In October 1946, in a quiet garden in Wiesbaden, an unknown person, whose writings and actions are only valued by his enemies, and that negatively, composed a short monograph entitled "The Possibilities of Germany", and this Estimate can best begin by a short citation from that unpublished work:

"Eventually -- not before 15 years, not more than 30 -- the Anglo-Saxon-Jewish combine and the Russian Empire will wage the third of the series of World Wars."

1960 was the first year in which the world political situation was ripe for a great war. But the exact moment of its outbreak is known to no one at this time, not even to any clairvoyant. It may take place this year, or any year after this, the last possible time being about 1975.

I

A brief comparison is in order with the situation of 1946. In that year, America-Jewry controlled, in a political if not military, sense the entire Western Hemisphere, all of Western Europe except a part of Germany, all of Africa, all the Near East, the Middle East, and the Far East. This all amounted to 9/10 of the surface of the earth and more than 3/4 of the earth's population.

Since then, this preponderance of power vi-a-vis Russia has dwindled to a point where the Washington regime at this moment has no preponderance of power vis-a-vis Russia, but stands in an inferior power-position.

The basic reason for the diminution of power is spiritual-organic. Power will never stay in the hands of him who does not want power and has no plan for its use. Desire for revenge, desire to "stop Hitler", desire to destroy Europe, desire to kill 80,000,000 Germans by the Morgenthau Plan -- all these are not will-to-power. Will-to-power means inherently the will to do something positive with that power, not the will to prevent something.

The more superficial and direct reason for the diminution of power was political incapacity on the part of the Zionists, or Washington regime as it is here interchangeably called. This incapacity manifested itself first in total incomprehension of the Russian soul, leading to the belief that this wild, chaotic, spirituality had surrendered itself permanently to the guidance of a small group of Jewish intellectuals.
A person who believes that the seizing of the apparatus of power -- government, army, police, press, education -- guarantees the continuance of power is a political non-entity. Yet the whole Washington regime believes this. In philosophy they are materialists and thus cannot ever understand that visible facts are only the manifestation of invisible spiritual movements.

To the extent that a people is materialistic in its religion and philosophy, it is non-revolutionary, but the Russians are completely non-materialistic, being completely dominated by feelings, and acting always from their feelings. Thus it was that the Russians, even without disturbing the Bolshevik governmental structure or ideology, effected a complete revolution and deprived the Jewish leadership of all power. The Jew in contemporary Russia is allowed to be a Jew, if he is first and foremost a Russian. In other words he is not allowed to be a Jew, and is being exterminated without physical violence.

Since the Washington regime believed in the "friendliness" -- i.e. Jewish domination -- of Russia, it gave China to Russia, as it had already given part of Germany and part of Japan. One cannot call this treason on the part of the nincompoop Marshall who accomplished the actual transfer of China from the Washington regime to the Russian sphere, for he was sent by the Washington regime on this very mission, and when he died, years later, was called by the Zionist press the greatest soldier, etc., etc. Legally speaking, it makes no sense to say the entire government of a country is committing treason, for it is they who define the enemy. In a spiritual sense, of course, the Washington regime are traitors to the United States and its people, but they have so defined the relationships that those who are loyal to the United States in a spiritual and political sense are regarded as traitors in a legal sense.

India was surrendered in 1947, and lost to the control of the Washington regime. Together with China it accounts for about 40% of the world's population.

Since then, Egypt has been lost and half the Arab world, through the creation of the foolish, unnecessary Jewish State in Palestine.

Cuba and Venezuela have been lost, with only financial bridgeheads retained, and all the Latin American possessions of the Washington regime, from Nicaragua to Argentina, are growing restive.

Because it retained the fiction of the independence of the European lands, the Washington regime has imperilled its grip on France, by allowing De Gaulle to set up himself up as a leader.

In Korea, the Zionists fought against the Chinese armies they had created, through the Great General Marshall, and these armies used the very equipment which Marshall had delivered to them, sufficient to equip 60 divisions. Not only did they lose the war, but they demonstrated to the entire world that the United States infantry is inferior, and that the Zionist empire is, in the Chinese phrase, a paper tiger.
On the positive side, there is little to record. The Zionists conquered Spain without a war, and have occupied it with their troops. They have completely incorporated England, and occupied it once more with troops.

Of all that they possessed in 1946, there remain only the greater part of Latin America, (now precariously held), all Europe except part of Germany and the greater part of the Mediterranean littoral (also precariously held). Japan has been lost, but Australia, without military value, is still held. The Philippines are still precariously held.

What the Washington regime has lost Russia has gained, either by extension of its influence directly or by increasing the neutral area. The extension of neutrality is of immediate benefit to Russia, exactly as it is of immediate loss to America-Jewry. This is so because of the concentric shape of the geographical theater of the political struggle. Russia occupies an inner circle, and America-Jewry an outer circle. The neutralization of India, Japan, Egypt et al. represent breaks in the outer circle, and weakening of the Jewish-American economic-political structure.

This is so also for a moral reason. Jewry always claims to speak for, and to represent, all humanity, with the exception of one unit, which is thus automatically the enemy of humanity. In a war of attrition, it is a positive detriment to be labelled by most of the world's press as the enemy of humanity, even though in a short war it makes no difference. Therefore, the more the Jewish-American control over the press of the countries of the world is weakened, the better is Russia's moral-political position.

II

It is instructive to compare the Second and Third World wars in their aspect of the quantitative relationships of the combatants. In the Second World War, on the one side (Germany, Italy, Japan, Hungary, Finland, Rumania and Bulgaria) were 225,000,000 people, with an area of less than 1,000,000 square miles at the beginning of the conflict. On the other side were approximately 1,000,000,000 people and approximately 50,000,000 square miles. In addition the so-called neutrals (with unimportant exceptions) were enrolled in the economic service of the Jewish-American-Russian coalition, since the coalition possessed a monopoly of their trade.

In the distribution of 1960, the quantitative aspect looms thus: on the one side of the Jewish-American leadership is a population of 400,000,000 and an area of approximately 30,000,000 miles. (These figures include all North and South America, all Western Europe, and more than half of Africa, together with Australia and environs.) On the other side of the Russian-Chinese coalition is a population of 800,000,000 and an area of approximately 15,000,000 square miles. (This includes Russia, China, and the Russian-held areas of Europe.)

These quantitative estimates are generous to the American-Jewish front, for much of what is given is questionable, from the standpoint of military value of the population and accessibility of the territory. Thus it is quite clear that none of the armies in Jewish-
American occupied Europe will have great military value, since the essence of the armies, i.e. morale, will be absent. Furthermore, the entire population of Latin America is at best available only for economic service; there is no expectation that in the Third, any more than in the First or Second World Wars, this population can be used as cannon-fodder. And if the movement for Latin American independence spreads, almost a third part of the figures, both for population and land area given above must be stricken. If the Arab revolt spreads further, it may cut off much of Africa from Zionist control.

On the moral side, the two wars are quite different. In the Second World War, Germany and Japan were both nationalist. Only secondarily, and in a propaganda way did they claim to represent any principle which was of universal validity. Thus they offered no great persuasion to the population in enemy countries or neutral countries to sympathize. The Jewish-American-Russian-English etc. etc. coalition, however, used no nationalist feelings except as propaganda against Germany. Their whole war cry was a universal one: Freedom, Happiness, Justice; a birthday-party every day for every person in the world.

In the Third World War two universals are offered by the contestants: on the one side the joys of Capitalism, on the other the perfect happiness of Communism. Germany, Italy and Japan all got out of the League of Nations when it was clear that it was entirely dominated by the enemy. Russia stayed in the United Nations all through a long period when the thing was entirely Jewish-American, and has persevered to the point where the thing can be sometimes useful to them even though they do not have the major control.

Thus, while the United Nations was at war against Russia's ally in Korea, a Russian was the head of the Security Council, the organ charged with the prosecution of the war.

A national, or particular, principle against a universal principle is at a crushing disadvantage in a World War. But this time, the Zionists face another Universal, and one with which half of their very own people are secretly, half-openly, or openly in sympathy. In a wax between Capitalism and Communism, the Jewish people finds itself physically on the one side, but spiritually on the other. Their minds are divided from their pocketbooks. This weakens leadership corps of America-Jewry, for this corps is entirely Jewish. The Jewish-American entity is Jewish as respects its head, American as respects its body.

In view of the complete lack of spirituality, intellect, political awareness, and moral courage in the American population, the possibility of an American revolt against Jewish domination has been entirely omitted. Such a thing is only a possibility after America-Jewry suffers a thorough military defeat, and even then only if it is followed by large-scale economic disasters.

III

The regimes of Washington and Moscow together make up a Concert of Bolshevism, just as the Culture States of the West made up the Concert of Europe of the 18th century.
Moscow and Washington share all basic values, and recognize it mutually. No matter how strong their political rivalry, they make "cultural" agreements whereby each may export its brand of culture to the other. Thus Washington sends the clown Bob Hope to Russia, and Moscow sends the cacophony expert Shostakovich to North America, causing the intellectuals to gush with admiration. The American cinema is not anti-Russian, regardless of preparations for the Third World War. Compare this with the preparations for the Second World War, when this same cinema created many thousands of hate-Germany films, which it is still turning out.

Bolshevism means, as simple historical fact, destruction of the West and of the remnants of its Culture. The Communist Manifesto sets forth a program to accomplish this on the economic-social side. In the ten demands that it makes, only nine are possible, and all these have been realized in the United States, but not one of them has been realized in Russia. The barbarian nature of the Russians is itself Bolshevism, but Marxian Communism is purely an export article in Russia, while in the United States, it is an accomplished fact.

The reality of this Concert is shown especially by the Policy of America-Jewry toward Germany. Much as it needs a German Army, it will not create a real German Army, but only a mass of helpless rifle-battalions to be slaughtered by Russia without a chance of winning. Both Russia and America-Jewry have failed to get the best performance from their German captives who make the rockets for them. Russia overworks its German rocket-men, and America-Jewry has so thoroughly denationalized, brain-washed and Americanized its German rocket-men that they are no longer German, and have thus lost the source of their technical superiority, i.e. their German inwardness. This is the final explanation why the German rockets made in Russia are better than the German, rockets made in the USA.

Most of the cinema in North America treats Russia and Russians as interesting and admirable, human and good. The cinema's purpose in the general scheme of propaganda is to control the emotional attitudes of the population. Control of the intellectual attitudes is the work of the press, and here Russia is treated negatively. Why this duality? Every ruling regime gives perforce in its propaganda a picture of itself, and the Washington Zionist regime itself suffers from this quality. Russia is not a total enemy, but a rival. The Korean war, 1950-1953 expressed the limited hostility of the Washington regime toward Russia and its official war-aim was not "victory" or "unconditional surrender", but "a just truce".

When the Germans in Russia make some new technical advance, Eisenhower congratulates the Moscow regime. Roosevelt never congratulated Hitler on such occasions. The Russian flag is flown in the United States on all festive, "international" occasions. Never did the German flag appear, nor does it today. The fundamental ineradicable Jewish hatred of Germany appears in the fact that even the Germany they control directly is not permitted to sit among the United Nations, on a par with the other puppets. The spate of anti-German films in the theatres and on television continues unabated. The anti-Russian films are few indeed,
One conclusion emerges, of military-political significance: in the Third World War, the Washington regime will list Germany among its enemies. Already the radio propagandists say "Russia and Red Germany." The intention here is, not only that the German rifle battalions be slaughtered by the Russian advance, but that the way be opened for the bombardment of Germany again, this time with more destructive bombs.

The Concert of Bolshevism is a reality only because of the attitude of the Washington Regime. Russia does not disturb it, since it works to their ends -- it gave them China, neutralized India and Japan. But they do not take it seriously, any more than they regard the United Nations as a serious thing.

IV

We now come to the military aspect of the Third World War. It is perfectly clear that the Washington regime has put its entire faith in "strategic bombardment." They plan to deliver the explosives to their targets by ballistic missiles, guided missiles, submarines and airplanes, land-based and carrier-based. This faith in bombardment is just that: it is faith, but not rational. Faith has certain advantages, but not in the realm of technics. Belief that I will discover a new weapon, will or at least, may, lead me to that discovery, but belief that this weapon will destroy my enemy all by itself will not increase the power of the weapon. Black magic would be better in this case, for it works directly on the morale of the enemy, whereas the faith in the weapon merely assumes that if his cities are destroyed, he will be disheartened.

Russia is a porous target, and rockets are effective only against dense targets. The Jewish-American citadel is far denser than the Russian citadel, and is thus vulnerable to rockets to a far greater decree. America-Jewry would be better off if rockets did not exist. In that case its citadel would be inviolate, and it could never sustain a military disaster of the greatest magnitude, for its armies would be at the antipodes and their victory or defeat would be of minor consequence. Thus the basic Jewish-American military doctrine is one which cannot possibly give it victory. But this same military doctrine, if adopted by the enemy, could give victory to the enemy.

Russian morale is tough, because of the barbarian nature of the soldier-material, and not because of good leadership, organization, or indoctrination. The Jewish-American morale is poor, the soldier material is utterly worthless in itself. This population has no political awareness, no significant military tradition, no military instinct, no military ambition, and no moral strength, and no respect for, or belief in anything whatever. This youth is characterized by the Beatnik, the American form of the Nihilist. He believes in nothing and respects nothing because there is nothing within his range of vision worthy of respect or inspiring belief. The Beatnik is not an insignificant entity: he is the ruling type in the American youth. He represents the fashion, all other youth feel inwardly inferior to him, as non-fashionable elements always do toward the fashion-corps.

Russian barbarians cannot be demoralized by rockets. The Beatnik can, because he has no morale to start with, no inner participation. The Russian population is young, and it is
rural, mostly in fact, the rest in spirit. The American population is old, and it is megalopolitan, mostly in fact, the rest in spirit. Speaking in general, only rural people are good fighters, not city-people, especially if the fighting is severe.

Rockets are merely artillery, and thus can never conquer. It is true that the doctrine arose in military circles during 1914-1918 that "artillery conquers the ground; the infantry occupies it." But this is mere stupidity, on a level with the military leadership and conduct of that war. Only infantry can conquer.

From this fact comes the Russian military doctrine. It derives from Clausewitz and is valid for all wars between powers based on the same continent. That doctrine is that the aim of war is the destruction of the enemy's armies by decisive blows. The Russian military sees in the Jewish-American bombardment of German cities in the Second World War mere stupidity, and here they are correct. But this same Russian military has not yet fully grasped the fact that the Clausewitz doctrine on The Aim of the War is not valid for intercontinental warfare. As far as the Jewish-American puppet armies in Europe go, the doctrine is correct. For Russian victory in Europe, these puppet armies must be rounded up, as they inevitably will be. But there still remains the Jewish-American citadel. How is Russia, without massive means of sea-transport as it is, to destroy the Jewish-American armies? It is simply not possible. Does this mean therefore that Russia cannot win?

It is clear that both contestants in the Concert of Bolshevism have a ruling military ideation according to which they cannot possibly win.

**America-Jewry, which believes in rockets, can win only with infantry.**

**Russia, which believes in infantry, can win only with rockets.**

So much for their similarity; now for the difference. Although the ruling doctrine in Russian military circles is an infantry-oriented one (as it should be), nevertheless the Russian military has equipped itself with good German rockets, better than the German rockets of America-Jewry.

But the Military of America-Jewry, though it talks out of one side of its mouth about "balanced forces," has not equipped itself with good infantry, for the simple reason that it cannot, entirely lacking any human material which could be shaped into good infantry. The Jewish-American naval forces now have the doctrine that they are mere artillery auxiliaries. The submarines exist to throw rockets; the carriers exist in order to carry airplanes to throw rockets; The cruisers exist to -- yes, why do they exist? Away with them, to the mothball closet! The naval battle at sea, the meaning of the fleet, is not contemplated. Protection of commerce is forgotten, since overseas commerce will almost all be cut off in the Third World War.
The Russian forces are prepared to fight with infantry, with artillery, with armor, with air forces, with missiles, ballistic and guided, thrown from land and from submarines. The American-Jewish forces are prepared to fight only with rockets.

Since the rocket is the only Jewish-American weapon, it is understandable that they do not want to abolish atomic weapons, nor to agree to stop their further testing and developing. By the same token it is understandable that the Russians sincerely want to render illegal the only weapon which America-Jewry can use against them.

But here only the Russian position is rational. The American-Jewish position would make sense if (1) it could win with rockets, and (2) it had superiority in rockets. But neither condition is present. It would be better to get out of the competition before the war than to lose the war, but politicians in general do not think that way.

The dispute rages in Russian military circles on whether American rocket manufacturing, storing, and launching facilities should have top target priority, or whether that should be given to American cities. Those who think nationally, organically, patriotically, humanly, would attack the rocket facilities first; those who think in terms of cold reason, regardless of domestic damage and losses, would attack the great cities as the prior targets.

Now, it has been said that America-Jewry can win only with infantry, and that Russia can win only with rockets. These propositions must be fully explained.

First, the meaning of the concept to win. Immediately the political and military planes separate themselves out. Politically, the concept of winning means the conclusion of peace on terms satisfactory to one's self. Militarily it means that the enemy asks for peace. This does not contradict Clausewitz in his statement that the military aim of war is the destruction of the enemy's armies. It merely widens the concept of military victory to cover the case, which arises now for the first time in world-history, in which a war is fought between two powers whose armies can have no contact with one another.

This assumes that in the first phase of the war the Jewish-American forces in Europe and their local auxiliaries will be entirely destroyed or expelled from Europe, including England of course. A minor series of operations will follow, hardly to be called a phase of the war, i.e. the finishing of the complete domination of Asia by Russian or Chinese arms. This will include the occupation of Hong Kong and Singapore, the neutralization of Pakistan, the occupation of Persia, the conquest of Turkey, and the delivering of the Jewish-American puppet formations in the Near East to the United Arab movement. A small-scale war may also be necessary to clean out completely the Jewish-American bases in North Africa. Japan will be neutral or allied to Russia.
But after this phase, the issue of victory remains undecided. The Jewish-American regime will not surrender, since the very existence of Jewry is at stake, and the whole United States and its population is there to secure the existence of Jewry.

So here is a war between continents whose armed forces have no contact, nor can they have any contact. Russia has no possibility of delivering a large army to the North American continent, Nor is it possible for America-Jewry to deliver a large army to the Eurasian continent, first because it has no such army, nor can it raise it in the numbers and quality necessary, and second, because it is impossible to mount an invasion of Eurasia from the North American continent.

Thus the only "contact" the hostile armies can have with one another is in the limited form of an intercontinental artillery duel. By these means, it is possible for neither contestant to destroy the armies of the other, since these will be widely deployed, offering no target. The only real target for intercontinental ballistic missiles is a large city. Here the United States offers a plethora of targets, and Russia few.

What is the effect of Jewish-American bombardment of Russian cities? And what is the effect vice versa? The Russian is a peasant, whether or not he tills the soil. He, is not city-oriented, even when he lives in the city. When the city is destroyed, little is destroyed, so he feels, The American, and a fortiori the Jew, is a megalopolitan, whether or not he lives in Megalopolis. When the city is destroyed, all is destroyed, so he feels. He who reads may draw his own conclusion at this point.

Next is the question of bombardment at intercontinental range by guided missiles. Since their precise degree of accuracy is a secret-secret-secret-secret matter, only common sense is available. Common sense teaches first that at thousands of miles distance no rocket can be guided to say, a factory, or within destructive range of it, and second, that against every weapon, even superior weapons, defenses, even if not complete and perfect, are always worked out. It would appear that guided missiles will be simply an auxiliary to the basic artillery, namely ballistic missiles, and will thus not be decisive.

Next is the question of bombardment by bomb-carrying aircraft. After the first phase of the war, the heaviest Jewish-American aircraft will have to take off on their bombing missions thousands of miles from their targets in Russia and Germany. These targets will be Russian rocket factories, stockpiles and launching facilities, as far as they know where these are located. On this point there is no doubt whatever that Russian counter espionage is many times as effective as that of American-Jewry. There is also little doubt that Jewish-American espionage in Russia labors under almost invincible handicaps. Thus, these aircraft will not be too well supplied with targets, and will not be decisive.

What was said above about bombardment at intercontinental range by ballistic and guided missiles applies equally well to bombardment at continental ranges by the same type of missiles, launched from ships of all types. And what was said about land-based bombing aircraft applies still, even though with less force, to bombing aircraft based on, aircraft-carrying ships. These have a shorter distance to travel, but since they cannot
destroy something whose location is unknown to them, such airplanes are no more
dangerous than Jewish-American espionage makes them.

On the point of bombardment by aircraft, Russia is thus better situated by virtue of the
superiority of its espionage, and the relative inferiority of the counter-espionage of
America-Jewry. But the fact that they have few if any aircraft carriers means that their
aircraft must fly thousands of miles before reaching the target.

We come back to the city as the target. If bombardment of cities is not decisive, no other
form of bombardment will be decisive. But it is quite clear that only in the case of
America-Jewry can bombardment of cities even possibly be sufficient for a decision to
ask for peace.

If this happens, an interesting new possibility opens up. In November 1918 Germany
surrendered to the English-led coalition, consisting of England, France, Italy, Japan,
China, India, Portugal, USA, etc. But after the surrender, England continued the
blockade, a war-measure after the war. Since the war was over, this could not be called a
means of destroying the enemy's armed forces. It was solely a means of killing civilians,
and in this blockade, continued until July 1919, a million people died of starvation in
Germany.

Now England was a civilized power, yet it continued war after surrender of its enemy.
There is thus the distinct possibility that barbarian Russia, signatory to no treaty to
mitigate the harshness of war, would continue to bombard USA after a surrender, in order
finally to eliminate it as a potential world-power, by complete destruction of its industrial
potential (which is almost entirely in cities). That which the Jewish-American-English-
French forces did in Germany after the Second World War; destruction of industrial
plants, and irrational plundering of natural resources in order to destroy them, could be
equally well done by Russia after the Third World War: further destruction of cities,
perhaps occupation (large armies might no longer be necessary) to destroy industry
systematically, on the pattern used by American-Jewish forces in Europe 1945-1950. If
there were no occupation, the forest areas could be destroyed by systematic
bombardment, converting most of the North American Continent into desert.

VI

The foregoing has assumed that Russia and China would be able completely to occupy
the Eurasiatian continent. How far is this assumption justified?

At present the Russian army is in a class by itself, being the only large army in existence
which is fully equipped with the best weapons and of good fighting quality. The Chinese
army is large, not fully, equipped, not equal to the Russian in moral qualities. The
Jewish-American army is quite inferior in size to both its enemies, extremely well
equipped, but of poor fighting quality. The German army is small, entirely without
equipment, entirely without morale. The Turkish army is small well equipped, and of
good moral quality. The Italian and French armies are both small, ill-equipped and
without morale. The English army is small, well equipped, and without morale. The Spanish army is small, not well equipped, but of good morale.

In a war between a coalition and a single power, the single power will win if other conditions are equal. A coalition must outweigh a single power. The coalition forces against Russia in Europe, however, are vastly outweighed by Russia in addition to their decisive handicap of being quite lacking in fighting morale.

The only army in the coalition of the Jewish-American forces in Europe which can be expected to fight well is the Spanish. The terrain in Spain also favors a defender. If De Gaulle is able to consolidate his regime he may neutralize France, and, as already seen, neutrality works for Russia. Not only France would be affected by such a development. Neutrality is the wish of all the peoples of Europe, and this force will definitely reach the political plane if it's given the encouragement of an example.

While it is possible that the Jewish-American forces might be able more or less to stabilize a front in France, in Spain, or in Turkey, this possibility is abstract at this moment, for the armies are neither in existence nor in a position which could stop a Russian invasion force.

Thus, the assumption that the first phase of the Third World War will develop as outlined above is one justified by the conditions of 1960.

No estimate would be complete which leaves two great political developments out of account, both of recent years. The first is the Arab Revolt, led by a great and vigorous man, Gamal Abdul Nasser. The second is the formation of nationalist, neutralist regimes by such brilliant statesmen as Marshal Jozef Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India, Field Marshal Ayub Khan of Pakistan, General Ibrahim Abboud of the Sudan, Sekou Toure of Guinea, Sukarno of Indonesia, Nkrumiah of Ghana, and others. These personalities embody an Idea, none are out for money or publicity. They live simply, work for and live for their ideas. One such man, in a position of leadership, is a world-historical force. All lead weak political units, and cannot by themselves fight either of the great world-powers. But all want independence for their people; Nasser, for example, for some 300,000,000 Moslems. Each is a symbol to great human masses. Their significance, in each case, in this Estimate, is that they diminish the Jewish-American power without augmenting the Russian-Chinese power. By their Palestine policy, the Zionists may even succeed in driving the Arab world to fight for Russia.

Eventually responsible leadership for a restive mass of some 180,000,000 Latin Americans will evolve. Already the seeds of revolt against Jewish-American economic domination have been sown. Witness Cuba.

The growing tide of neutralism in the world, is due to the political incapacity of the leadership corps of America-Jewry. If this tide rises in Europe, America-Jewry would be defeated before the war. De Gaulle is not a great man, but if he is able to gain French independence, he will immediately find himself the spiritual leader of all Europe, pygmy
though he is. De Gaulle is a cretin, but people will follow even a cretin if he embodies their deepest, most natural, instinctive feelings. De Gaulle's driving force is a vanity of super-dimensional extent. Even Churchill, the embodiment of the Idea of Vanity itself, was still content to be a Zionist executive with a front position, a big office, and a resounding title. But De Gaulle wants more: he wants to be equal to the masters who created him and blew him up like a rubber balloon. Because of the spiritual force upon which he has accidentally alighted -- the universal European desire for neutrality -- he may even succeed. An idiot might save Europe. History has seen things as strange.

VII

An unusual point among the historically-unique relationships of the Third World War is that while neither side can win -- in the classical military meaning -- neither can lose, in the classical military meaning of that word. The armies of America-Jewry cannot destroy the armies of Russia, and the armies of Russia cannot destroy the armies of America-Jewry on the North American continent. Into the middle of an Age of Annihilation Wars comes now a war in which political and military annihilation is mutually impossible to the contestants.

But in a political sense, victory is still possible. Victory means, in the Third World War, not annihilation of the opponent, but conclusion of peace on one's own terms. Speaking thus of political victory, it is clear that America-Jewry -- under the conditions of 1960 -- must lose, and Russia must win.

Russia holds the initiative, it has the moral force, it has the arsenal. America-Jewry has no moral force, completely inadequate military forces, and has moreover a military doctrine (or, perhaps, an anti-military doctrine?) according to which it does not need any military force except artillery.

This Russian preeminence is not at all owing to Russian cleverness but solely to its opponent's stupidity. To cite once more the unpublished "Possibilities of Germany" from the year 1946: "In every respect but one, Russia is superior to the enemy. Technically, America-Jewry is better prepared. The only way Russia can overcome its handicap in this respect is through German brains. In a word, Russia needs Germany." Since 1946, Russia has obediently armed itself with such rockets as Germans have made for it, and this has been its main cleverness.

It was not Russian cleverness which drove out Chiang from China, but the Jewish-American agent Marshall. Russia did not neutralize India -- The Anglo-American troops there were withdrawn by order from Washington. Russia did not occupy Eastern Germany -- America-Jewry gave it to Russia. Russia did not take the Suez Canal -- Nasser did it. Russia did not liberate Cuba -- Cubans did that. Russia is not making trouble in France for America-Jewry -- that is being done by De Gaulle, and the Communist party there has opposed him to the utmost. The Russian Communist Party in the Western European countries harms the Russian interests, and merely serves as scapegoat, bogey, and whipping boy for the Washington regime.
Russian "successes" -- except for its German-made rockets -- are all the gift of the Washington regime. Jewish-American political stupidity is invincible. But the power-gifts which the Washington regime has made to Russia are not explicable entirely by simple stupidity, simple incapacity. There is the further factor at work that the Zionist Washington regime is on both sides of most power-questions in the world. Its sole firm stand is its fundamental anti-German position: Germany must be destroyed, its young men must be slaughtered. In Algeria, Washington is on both sides: it is with the French Government, as its "ally": it is with the rebels by virtue of its world-program of "freedom" for everybody. In Egypt, the Washington regime told Palestine, England and France to attack, and when Russia rose, it told them to stop. It was, within a week, anti-Nasser and pro-Nasser. It occupied Lebanon, then evacuated. It held back Chiang when from his island, he would have attacked China with whom the Washington regime was then at war. It defended South Korea, but helped the Chinese maintain their supply line to the front. During the Chinese War in Korea, it made war and negotiated peace at the same time, for years. In Cuba it forbade exportation of arms to the loyal Batista and thus helped Fidel Castro; now it is committed to the overthrow of Castro.

It is a psychological riddle, decipherable only thus: the Zionists have two minds, which function independently. As Zionists, they are committed to the destruction of the Western Civilization, and in this they sympathize with Russia, with China, with Japan, with the Arabs, and as such they anathematize Germany, which is the mind and heart of the Western Civilization. As custodians of the United States, they must half-heartedly remain at least the technical and political domination of that Civilization even while destroying its soul and its meaning. In a word, they are working simultaneously for and against the Western Civilization. Quite obviously they are thus doing more damage than conferring benefit! If a commander of a fortress sympathizes with the enemy, but yet insists in defending the fortress rather than surrendering it, he has surely found the highest formula of destruction.

Thus the newspaper tag of "East versus West" is meaningless. It is East versus East, with the West supplying the lives and treasure for destruction.

If Russia represents the Principle of Stupidity, then Zionism represents the Principle of Malice. Of course neither of the two is without the leading characteristic of the other, but stupidity reigns in Moscow, and Malice in Washington.

The orchestra is in the pit, the spectators gape uncomprehending, the curtains rustle with expectation. The play is entitled "Where Ignorant Armies Clash by Night." Stupidity is in the lead, supported by Malice. The producer is Destruction, and the company is called The Forces of Darkness.

It is already the predetermined curtain-time. Will the drama commence on time?