They didn't even suggest that it was. They were desperate for labourers. They needed healthy, reliable workers who worked hard, not starving wretches. Those who could not keep up, were elderly or sickly ended up dying from exhaustion, old age or disease in some cases; they were not murdered. This was not solely the Germans' fault either.

Britain, America and the U.S.S.R. started the war, so they were equally responsible for these labour-related deaths. They put Germany in this desperate situation. Had there been no Angle-Saxon aerial war or Angle-Saxon invasion, this level of mass labour would not have been necessary and the U.S.S.R. would have been defeated relatively quickly.

Black concludes:

Had it not been for the continued conscious involvement of iconic American corporations in Hitler's war against the Jews, the speed, shape and statistics of the Holocaust as we know it would have been dramatically different. No one knows how different, but the astronomical dimensions could have never been achieved. For their part, American corporate collabourators have long tried to obscure or hide the details of their collusion using the well-known tools of corporate misinformation, financial contributions, and bought and paid for historian reviews. But in [sic] era when people no longer believe big corporations, the dots can be fully connected to unveil the outlines of an indispensable Nazi nexus.

Fade to marrs

This is partly true. One cannot legitimately indict NS Germans for war crimes and crimes against humanity when one's own corporations, nation and people funded, supplied and supported the alleged perpetrators. In this respect



Jim Marrs shares Black's sentiments. But while Black indicts the entire West, meaning all white peoples, for the "holocaust," much like Richard Rubenstein before him (in *The Cunning of History: The Holocaust and the American Future*), Jim Marrs circumvents this problem by arguing that the U.S. only became "evil" thanks to NS infiltration and subversion after the war. The Dulles brothers, Prescott Bush, the Rockefeller family

and Henry Ford come to mind. But one need only read Max Boot's *The Savage Wars of Peace*, Kenneth Hagan's *This People's Navy*, Russell Weigley's *The*

American Way of War, Dr. John Grenier's *The First Way of War*, and any work written by Brian M. Lim on the Philippine War (1899-1902) to see the ignorance and audacity of such a thesis. It sounds as if neither Black nor Marrs knows or cares that Angle-Saxon Americans used slave labourers during World War II (forcibly relocated from South America); conducted human experiments for their pharmaceutical industries in the 1930s and 40s (thousands of Guatemalans, mentally ill persons and Africans were their unwitting victims); committed genocide against Native Americans; experimented on and murdered/killed at least 211,000 Filipinos (see photo on p. 218); helped mass murder tens of thousands of Chinese nationalists (the Boxers) in their own nation under "pacifist" Smedley Butler and his fellow Marines; or that Americans, again under the leadership of the "pacifist" Smedley Butler, endorsed and used Haitian slave labourers to construct Haiti's roads. This brief summary leaves out the fact that Thomas Jefferson flouted his own sacrosanct constitution in 1805 by declaring war without congress's approval, sending what passed as the American navy at the time under General Eaton to Tripoli to enact his will, and nearly carried out a secret plot to overthrow a foreign government. Jefferson, like George Bush Sr. decades later, abandoned his "allies" at the last minute and who knows what horrid fate awaited them for joining a foreign plot against their own government. If it was anything like what happened to those Iraqis and Kurds who dared to rise against Saddam Hussein at H. W. Bush's instigation, then the horror is too ghastly to imagine. The Americans, again at Thomas Jefferson's behest, under Commodore Dale even used a false flag (a Union Jack) to fool the pasha's forces aboard Tripoli in 1801. All of this was all about "markets" and "multinational profits," and all long before National Socialism ever even existed.

Since Edwin Black's research is based entirely on IMT hearsay and "eyewitness" testimony, let us reconsider Marrs in this milieu. Marrs, like Black, believes that Hitler and the NS Germans were guilty of *all* the crimes that were attributed to them. In this respect, Marrs's beliefs are as mystifying as Black's since Black knows all the details of the Transfer Agreement and Marrs repeatedly offers evidence in *Rise* that not only contradicts such allegations, but reflects positively on Hitler and NS Germany. A few examples: Otto Warburg's cutting-edge cancer research; NS Germany's anti-tobacco, healthy eating/living, and early detection of breast cancer campaigns; NS Germany's animal rights legislation; NS Germany's incredible technological advancement (rockets). One is confused by Marrs's argument that the world became "evil" after World War II because Nazis escaped to South America via "rat-lines," a term that is offensive in the light of the truth about most of the German leadership, and were kidnapped under the auspices of *Operation Paperclip*. Marrs goes so far as to accuse NASA as having been a Nazi fifth-column. He offers no proof and in fact confuses correlation with causation!

CHAPTER 18

220 - WARWOLVES OF THE IRON CROSS

repeatedly. Just because two phenomena share a relationship does not mean that one caused the other. This seems to be a problem with Black's research as well: *because Jews left in trains and did not come back to where they were before they left, they were "exterminated."* The gist: leaving by train equals extermination via gassing. Really? What is his proof for this supposition? An "eyewitness" affidavit perhaps? An IMT "confession"? His case is circumstantial at best, and utter nonsense at worst.

The U.S. did everything it did *after* World War II *before* that war, so none of America's criminal actions or behaviours can be attributed to "evil Nazis." NASA did absolutely nothing to advance the interests of the German race, Pan-Germans or the state of Germany. Germany was not a superpower, but a split-up puppet state that was manipulated like many others in the postwar bipolar world (just like the Communist satellites of Korea, Vietnam, etc.). The U.S. used Germany as its continental shield against the U.S.S.R.; Germany did not use America. What Marris and perhaps Black as well condemn, likely unawares, is Albionism and corporate autonomy. Neither author seems to realise that international business and banking are nationalism-exempt (even in wartime) and thereby operate independently of national control. We need hardly mention that Marris really indicts Freemasonry, a Brit enterprise, and Zionism, and the occultism that accompanies both, as opposed to Germanism or National Socialism. Black in like fashion really indicts corporatism at the expense of truth for NS Germany and Hitler. Marris mentions Forrestal's death in *Rise*. Um, James Forrestal was trailed by Zionists, not Nazis. Henry Kissinger was Jewish not a Nazi, and was a *paid* Rockefeller consultant. Rockefeller never once paid Hitler for anything. Angle-Saxons, not Nazis, added fluoride to their water supply.

I don't see much future for the Americans. In my view, it's a decayed country. And they have their racial problem, and the problem of social inequalities. Those were what caused the downfall of Rome, and yet Rome was a solid edifice that stood for something. Moreover, the Romans were inspired by great ideas. Nothing of the sort in England to-day. As for the Americans, that kind of thing is non-existent. That's why, in spite of everything, I like an Englishman a thousand times better than an American.

—Adolf Hitler

The Final Solution to Jim Condit.

Veronica Clark, Luis Muñoz & Hans Krampe

Jim Condit believes he has the final solution to Adolph with a "ph" Hitler,¹⁹⁰ whatever that is supposed to mean. In one long essay submitted to *rense.com* he wrote,

I am going to take a bow – for the late, great Dr. Paul Reznowski – who I referred to at his request as "Ratisbone" in the "*The Final Solution to Adolph Hitler*" video, now renamed "*The Nazi-Zionist Connection: The Final Solution to Adolph Hitler*"—and I also referred to him as "Ratisbone" in the 3 hour radio interview I did with the formidable Christopher Jon Bjerknes (one of the good guys) in May of 2007. The video...is free on CJ Bjerknes's website, www.JewishRacism.com. (Christopher has every right to have such a website, *as he himself is part Jewish*, on his grandpa's side; emphasis added) [...].

Okay, Bjerknes is of Jewish descent. While this point is irrelevant, for some reason Condit is okay with this but isn't okay with the fact that *some* German generals and NSDAP members were of Jewish descent. (Condit also seems unconcerned with the possibly Jewish surname Reznowski.) The

problem, however, is not Bjerknes's ancestry, but his affinity for engaging in NS-bashing in order to make his anti-Zionist rhetoric and argumentation stick. The substance of what he claims: the "Nazis" were so "evil" that they colluded with the Zionists to "grab Palestine," and many of these "evil Nazis" were even Zionists themselves! The Nazis weren't just "evil," they were above and beyond evil—they colluded with Zionists to "mass murder innocent, non-Zionist Jews" to "steal Palestine" for the "Nazi Zionist Jews" (the worst of the worst, like Eichmann). Bjerknes is suggesting that those "Nazis" who worked with any Zionists at all were tried and true Zionists themselves (guilt by association): that *these* Zionists created the world's only problem and are, therefore, the most "evil" human group alongside the "Nazis." After all, these Zionists, so Bjerknes, helped the "Nazis" plan and carry out the holocaust of Jewish people. He's another IMT victim is what he is, which is why he can't seem to see anything beyond his anti-NS blindfold. And what of all the "non-Nazis" and political groups that colluded with Zionists before, during, and after the war? Are they "evil Nazi Zionists" too? If not, why not? And were the Rothschilds then "heroes" since they did nothing to stop Britain from blocking "Nazi-Zionist" emigration ships to Palestine?

Condit goes on:

By the way, Dr. Reznowski, of Polish and Ukrainian descent, died on the Saturday before last Easter (2009) of a heart attack at the age of a youngish-looking 69. We will not know what we will not have now—because the good Dr. was travelling to the Midwest a few weeks hence, and part of his trip was going to be to stop in Cincinnati and fill me in on hours of his latest research...".

Why...am I going to take a bow for him? Because the little, super-poorly made DVD I put together based on his information has quietly made its way around the world to the right people [*And just who might those be? The editor.*] to where now nobody in the know can defend against Dr. Reznowski's thesis: that it is impossible to understand WW II and Hitler unless you know that he was raised to power by the money of the Rothschild/Warburg Banking dynasties, and that he was essentially a part-Jew working with other top Jews, at least at the beginning of his career. He seemed to have flipped several times during his career a bit, but once WW II started he was already out-manoeuvred, even if he had thoughts of trying to overthrow the Jewish Banksters.

So Hitler "flipped," but only "a bit," but then turned on the "Banksters" after all, only too late? How does one measure "a bit"? We have to qualify such a claim. Condit then contradicts his thesis that Hitler willingly worked with Zionists to intentionally found Israel when he claims that Hitler was "out-manoeuvred." He could only have been outmanoeuvred by the very Zionist entity Condit claims bankrolled him and with whom he had a love-in. The problem with all of this is that Condit need only say it and that's that. Anyone can say anything is true without any evidence, justifying their assumption by claiming that the evidence is all hearsay, missing and/or hidden, which makes said assumption impossible to disprove. Condit, not his opposition, has the burden of proof here, and he has offered nothing but baseless conjecture.



There is no evidence that proves Hitler was Jewish or even a *Mischling* (part-Jewish). Schicklgruber is no more a Jewish surname than Hitler is (many Jewish Hitlers were tracked down by Hamann, but not *one* was related to *the* Hitler). One need only consult Alfred Konder's family tree assessment of Hitler (available from Third Reich Books online) or the book *Hitler's Vienna* by Brigitte Hamann. Neither found anything suggesting that Hitler himself was Jewish. The second point that Hitler worked with Jews is true. Manstein, Zukertort, Hollaender, Rogge, Milch, Wilberg and many other men in Hitler's service were ethnically Jewish. However they did not identify as Jewish. As with any group of people that want to assimilate, if one does not allow ethnic Jews to disavow their people and worldview if they so choose, then that propagates and upholds Jewish supremacism and hatred of non-Jews (group rejection backlash). Put differently, Jews who are willing to separate from their Jewishness and adopt a non-Jewish identity or nationality ought to be accepted, or they will have little choice but to resort back to their Jewishness. Hitler was willing to do this. Hitler's Jewish soldiers fought incredibly well on all fronts. Most made outstanding Germans.

One must understand, and one will glean this from Hitler's own notes documented and published by Werner Maser as *Hitler's Letters and Notes*, that Hitler did not perceive the role Jews played until he had actually *witnessed* and *studied* the role they played as (what he saw as) the 'hidden hand in history'. This very claim is documented by Hitler himself in *Mein Kampf*. Hitler did not 'blame Jews' until later in his life and career, starting in the mid-

One must understand, and one will glean this from Hitler's own notes documented and published by Werner Maser as *Hitler's Letters and Notes*, that Hitler did not perceive the role Jews played until he had actually *witnessed* and *studied* the role they played as (what he saw as) the 'hidden hand in history'. This very claim is documented by Hitler himself in *Mein Kampf*. Hitler did not 'blame Jews' until later in his life and career, starting in the mid-

1920s, and he specifically blamed "*International Jewry*," not Jews in general. He, like any anti-Judaist, had to 'verify' his anti-Judaism via years of observation. His first anti-Jewish writing did not come along until 1919. More to the point, Hitler was not as anti-Judaic as he made himself out to be, but this does not mean he was a Zionist, pro-Jewish or part-Jewish.

As for Hitler's financing, of course he accepted Warburg/Rothschild money indirectly via Montagu Norman and Standard Oil/I. G. Farben during and after 1933. So what? This doesn't mean he was Jewish, Zionist or in on a ploy. Without it he never would have come to power. This is something that is unavoidable if one wants power, because certain people and family dynasties control the world's finances. One cannot circumvent their system. That is impossible. Hitler tried it and failed.

Condit goes on to assert that Dr. Reznowski also told him "[I]n his first call to [m]e about this subject in 1999—that eventually...we would find that almost all the top Nazis were part Jewish. I thought at that moment he had gone off[] the deep end. It appears he will be proved right, though,—with the only exception possibly being [v]on Papen. Although a lot of this is still up in the air and unproven." If this is "still unproven," then why does Condit insist on pushing this thesis? His entire argument rests on hearsay, rumours and alleged "eyewitnesses."

Kardel's mythical masterpiece

Let's revisit Kardel, whom Condit cites often. Henneke Kardel's "evidence" for all "top Nazis' Jewishness" is nonexistent. Kardel also said that Hitler "founded Israel": quaint but incorrect. Napoleon sent Jews to Palestine to get them out of France long before Hitler sent Jews there. The Brits, not Hitler, wrote and signed the Balfour Declaration. Harry Solomon Truman, not Hitler, recognised and legitimised the state of Israel while the Brits and Slavs (in Eastern Europe and Russia) let tens of thousands of them emigrate to Palestine after the war. Even Stalin was a "Zionist" (the proof is in an essay featuring Stalin's correspondence with Roosevelt in the JSTOR online database): he asked Franklin Roosevelt, alleged to have been of Dutch-Jewish descent by Dr. Heinrich Pudor, for advice with relocating Jews. He provided them with a beautiful homeland in Birobidzhan,¹⁹¹ but they refused to stay and raised a raucous against Stalin's relocation policy. Is this why Jewish doctors are suspected of poisoning Stalin, as suggested in *Pravda* and by loose-lipped Russian Jewish war veterans? The *Jewish News of Greater Phoenix* reported:

In 1952, nine top Kremlin doctors – six of whom had Jewish names – were arrested for allegedly having medically murdered two of Stalin's

associates in 1945 and 1948, and for planning to poison other leaders in the future, including Stalin himself.

The blood libel that would become known as the "*Doctors' Plot*" was painted as a Zionist-Jewish conspiracy conducted from the United States.

It sparked a frenzy of anti-Jewish hatred – from articles in the state-controlled media to Jewish doctors purged from their jobs – which only died when Stalin did.

....Asked if she thinks Jewish doctors poisoned Stalin, NeNe responds: "*We have no facts in Georgia about this. But we heard the rumours that he was poisoned.*"¹⁹²

And *Pravda* (online English edition) reported in December 2005:

It was not true when some people stated that "*Stalin was seriously ill, especially after the dramatic stress he endured during WWII.*" These talks appeared as soon as bulletins about Stalin's health were published for the first time on March 4, 1953. These official bulletins stated that on the night of March 2 Joseph Stalin had cerebral hemorrhage caused by his hypertension and atherosclerosis.

The false statements were encouraged by Lavrenty Beria and his protégé Malenkov and Khrushchev as soon as they became leaders of the country.

The discovered documents reveal that the Soviet leader got poisoned within February 28 - March 1, 1953, between the Saturday night and Monday, the period when [the] majority of doctors cannot be reached...because of their day off. That was done on purpose to give the poison enough time to take effect.¹⁹³

Moving along, L. B. Johnson and other U.S. presidents, not Hitler, helped Israel acquire nuclear weapons and become a "world power"—all at U.S. and (occupied) German taxpayers' expense. Hitler just wanted Jews out of Europe; Palestine was the only feasible place to send them after the Madagascar Plan became impossible to implement (thanks to Britain and France). Now, since Britain *blockaded* the Jewish ships bound for Palestine, how does the whole London-Rothschild-Washington-Berlin-Zionist plot to get Jews *into* Palestine thing work? Clearly Zionists did not possess ultimate power as Bjerknes and Condit both imply or they would not have faced any opposition from the Brits or any others regarding Palestine, which they did. Furthermore Rothschild would have screamed to no end over the British blockade had he been the fervent Zionist certain researchers declare he was.



The altered photo of Alfred Rosenberg (left) versus his real photo (right). He was not Jewish.

A lot of people think that Adolf Eichmann was also part-Jewish, but there's no proof. He may look Jewish, but so do a lot of non-Jews (*see his photos next*). Physical appearance is not proof. Furthermore at least one photo of Alfred Rosenberg, a common Jewish surname, was doctored to make his nose appear convex—i.e., 'Jewish' (*contrast photos above*). He had a straight nose and was not at all Jewish in spite of his surname. There is no evidence other than his last name and his doctored photo on the Internet. The bottom line is that one has to *prove* one's accusations. Bryan Rigg, a Jewish military historian, documented his findings and *his* evidence indicates that only a few Wehrmacht generals and top-level NS officials were part-Jewish (Milch's lineage is still disputed). This does not mean that they dictated policy or supplied funding, however. Most of them were decent men. Are we really going to accuse General Erich von Manstein of some conspiracy role because he had Lewinskys and Levys in his bloodline?



Adolf Eichmann was not Jewish.

Condit continues: "*By the way, the reason Dr. Reznowski called me – is that he said he wasn't sure that he could find anyone else, even with a minor voice on the internet – who would present the evidence straight to the public, without trying to over-demonise Hitler; or trying to be an apologist for him.*" No need for evidence, right Condit? This mysterious Dr. Reznowski's word is all the evidence you need. Has Condit ever even listened to an entire Hitler speech, or read one? How about his 26 May 1944 Platterhof speech to officers and generals, which is now available in English, or his incredible declaration of war against the U.S.? Hitler needs no "*apologists.*" If that was true then no one would even bother with him. Does anyone but the court historian argue on Truman's, Stalin's, Lenin's, Roosevelt's or Churchill's behalf? Those men need the "*apologists.*" Need we remind Condit that Hitler secretly declared war on Freemasonry, destroyed Freemasonry in every nation he liberated, purportedly interned Freemasons by the thousands, and even published their secret files after temple raids? These are hardly the actions of a tried and true Jewish person or Zionist since Jews and Zionists shared World Masonry's position and aims.¹⁹⁴

Again, Condit: "*Reznowski acknowledged that at time[s] Hitler seemed to be trying to prevent the WW II bloodbath, and there is a book about Hitler trying to keep the peace before World War II broke out by a guy with an Irish-sounding name I believe—but the title is escaping me (emphasis added).*" How convenient. He carries on: "*As I say—this thesis on Hitler, expressed in my DVD and in the interview I did with Christopher Jon Bjerknes has won the day with thinking people despite a complete blackout in the "revisionist" community and, of course, a complete blackout in the world Jewish Press (such as*

ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, FOX and Clear Channel Radio. They can't expose their last super-successful false flag - when they're in the midst of trying to pull off their CURRENT false flag operation."

Actually the "world Jewish Press" recently shouted about Hitler's "proven Jewish roots." (More on this later.) And on 22 April 1984 Edwin Black was on *Channel 5 News* discussing the NS-Zionist Transfer Agreement.¹⁹⁵ Continuing on, if Hitler tried to "keep the peace," then how was he "the ultimate false flag"? That makes about as much sense as J. K. Rowling's faulty comparison of the "mudblood" Lord Voldemort with Hitler "the Mischling Jew." And what is this talk about a "blackout" in the revisionist community? What blackout? Condit's arguments have been addressed not only by us (in *The Hyenas of High Finance*), but by Carolyn Yeager (online). Bjerknes's thesis is satisfactory only to those who believe that 1) Zionism is more immoral than Pan-Anglicanism, 2) the world's *only* problem is modern Zionism, or 3) "Zionist Jews" constitute the world's *only* problem. This perspective ignores the role of Angle-Saxons, non-Jewish bankers, corrupt and criminal elites of all ethnicities and nationalities and the masses who go to war for them all, as well as the role Freemasonry has played as Zionism's force multiplier in modern history. If one does not think this world has an Angle-Saxonist problem, and more where that came from, then one is wilfully ignoring all those who do the bidding and enforce the will of the very "Zionists" Bjerknes despises so much.

At the point of no return

We're now at the point when Condit starts 'flaming' (using CAPs): he lists his findings which we challenge one by one. He begins,

"Hitler was part Jewish unlikely," someone said. On the contrary, the PREPONDERANCE of the evidence is that Hitler was Jewish, maybe half. Much of this is listed on the DVD. - Hitler tried to hide his own birth origins with a VENGEANCE. How many legitimate people are trying to hide their own birth origins? The Austrian government, under Dolfuss, eventually assassinated by the NAZIs did a massive study on this little guy from Austria who had emerged like a shooting star on the world stage and found that his grandmother, Schicklegruber, was registered as a maid at the Rothschild House in Vienna when Hitler's dad was conceived. This fits in with Bismarck's mysterious father and Bill Clinton's. These super-wealthy sire many children and then watch for one with talent. Also, look at internet pictures of his mother Clare [*sic*] Pohlzl [*sic*] - her eyes look like she could have been one of those abused

children an area I believe happens, but which I do not understand well - either how or why it is done.

All of this is nonsense. Looks abused? Please. Hitler did not arrive like a "shooting star," but fought for fourteen long, hard years and was gassed in the trenches in case Condit forgot. He was blind for weeks and no one was sure whether he would regain his eyesight. Thomas Weber (*Hitler's First War: Adolf Hitler, the Men of the List Regiment, and the First World War*) has tried to argue that Hitler's blindness was psychosomatic. Then why did he fight all four years of the war waiting until the *last* year to *imagine* he went blind? We are, after all, expected to assume he "faked it" to avoid being in the war. That makes sense now, doesn't it? Apparently anything goes as long as it maintains the official Allied image of Hitler as an unequivocally evil, wretched, horrible, degenerate, perverted, bumbling and neurotic tool. Needless to say Hitler's eyesight was never quite the same afterwards and he needed bright lights in every room to be able to see well. Otto Wagener documented this in his memoirs (*Hitler: Memoirs of a Confidant*). Others have mentioned it as well. And might we request that Condit at least learn how to spell their names correctly if he is going to assume the role of a Hitler expert? It's Adolf and Klara Pölzl. Werner Maser blew the Rothschild allegation away in his book *Hitler: Legend, Myth and Reality*. He and Brigitte Hamann (*Hitler's Vienna*) both knocked aside the lies of the Frankenberger/Frankenreither connection to Hitler as well. Neither exists. As for the Rothschild connection, Hitler's grandmother was not in the right place at the right time, nor was she of the appropriate age—a poor peasant woman hired by a Rothschild at 41 years of age? Not to mention the alleged Rothschild with whom she liaised has never been identified (which Rothschild was it, exactly?). This Angle-Saxon apologists' argument is pure smoke and mirrors for some ulterior agenda of which Condit himself may not even be aware. Perhaps we should begin taking a closer look at Condit's lineage. His surname is Old French, likely meaning "conduit" (water channel) and was first found in Yorkshire, England where a Roger de Cundi was on record circa 1150. The Templar records show an Aliz de Condi in Lincolnshire, England in 1185.¹⁹⁶ So, Jim Condit is none other than a Pan-Angle. One need only imagine what his motive for lying about Hitler might be.

Moving on, Condit goes on to assert: "Hitler fails to crush the British at Dunkirk: a knockout blow against any of the official stories about Hitler." This was already dealt with in *The Hyenas of High Finance*: we need look no further than General Rundstedt. However, Clarence Streit wrote a revealing passage about Hitler's so-called "Great Blunder" in *Union Now with Britain*

(1941). He speciously assumed, like so many others then as today, that Hitler intended to wage war against Britain and take over the world all along. He therefore wrote:

That, briefly, is the reasoning that led me to expect disaster – but not decisive defeat – for the French and British this time as in World War I, once Germany attacked. The only questions in my mind were, which of the two great democracies would Hitler seek to knock out first, and how swift and great would the disaster be.

Here my guesses were wrong. I underestimated the speed and the extent of the disaster, and yet I overestimated Hitler. For I thought he would go for Britain first. Napoleon had already proved that one could conquer the Continent and yet lose because England remained in control of the seas. Hitler had played his cards so shrewdly that it seemed prudent to expect him to profit from this experience. His Scandinavian campaign pointed in this direction, for it opened the way for invasion of Britain from Scapa Flow to the Channel. It did not fit into an attempt to knock out France first.

When, after the break at Sedan, the Germans headed for the Channel and not toward Paris as in 1914, I felt dismally sure that Hitler was shrewder than Wilhelm and Napoleon. Then he took Calais, Boulogne, Dunkirk, held all the Channel ports, and left me aghast at the possibility he had gained of sweeping on through Britain. So amazingly efficient and thoroughly prepared an army would no doubt have shallow shipping ready to swarm across the Channel.

And then, on June 5, Hitler turned and spent on France his surest knockout blow. I still wonder why. Whatever his reasons, history may well find that France diverted him into the decisive blunder that cost him his best chance to win the war and gain the keys to world control.*

* After this book went to press, I found confirmation of this view in the interview Lord Halifax gave the press Jan. 25, 1941, the day after his arrival in Washington as Ambassador. *The New York Times* of Jan. 26 reported him as saying:

"I believe that when history comes to be written, it will be said that Hitler lost the war in June, 1940, when he failed to take advantage of the situation after the French collapse and the withdrawal from Dunkerque."

"Do you mean that Hitler could have taken England at that time?" a reporter asked.

"I think he had a better chance then than he ever will have again," the Ambassador replied."

Had Britain or the United States occupied the place of France there seems no reason to suppose that the disaster would have been less. For the test showed not simply that the French were unprepared to withstand the initial onslaught, but that the British were still less prepared for it and that we Americans were far behind the British.

The 1940 showdown showed that all the old democracies, great and small, European and American, were tragically unprepared for war and vulnerable to attack—*despite the huge amounts each had spent for defence*. It left the people of no democracy in position to blame other democracies. Those that still survive need to say instead, *"There, but for the grace of God, go I."*

It showed, too, how sound was the supposition that the democratic philosophy itself exposes a people dangerously to the wars of aggressive autocrats. The democracies were vulnerable in different ways, but none was in position to withstand in May, 1940, the surprise that Hitler was able to deliver then. The democracies that remain, remain because they did not have to suffer then, as the others did, the full shock of his onslaught. *The billions we Americans have spent* and the *millions we have drafted*, since France fell, show with brutal frankness how much we had been relying on French taxpayers and their sons to defend America in defending France.

It is no reflection on the magnificent fortitude and daring which the British are showing to recall that they did not have to bear the brunt of the assault as did the French, and that they did have an opportunity to steady themselves which the French never had.

Could the British have been saved by their Channel and their chins had Hitler, when he reached Calais, concentrated everything on following swiftly through to London? He had already captured on the Continent practically all the armament of the British army. Sir Walter Layton, of the British Ministry of Supply, told the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, October 17, 1940, that Britain *"had thrown in the land battle all that she had of trained men and equipment. When, therefore, the men of Dunkirk arrived in England with nothing but what they stood up in the cupboard was very, very bare indeed."* An American army officer in position to know has told me that the British then had *"hardly a full division"* in condition to defend the Island, and that its beach defences against invasion at that time were extremely weak.

No doubt *the R.A.F. and the British navy would have made invasion cost the Germans dear*. But Hitler has shown how ready he is to sacrifice the lives of others—and the cost of invasion is increasing all the time. Surely his best hope of securing surrender of the British fleet was a stunning, swift

invasion then of England. Control of the seas would have closed a prison door on the French army and at the same time would have opened to Hitler the door to an unprepared America. But Hitler, when he reached the Channel and had to make his tremendous choice, chose to give the British and not the French the time every democracy needs to begin to fight.

Here is one of the great mysteries of this war—one about which a whole shelf of books may well be written. Why did Hitler make this blunder? Had Hitler completely failed to learn from Napoleon and World War I? Had he planned all along to knock out France first? Or did he have a plan to strike at England first, but was diverted from it at the crucial moment? *If so, what diverted him? Or who* (emphasis added)?¹⁹⁷

In discussing these questions recently with the American army officer to whom I have already referred,* I learned that he, too, and some other high military authorities believed that the original German plan was to knock out Britain first. They, too, were amazed when the Germans turned from the Channel back toward Paris. According to my friend's information, Hitler himself was directly responsible for this sudden change in plan. That would seem plausible. Even so, the reason remains guesswork.

* I submitted this chapter to this officer for his comment and criticism. He replied:

"I have no fault to find with the article except in one respect. While basically you may be right as to the fall of France, to me the biggest single factor in the debacle was not so much the democracy of the people with their highly individualistic attitude, but was essentially based upon the defence psychology of the people, as a whole, and their leaders. This, coupled with a mental rigidity, or, perhaps, more properly speaking, a lack of adaptability, caused the other factors, such as you mention, to have a much more devastating effect than would have been the case otherwise."

"Aside from the foregoing, I think the article is fine."

To me, this rigid *defensive psychology* is but another of the weaknesses to be expected in any democracy when war begins. This type of military mind seems almost certain to be in command then in a democracy. In peacetime a democracy and its politicians are bound to fear the strong, aggressive, adventurous type of soldier and sailor, and give the highest posts to the officers who fit in best with the *defensive psychology which naturally dominates a democracy in peacetime* (emphasis added).

Streit was wrong about many things as we will soon see in H. W. Koch's revelations about the evolution of *Barbarossa* and *Sea Lion*. As for his "*defensive democracy*" line, that is genuine balderdash. Any glance at Lawrence Dennis's charts of democratic wars waged by the Pan-Angles in *Dynamics*

refutes this Angle-Saxonist twaddle. At any rate, Streit then asked: *Why did Hitler turn on France?* To that he answered:

No doubt a number of factors, some apparently contradictory, entered into Hitler's decision. Perhaps he did not realise how bare the British army cupboard was. Certainly the splendid work of the British navy and the R.A.F. at Dunkirk did much to hide this poverty and to remind him that the Channel was not the Rhine or Meuse. Quite possibly Hitler himself was not prepared for so smashing a success, had not expected to reach the Channel so soon, *had not prepared to assemble there so early the boats and planes needed for invasion.*

How about the fiscal costs associated with such an invasion as well as increasing Soviet aggression in 1940? Streit was conspicuously ignorant of both.

Perhaps Hitler could not resist the temptation of humiliating the French when he found their resistance less than anyone expected. *After all, France was Germany's "hereditary enemy" and Hitler's early hate.* Its army had much greater military prestige than Britain's, and here was a long-dreamed-of opportunity to crush it ignominiously—an opportunity that was much too good to last long. Every people has its moments of weakness and of panic, but few have shown such resiliency and powers of quick recovery as the French—the only people who have both won and lost an empire three times over in the last two hundred years. Given merely time to catch their breath and recover from the shock, *the French were capable of swiftly reorganising their army into a formidable force on Hitler's left flank.* The British were infinitely weaker than the French in the very elements that need the longest preparation—in numbers of trained officers, soldiers and reserves. If Britain was potentially the greater danger to Hitler, *France was a much more immediate danger.*

Of course, these French assets would not matter much if Hitler quickly gained control of the seas—but *could he gain it quickly enough, if he left a reviving French army on his flank? And what if he failed to gain control of the seas even by invading Britain?*

On the other hand, perhaps Hitler was so drunk with success when he reached the Channel and so contemptuous of both the French and British that he thought he could safely take time out to fell the former first.

It seems more probable to me, however, *that respect for French powers of recovery rather than contempt diverted Hitler from London to Paris.* Had Hitler found the French army as weak as it is now the fashion to believe, *he would hardly have made the efforts he was making at this*

critical time to persuade Mussolini to stab France in the back. We forget too easily that while the Germans were closing in on Dunkirk, June 2, they were also air-raiding down the Rhone Valley to prove their ability to support an Italian attack. It hardly seems likely that Hitler would have sought to share with Mussolini a victory he believed that he could *quickly win alone*. The psychological weight of Italy entering the war just when it did can hardly be overestimated, in trying to judge now why men, caught in a torrent of events, acted as they did.¹⁹⁸

If so much of the British army was rescued at Dunkirk, it was not only because of the British naval and air forces, but also because of the actual and potential pressure of the French on the German flank—pressure so great as to divert German planes from Dunkirk even to the Rhone (emphasis added).¹⁹⁹

Since some readers will remain sceptical even after all this we have provided a concise chapter on the evolution of both *Sea Lion* and *Barbarossa*.

Back to Condit: "*Hitler fails to drop two ships in the Strait of Gibraltar—and thus turn it into a German Lake: another knock out punch against the idea that Hitler was foremost interested in winning World War II once it started.*" Simple explanation: Franco would not allow him to. Hitler was angry at Franco, but he wasn't about to push Franco into the arms of the Allies. Besides, Hitler needed Franco's support for the sake of the Berlin-Madrid-Tokyo alliance operating in Mexico, Brazil and Argentina. Franco allowed Hitler to use Spanish naval bases. German U-boats were resupplied at Spanish ports and Italian bombers refuelled at Spanish airfields, while Spain helped to build observation posts around Gibraltar for German spies. Franco also turned a blind eye to Spanish volunteerism numbering into the thousands in the German military (the *Blue Division*). Though not without wild conjecture and scathing anti-German bias, William F. Wertz, Jr. offers a great deal of insight into the Berlin-Madrid alliance, which was largely clandestine. His essays are available online. Condit also neglects Churchill's bribery of Franco's generals to stay out of the war.

Graham Keely reported the following in this respect:

Winston Churchill authorised millions of dollars in bribes to stop General Franco from entering the Second World War on the side of Germany, a new book claims.

The British wartime leader persuaded Juan March, a Spanish banker, to act as a secret agent, organising payments of millions of dollars to the generals. *In return the generals persuaded Franco not to side with Hitler.*

In the summer of 1940 Churchill was convinced that Spain would enter the war on the side of Hitler after receiving reports that Franco and the Germans were planning to invade Gibraltar. Ferrer has claimed that a British officer, Alan Hillgarth, *came up with a plan to bribe the generals*, believing that Franco's high command was corrupt and, because they were not paid much, would be open to bribery.

A letter from Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Solborg, a US agent in Portugal, to J. Donovan, the head of strategic services, read: "*The Spaniard selected to be the main internal instrument to acquire the political favours of these generals was the rich financier Juan March.*" [...]

Ferrer said that questions remained as to whether March was a double agent. He claimed that documents suggested March may have stayed in the pay of the Germans while working for the British. When he was approached by the British in 1940, however, March accepted the role. He approached 30 generals who had fought in the Spanish Civil War. *Though their sympathies had been with the Nazis they switched sides.*

The \$10 million bribe money was *deposited in a bank account in New York in 1940* but the plot *nearly fell apart* a year later *when the US Treasury thought that March was using the money to support Hitler.*

The British Ambassador in Washington convinced President Roosevelt that British military interests depended on the account being unfrozen. The Americans relented and in 1942 alone the generals received between \$3 million and \$5 million.

The book said that some generals were not simply bought off by bribes—many loathed Franco (emphasis added).²⁰⁰

In short, Hitler had to make do without Gibraltar. (Not to mention New York bankers supporting Hitler was clearly out of the question.)

Condit then writes:

IBM, based in New York City, helps Hitler catalog Jews in German territories with IBM punch card system – and Thomas Watson, president of IBM, gets plenty of awards from Hitler. The Jewish run *New York Times* neither "*notices*" nor protests. [*Were they supposed to notice something, and if so, what? The editor.*] Watson travelled to Germany in March, 1933, Hitler's first month in office—as if spring-loaded for the task.

Watson was just interested in making money. IBM had connections to Germany before Hitler *came along* and has had connections to Germany since then. Corporations are *exempt from war*. This is standard capitalist (Angle-

Saxon) practise and always has been, as we will see in Springborn's analysis. It is true that the Ford Motor Co. plant in Germany remained untouched during Churchill's German holocaust, but this is irrelevant. Churchill avoided deliberately bombing the plants of his Pan-Angle comrades. Ford was American, not German. For his part Hitler was smart to accept foreign investment. Only a moron would have said "no" to such foreign enterprises parking subsidiaries or investing in Germany. This bolstered his economy and created jobs for Germans. Hitler had to have an economy. Was he supposed to just pull money out of a magical hat? Hitler had his *own* national bank and printed his *own* money, free of Rothschild London authority, but this does not seem to satisfy Condit. He appears to be labouring under the notion that Hitler was a "master race" nutcase and committed genocide. If so, he believes all the Albionist-Zionist "ueberracist" tripe that has been debunked by copious research. (See Chapter 25.)

Condit then wants to know why Hitler didn't "arrest or detain one top banker or officers of Jewish banking houses in Germany, such as the Rothschilds or Warburgs."

He did. When the Germans arrived in Austria in 1938, one of their first acts was to seize Rothschild interests in Austria, thereby breaking Rothschild control of all continental Europe (outside of England). In France the NS Germans searched for Guy de Rothschild, but he escaped to New York City where his wife had a son, David René James de Rothschild, who controls the Rothschild dynasty today. Guy de Rothschild himself went to the 'City of London' to help manage the bankers' global war against Hitler. Their strategy was to help arm and sustain the U.S.S.R. so that the Russians and Germans would break one another, thereby allowing British bankers to reassert their control over Europe. As for Baron Louis de Rothschild:

William Shirer, then a correspondent in Vienna, watched SS men "carting off silver, tapestries, paintings, and other loot from the Rothschild palace." Baron Louis de Rothschild, who was Jewish, was arrested by the Gestapo and only able to buy his freedom after turning his Austrian steel mills over to the Hermann Goering Works, a giant government-run steel company controlled by Goering. Hundreds of German businessmen flocked...to Vienna to buy up Jewish businesses at bargain prices. Hitler's bloodless conquest of Austria was his greatest triumph yet. His popularity in Germany and his prestige with the generals was greatly increased. Most important,...Austria would enable the German economy to keep going for another year. Although Austria was a small country its gold reserve of \$38 million was larger than the meagre gold reserve Germany had left. When Dr. Schacht, the president of the Reichsbank, arrived in Vienna to take over the Austrian National Bank,

he claimed the entire gold reserve for Germany, along with Austria's foreign exchange reserves, which amounted to almost \$500 million.²⁰¹

Hjalmar Schacht, a Rothschild agent and Freemason who was acquitted at Nuremberg while everyone else was imprisoned or hanged, was fired, arrested and put under Gestapo surveillance as soon as he refused to go along with the Four-Year Plan (Schacht's ordeal started in 1937).²⁰² Hitler admitted to having used Schacht for his own ends (see *The Hyenas of High Finance*). Schacht was forced to resign in November 1937 as Minister of Economics and General Plenipotentiary at Goering's request. He remained the nominal President of the Reichsbank until Hitler sacked him in January 1939. Then he was watched by the Gestapo. After that Schacht held the nominal title of Minister without Portfolio, and received the same salary, until he was utterly sacked in January 1943. Why was this Freemason sacked? A new Reichsbank law, promulgated on 15 June 1939, made the bank "[u]nconditionally subordinated to the sovereignty of the state." Article 3 decreed that the bank should be "directed and managed according to the instructions and under the supervision of the Fuehrer and Reich Chancellor."

Henry Picker, one of Hitler's stenographers, recorded the following on 22 April 1942:

I told Luther that any collabouration between us was impossible, that he might perhaps have some legal means of retaining his position, but that I had now assumed office, that I would brook no argument from him, and that, if the interests of the country demanded it, I should not even hesitate to break him; and then – and this was the idea that Meissner had suggested as a solution – I offered him the post of Ambassador to Washington, if he would voluntarily resign his present position. This he declared himself ready to accept, provided I would add an allowance of fifty thousand marks a year to his pension. I can see him still, his eyes modestly downcast, assuring me that it was pure patriotism which caused him to fall in with my suggestions!

So I had to pay good money to open the way for the appointment of a man of international reputation to the Presidency of the Reichsbank—Dr. Schacht. Schacht understood at once that it would be ridiculous to think of launching any rearmament programme unless we were prepared to vote many billions for its implementation. In this manner I was able to extract a sum of eight billion, though the announcement of the figure caused Schwerin-Krosigk, the then Minister of Finance, many grave misgivings. At this moment General Blomberg was unfortunately stupid enough to disclose that, apart from this eight billion, a further supplementary sum of

twelve billion would be required to carry out the preliminary phase of the rearmament programme. I reproached Blomberg bitterly for his indiscretion. *After all, seeing that the whole gang of financiers is a bunch of crooks, what possible point was there in being scrupulously honest with them?* By far the best thing was to state our needs bit by bit as they arose. This method was also to the advantage of the financial experts themselves; for if things should go wrong, *they would then be in a position to justify themselves in the public eye by claiming that they had been told the truth.*

It is characteristic of Schacht that, from the first eight billion marks, he retained five hundred million as interest! He is a man of quite astonishing ability and is unsurpassed in the art of getting the better of the other party. *But it was just his consummate skill in swindling other people which made him indispensable at the time.* Before each meeting of the International Bank at Basle, *half the world was anxious to know whether Schacht would attend or not, and it was only after receipt of the assurance that he would be there that the Jew bankers of the entire world packed their bags and prepared to attend.* I must say that the tricks Schacht succeeded in playing on them proves that even in the field of finance a really sharp Aryan is more than a match for his Jewish counterpart. It is Schacht who was the instigator of the plan, subsequently put into practice, of devaluing German shares held abroad. Most of these represented reparations held in the form of shares; these shares were then later purchased in the open market by intermediaries on our behalf at prices varying from 12 per cent to 18 per cent of their real value, after which German industry was compelled to redeem from us at par value. In this way, thanks to a profit of 80 per cent and over, we were able to organise an 'export dumping campaign' which brought in three-quarters of a billion marks in foreign currency.

It is greatly to Schacht's credit that he remained completely silent on the existence of this foreign currency. There were several occasions on which, had the existence of these funds been known, *the most determined efforts would have been made to deprive us of them.* I am thinking particularly of the time when we did not know where to lay our hands on the money for the salaries of our officials, and of the moment when we were faced with a complete lack of rubber. It was only in 1938, when war was obviously inevitable, that I made publicly known the existence of these reserves. It was clear that the future belligerents would, like ourselves, make the most strenuous efforts to buy up any and everything in the way of raw materials that the world's markets had to offer. *Speed, therefore, was essential if we wished to avoid seeing our gold and foreign currency reserves transformed suddenly into paper and metal of no value. It was to Funk that I entrusted the*

task of buying our share of raw materials. In spite of his ability, I felt *I could not quite trust Schacht in this matter*, for I had often seen how his face lit up when he succeeded in swindling somebody out of a hundred-mark note, and *I feared that in the face of such temptation he would quite probably try his Freemason's tricks on me* (emphasis added)!²⁰³

Hitler was not only open about rearmament, but was not alone in his desire to reassert Germany's place among fellow world powers. But only by 1938, mind you. This conversation makes this clear enough. He also distrusted Schacht, but knew that in order to get anything accomplished he had to play ball with Jewish bankers and the Bank of England, whom Schacht represented.

The Rothschilds and Warburgs were not in NS Germany; they lived in America and England. Was Hitler supposed to have them assassinated and what would this have achieved? Perhaps Condit doesn't like to bother with actual facts. One of the Warburgs whom Condit claims bankrolled Hitler was already dead by the time World War II broke out: Paul Warburg died on 24 January 1932, at least a year before Hitler was even chancellor, so how exactly did he bankroll Hitler? How about the Swiss? It turns out *they* actually funded the NSDAP throughout the war! Just mull over LeBor's book *Hitler's Secret Bankers: The Myth of Swiss Neutrality During the Holocaust* and, by all means, consult Antony Sutton's *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*. In spite of the title the author failed to make a single credible, *direct* tie between Wall Street and Hitler. There wasn't one. He cites some obscure out-of-print book, allegedly authored by James Warburg about his "secret" visit to Hitler, which is a ludicrous fraud. James Warburg, Paul's son, was the financial advisor to *Roosevelt*, not Adolf Hitler. The Warburgs were behind the Federal Reserve Bank consortium in America and the C.F.R. (Council on Foreign Relations) in America, *not* NS Germany. The only nation and people that look bad in Sutton's book are the Angle-Saxons and America.

Further, keeping some of Germany's Jewish banks in operation helped Hitler deport Jews, which was his ultimate goal. The Allies, not Hitler, made the Madagascar Plan impossible, so out of desperation and practicality Hitler turned to British-occupied Palestine for a solution to his "*Jewish problem*." These Jewish banks helped arrange the financial agreements with Palestinian authorities for the humane, orderly and peaceful deportation of Jews. Hitler simply wanted them to leave. The Allies were the ones who made this impossible.

Sutton
Warburg
?