TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARMINIUS: EUROPEAN CULTURE HERO
BY MERLIN MILLER
4 One of history’s greatest military strategists, he lived exactly 2,000 years ago and fought the tyrannical Romans. Thanks to Arminius the Cheruscan, the empire’s expansion was stopped in its tracks. . . .

HIDDEN TRUTH OF OUR ANCESTORS
BY DR. INGRID RIMLAND ZÜNDEL
10 Even today we must struggle against those who would hide from us the glorious struggle of Arminius and the true history of our white culture heroes. . . .

GREECE BATTLES THE SNAKE OF ZION
BY PETER PAPAHERALIS
15 We often forget Germans and Americans were not the first nations to be targeted for destruction. The “symbolic snake of Zion” first went after the Greeks. . . .

WEST STABS GREECE IN THE BACK—AGAIN
BY JOHN TIFFANY
20 In several shameful episodes, perfidious Albion and perfidious France joined forces to undermine their Greek allies, on behalf of the Ottoman Empire. . . .

KONSTANTINOS PLEVRISS: A GUTSY GREEK
A BARNES REVIEW INTERVIEW
26 Remarkable Greek author Konstantinos Plevris—a modern-day Leonidas—granted TBR a rare and candid interview we know readers will enjoy. . . .

JOHN MUIR’S LITTLE-PUBLICIZED VIEWS
BY MICHAEL A. HOFFMAN II
33 Famous environmentalist John Muir was not the flaming liberal he is generally pictured as being. You might not have heard about it, but his Christian faith was a key part of what made up this Scottish-born human dynamo and cutting-edge conservationist. . . .

HITLER DOCUMENT EXPLAINS 1941 ATTACK
BY ADOLF HITLER
35 In this address directly to the people of Germany, Adolf Hitler explains why the radical measure of invading the Soviet Union was necessary for the very survival of the West. . . .

1941: WHY DID GERMANY ATTACK RUSSIA?
BY UDO WALENDY
41 Relating to Hitler’s “Russia” proclamation is this article on how Germany’s only hope for national survival was a pre-emptive strike against the USSR, which we now know had deployed massive numbers of men and materiel for use against Europe. . . .

THE MAN WHO REWRITEd WORLD WAR II
BY DANIEL W. MICHAELS
44 Exposing the lies of Stalin, the bold Russian historian Viktor Suvorov was the first to explain what really lay behind the so-called Great Patriotic War. . . .

LEND-LEASE: STALIN’S LIFEBLOOD
BY DANIEL W. MICHAELS
50 If the American taxpayers, manipulated by the diseased FDR, had not jumped into the breach, with gigantic giveaways to the Communists, Stalin’s Mongol hordes would have gone down to defeat and the world would be a much better place today. . . .

HONORING FASCIST FATHER CAUSES STIR
BY FRANK JOSEPH
55 The Slovakian leader of World War II is not forgotten. Despite efforts of the church leadership at least one bishop still honors the great man who gave his life for his country. . . .

VALKYRIE: THE FINAL PLOT TO KILL HITLER
CAROLINE YEAGER & WILHELM MANN – PART 2
59 What kind of people were they, the plotters who intended to kill Adolf Hitler with a briefcase bomb and then to take over Germany and surrender it to the Allies? Hollywood wants us to believe they were heroes. But a closer look shows that they were about as brainless as they were gutless. . . .

A DAY AT THE BENDERBLOCK: JULY 20, 1944
BY WILHELM MANN
65 The “Bendlerblock,” the military nerve center of Berlin, is best remembered as the center of the botched attempt to overthrow the National Socialist regime of Adolf Hitler on July 20, 1944. It is also where four of the conspirators were executed by firing squad that same night, including the leader, Gen. Olbricht. . . .

Features:
Personal from the Editor: 2.
Editorial—NWO on its last legs: 3.
Arminius story to be made into film. 7.
Celebration planned for Arminius. 13.
Russian historian blames Poland. 42.
TBR Home Shopping Section. B-1 to B-6.
Barbarossa the man. 47.
Ernst Remer saves the day: 61.
History You May Have Missed: 69.
Letters to the Editor: 71.
A Time to Draw the Line

With this issue, TBR marks a remarkable occasion: It is now 15 years since the inaugural issue, in October of 1994, that we have been publishing. Happy birthday to us. Who would have imagined it possible back then? Over that period of time, many Revisionist periodicals have come and gone, but TBR, starting out on a shoestring, is still around, and is acknowledged as the biggest-circulation, and in many ways the best, of all them. Each issue is a timeless classic. In fact many readers say we seem to just get better and better.

We owe it all to our crew, at the office, our production department, our freelancers, our contributing editors, our printer and you, our faithful readers. Incidentally, we want to give a special thank-you to those of you who have purchased our poster of Revisionist superheroes. Our posters help inspire truth seekers everywhere, and the money from the sales is a big help in keeping us going. These unique posters are still available, exclusively from us, so if you want one or more of these collector’s items, see our color ad between pages 66 and 67.

We are honoring not only the Revisionist superheroes, but also others of our culture heroes. For example, another important anniversary that coincides with TBR’s own is the bimillennial anniversary of Arminius’s Battle of Teutoburg Forest, on the remarkable date of 9-9-9, which saved Germanic and Keltic civilization from Romanization. Without it, we certainly would not be speaking English today—there would never have been an English language. Shakespeare would not exist. We would probably have very little freedom, including the freedom of speech and of the press, were it not for this Germanic cultural hero.

Arminius drew a line and basically said, Roman empire, this is as far as you can go. And speaking of Germanic cultural heroes, we must give honor to Adolf Hitler, usually regarded as a monster but who saved Western civilization from the barbaric savagery of the Communist hordes and their Bolshevik leaders, as we explain in this issue.

And we have other culture heroes who also have “drawn lines”—Jozef Tiso, who stood up for Slovakia, the archbishop of Trnava, Ján Sokol, who dared to celebrate Tiso, the gutsy Konstantinos Plevris, defender of Greek civilization, the Spartans at Thermopylae, the tough, freedom-loving people of Greece down through history, and modern heroes such as Dr. Ingrid Rimland Zündel, who is publishing a wonderful book about Arminius, and her husband Ernst, in jail for asking questions and telling truths about World War II. Udo Walendy is another “line drawer” writing in this issue, and we celebrate Russian Revisionist Viktor Suvorov as well. Also we cannot forget Dr. Fredrick Töben, languishing in prison for refusing to cooperate with the dictatorial courts of the unfortunate land of Australia. There are always troublemakers who do not want you to think or speak about your knowledge of the truth.

And there are always those who will bravely “draw the line” and bravely say, “enough is enough.” Reaffirm your commitment to honest history and our cultural future by renewing your subscription to TBR and buying a gift subscription or take two. Time the take to read our special “wrapper” on why this is so important.

John Tiffany, Assistant Editor
HERE’S WHAT DIDN’T HAPPEN, but could so easily have been: In Western Europe, in the autumn of 1941: The Red Army sweeps south from Germany and France into Italy and Spain. Everywhere the NKGB imposes the bloody terror already suffered by the tortured nations of the east. Millions are rounded up—anti-Communists, former military officers, shopkeepers, land owners including small farmers, members of youth movements and cultural associations. The luckier ones are shot outright. Many more die horribly in the blood-soaked basements of Soviet interrogation centers. The rest join endless columns shuffling off to Siberia and the Gulag Archipelago. Only the prettiest girls are kept behind, alive, for now. There is an epidemic of rape. The lower ranks of the new Red puppet administrations consist mainly of sadistic criminals and psychopathic perverts, many of them Jewish. The key posts everywhere are overwhelmingly dominated by Jews. Too late, the people of Europe learn that their new masters take literally the Talmudic admonition, “The best of the ‘goyim’ [a scurrilous word for non-Jews] must be destroyed.”

How close this nightmarish scenario came to becoming reality is revealed in Russian military historian Viktor Suvorov’s definitive account of the buildup to Operation Groza (“Thunderstorm”), the Red Army’s massive assault on Germany and the rest of Europe scheduled to begin on July 6, 1941. Icebreaker, by Suvorov, details the huge scale of the lengthy Soviet preparations to attack the West. In 1939, for example, when Hitler had a total of 4,000 paratroopers ready to seize key points ahead of an advance, Stalin had more than one million. Soviet tank production dwarfed that of the rest of the world put together, but the majority of the tanks were capable of effective operation only on the good roads of Western Europe and were useless when forced onto the defensive in the backward wastes of Russia. Soviet pilots were totally untrained in aerial combat, since the German Luftwaffe was to be destroyed on the ground on Day 1 of Operation Thunderstorm.

As things turned out (as the chief of the General Staff Academy of the Armed Forces of the USSR, Gen. S.P. Ivanov, admitted in 1974), “The Nazi command succeeded in forestalling our troops, literally two weeks before the war” was supposed to begin. This was why the advancing German Wehrmacht found millions of Russia’s best troops crowded together with huge supplies of ammunition, fuel, airplanes and tanks in indefensible positions right on the frontier.

Suvorov shows clearly how Stalin came within 14 days of taking this key step along the Marxist-Leninist path to ultimately bolshevizing the world, including America. But Hitler guessed Stalin’s design. That is why WWII ended “catastrophically” for Stalin. He “only” got half of Europe (thanks to Roosevelt and Churchill), and some places here and there in Asia.

Regardless of the abuse heaped on him by the media and the establishment historians, this book proves Adolf Hitler is the savior of the West (and the East). For more on this subject see our package of articles in this issue on Viktor Suvorov, Icebreaker and Operation Barbarossa, starting on page 35.

—JOHN TIFFANY
Assistant Editor
The Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (described as the “Varus disaster” by Roman historians) took place in A.D. 9 from Sept. 9 to Sept. 11 when an alliance of Germanic tribes led by Arminius, the son of Segimer of the Cheruski, ambushed and slaughtered three entire Roman legions led by veteran warrior Publius Quinctilius Varus. The battle began a seven-year war which eventually established the Rhine as the boundary of the Roman Empire for the next 400 years, until Western Rome was completely overrun by her “barbarian” neighbors. After its defeat at Teutoburg Forest, the Roman Empire made no further concerted attempts to conquer continental Europe beyond the Rhine—although Germanicus did lead a punitive expedition to avenge Varus and bury the thousands of Roman skeletons still left on the battlefield. Teutoburg Forest has been called one of the 10 most important battles in human history and saved half of Europe from centuries of Roman domination. Above, Arminius signals his forces to attack the Romans. (For more on Arminius, see TBR November/December 2008 and TBR January/February 2000.)
Arminius was a Germanic prince, who, with the greatest distinction, served the Roman empire. He commanded their first German auxiliary cavalry and achieved the status of Roman citizen and knight (eques). As a boy, Arminius and his younger brother, Flavus, were taken to Rome and indoctrinated and trained to promote the glory of the ever-expanding Roman empire, this also being a custom of the Romans to “borrow” the sons of “barbarian” chieftains for a time for just this purpose.

But upon return to his homeland in Germania, Arminius witnessed the tyranny and oppression of his own people at the hands of the Roman occupiers. The Germanic tribes were fiercely independent and racially Nordic and not accustomed to the imposition of unfair laws, physical abuses and taxes without their consent. Justice became as foreign as the new Roman governor, Varus—a privileged, yet lecherous and loathsome tyrant. Varus was tasked by Augustus Caesar to bring Germania to her knees—in unquestioning servitude to Rome.

As a tribal noble and commander of all of the auxiliary forces in Germania, Arminius was assigned to assist the languorous, yet power-consumed governor. Arminius knew the ways of both the Romans and the Germans and became an invaluable advisor—but one torn by his sworn loyalty to Rome and his natural loyalty to his land and kinfolk, with their sense of fair play and justice.

Arminius also met and fell in love with a beautiful German princess, Thusnelda. Their love story is one of the greatest and most unbelievable in history, yet true. Thusnelda’s father, Segestes, an ambitious noble who saw the benefits of serving Rome, condemned the union and became a bitter foe to Arminius. But the young lovers defied him and eloped—setting off a string of events that changed the face of the continent.

Many of the German nobles benefited by their allegiance to Rome, but the people suffered and Arminius and his bride became acutely aware. Unlike any other, he determined to free his people from the evils of Rome, although it meant risking everything—title, wealth and family. He secretly began to organize the ever-quarrelsome tribes and planned to rid their lands of the invaders. This was an impossible task, as Rome, at the peak of her empire’s power, had several invincible legions—10,000 to 12,000 battle-hardened and well-equipped soldiers plus their many attendants—stationed in Germania. Also, the Germans were often pitted against each other, and many could not be trusted. In fact, Segestes would betray Arminius to Varus at a final banquet, exposing Arminius’ revolutionary plans, before the Romans were to leave their summer encampment for their
winter Rhine forts. But the Roman governor was so impressed by Arminius and the perceived ridiculousness of the allegation, that he did not believe the charges. Arminius had the wits and charm to turn this betrayal into a seemingly ongoing family squabble of Segestes’ resentment for the loss of his daughter.

Subsequently, during the trek, and with stunning surprise, Arminius did lead the unimaginable attack on Rome’s three best legions, totally destroying them and capturing their fallen “eagles,” in the year A.D. 9, exactly 2,000 years ago. In fact, the major fight took place on the ninth day of the ninth month of the year 9, a strangely symbolic date—9-9-9.

This defeat, regarded by authorities as one of the 10 most important battles in man’s long history, was partially enabled by Arminius’s skill at deception—learned from the Romans. But most important was Arminius’s courageous leadership ability, his keen understanding of Roman tactics and his unique familiarity with the terrain and weather—all enemies to the disciplined, yet unsuspecting Roman soldiers with their traditional formations and predictable maneuvers. The gods also favored a Germanic onslaught by bringing down a torrent of cold rain, which further demoralized the weary and confused Romans.

Arminius’s success brought peace and self-rule to his people for a time, but it was to be short lived. The Romans would return, under Tiberius Caesar’s rule, to attempt a punitive re-conquest of Germania. Arminius again rose to the occasion and led the Germanic resistance—even fighting against his own brother, who remained loyal to Rome. Flavus was more impressionable when he was sent to Rome and its grandeur and debauchery had greater effect on his dogmatic character. Their dramatic confrontation across the Weser River is one for the ages, as Arminius publicly chastised his brother as a traitor to his Volk.

Arminius’s victories and Rome’s costly campaigns for reoccupation, under General Germanicus, ultimately led to Rome’s abandonment of the conquest again, this time leaving for good. But during the most difficult times, Segestes betrayed his own daughter—allowing Germanicus to take her without a fight and aiding the Romans in her capture. She was pregnant with Arminius’s son, and they were never again to be reunited. But her noble bearing, and unwavering loyalty to her husband, were held in the highest regard by the Romans, even as she and her son

Thusnelda is paraded in front of the Roman emperor—with her father in attendance—during the triumphal celebration for Germanicus.
were paraded before the rabble of Rome in a triumphal parade.

Arminius’s story is one of love and of noble sacrifice for the most honorable of causes—the freedom of his people. He spent years trying to further unify the tribes and establish a form of nationhood, which might have enabled the return of his wife and son, but he was undermined by power-hungry rivals. Ironically, it was Roman historians who recorded the deeds of Arminius, and their writings reflect the greatest respect for their most capable and enterprising enemy—the man who utterly defeated them on more than one occasion.

Like a Greek tragedy, Arminius was eventually murdered and Germany’s unification would need to wait for many centuries. In Germany today, Arminius should be regarded as their greatest hero—an ancient-era George Washington. It was a direct result of Arminius’s defiance to the tyrannies of empire that ensured the northern half of Europe would not become Romanized, but rather Anglo-Saxonized—the impact of which would resonate throughout the world and throughout history, to the present day. However among German youth, he is virtually an unknown quantity—lost in the political correctness of an insidiously expanding modern-day globalist empire—a New World Order, which increasingly undermines traditional heroes and nationalism, not only in Germany, but throughout European-derived Western Civilizations.

**CELEBRATING HIS MEMORY**

My wife and I traveled to Germany in the summer of 2008 and visited the Hermannsdenkmal (Arminius Monument). It is a most impressive sculpture, completed in 1875, which rises above Teutoburg Forest near Detmold, Germany. Surprisingly, there were hardly any tourists, German or otherwise. It was as though he had been abandoned, waiting for the reawakening of his people. The museum in Detmold only had a small section dedicated to Arminius.

We also visited the battle site, near Kalkriese—which was discovered in 1987 through the efforts of an amateur British archeologist, who found numerous Roman coins, battle implements and other remains. A large visitor center and unseemly museum has been built, but they look as if they were designed to deter tourists, instead of welcome them.

This year, 2009, is the bimillennial German celebration of the “Varus-Schlacht” (Varus battle) fought 2,000 years ago nearly to the day. From May to October, many events are planned for all ages. Even Chancellor Angela Merkel attended the opening ceremonies in May. The Hermannsdenkmal has not seen such large numbers of visitors for decades.

During the summer, as many as 20,000 visitors came on one weekend. Many other Europeans took part in the festivities. The Hermannsdenkmal has found its day in the sun in spite of

---

### The Story of Arminius To Be Told in New Film

Arminius determined to fight the destructive influences of the Roman empire and the loss of freedoms to his people. We are now faced with a similar challenge. We must unite good people, through common cause, to fight the ongoing destruction of our way of life. America’s Founding Fathers created our Constitution, a unique document in all of history to provide for the just self-rule of an independent minded people. It is up to us to fight for it.

And that is why Americana Pictures has been founded. With funding success and inventive marketing, the company intends to circumvent the Hollywood barriers and provide a true alternative to the controlled mainstream media. We must entertain first, but we must also inspire in positive ways. *The Liberator* is a powerful screenplay written in the spirit of *Braveheart*, *Gladiator* and *The Patriot* and is a call to our people to wake from their stupor and rise in resistance to the invisible chains of our contemporary enslavement.

It is with careful consideration that Americana Pictures chose *The Liberator* as its first motion picture. Our potential is enormous, and we must create a brand name in “Americana Pictures”—a name that represents quality entertainment and stories with “heart.” Our motion pictures should be much anticipated by audiences. These audiences are a sleeping giant, long ago abandoned by Hollywood. They await our positive action. Mel Gibson paid a steep personal price, but proved, with great profitability, that we no longer need to depend on Hollywood’s distribution models—which serve as unfair barriers to quality storytellers. Mel succeeded against an industry juggernaut and helped to redefine a new and better course of action for independent filmmakers—those interested in saving this country.

So many wonderful stories need to be told. Especially missing are stories, which have positive impact on the spirit of European-derived peoples and on the well-being of our progeny. Americana Pictures will promote fresh talent and the best of traditional American ideals—as we touch the very souls of our people. Through high-quality, low-cost motion pictures, Americana Pictures is joining the fight. Today, in so many ways, America is just like Rome at the peak of its empire. Powerful, but corrupt within and set for a gigantic fall—unless the forces of good can prevail and restore the American Dream. Once again, it is time to unite the tribes.
videogames, i-pods, Facebook and other useless diversions. Three museum exhibits explaining Hermann’s battle to defeat the Romans will educate and inspire the public and reinforce the importance of the victory to Germans and all peoples of European descent. Even schoolchildren are learning about this great culture hero. It seems, despite unrelenting attempts to suppress it, the German spirit is reborn.

THE NEW ROME

In America, as in ancient Rome, we have been transitioning from a Republic to an Empire—and it is also destroying us. Like the Roman army, our military is spread very thin, trying to maintain forces in over 130 countries. We are fighting unjust and undeclared wars, and the cost in human life, ill will and financial indebtedness cannot be forever maintained.

Like the Roman Senate, our Congress also serves special interests rather than the interests of our people—creating an atmosphere of injustice and imbalance. Unconstitutional laws are being enacted daily, which further restrict our individual rights and pit various entities against each other by granting favored status to select groups.

Government has grown well beyond our Constitutional guidelines and a surreptitious police state is developing. Our currency is collapsing under the weight of the Federal Reserve’s unethical and unconstitutional interest charges and our government has gone on a socialist spending spree—with a philosophy of spreading the wealth and destroying any sense of personal or governmental responsibility. We are outsourcing our productivity through unfair trade agreements and the middle class is disappearing. Times as challenging as those faced by Arminius loom fatefully ahead for an unsuspecting America.

Like ancient Rome, we have become a multicultural, multiracial nation of immigrant servants and dependent wards—many of whom do not wish to assimilate with our traditional national identity. America’s “empire,” controlled by a select and self-ordained few, appears to be forcing the furtherance of a New World Order, which will totally destroy all national sovereignties and lead to a borderless, globalist “Third World” where the masses are governed by a parasitic ruling elite—Rome revisited. Bizarre, to be sure—but throughout history, the quest for wealth and power has led ruthless men to conspire for their own gain. The result has usually been wars and famine, profiting a few and destroying the many. And today, the potential for a global armageddon is greater than ever.

Over the last one hundred years, the most effective enabler for empire builders has been the media. In all forms—motion pictures, television, radio and print—the public has been fed an increasing diet of false or superficial news and increasingly decadent entertainment. In Roman times, the masses were sim-

HARSH ROMAN RULE

The scene above, carved onto the column of Marcus Aurelius in Rome, depicts captured Germanic leaders being forced to decapitate fellow Germanic leaders. Armed Romans on horseback supervise the grisly scene. The Romans, in order to control the vast territories they had conquered, crushed resistance and killed or sold into slavery all who did not obey. Anyone who resisted was abused as an example. The Romans were a contradictory people—unspeakably cruel and debauched in many cases, but compassionately democratic. They were barbaric yet civilized, creative and intellectual. One reads of acts of great cruelty committed by masters against their slaves in the later Republican and early Imperial periods. Yet there was also compassion to be found among the Romans: A constitution of Claudius enacted that if a man abused his slaves, who were infirm, they should become free; and the constitution also declared that if they were put to death, the act would be murder. It was also enacted that in sales or division of property, related slaves, such as husband and wife, parents and children, brothers and sisters, should not be separated. Today statues of native leaders such Vercingetorix in France or Arminius in Germany honor patriots who battled against Roman domination in Europe.
ilarly entertained with violent and debasing diversions including life-and-death spectacles of all sorts at the local coliseum. When you can control the minds of the masses, you can convince them that any falsehood is true and any truth is false. You can also excite them to action—through manipulative intrigues.

The most effective forms of propaganda are usually cloaked in entertainment and through a steady process of indoctrination, we adopt beliefs and attitudes that are often contrary to our own best interests and nature. If we ask why the family unit is failing, faith is disappearing, ethnic identity is shunned and nationalism is scorned, the answer lies with the overwhelming effects of a mainstream media that is totally owned and controlled by a small, but cohesive group—dedicated to our destruction. Hollywood has a definite agenda, which serves internationalists’ designs and is determined to undermine traditional American values and all that we hold dear—including; family, faith, ethnic identity and national sovereignty.

WHERE ARE OUR HEROES?

Where are our heroes today? Why do we only worship anti-heroes, who promote decadence and despair? Why do our youth know so much more about Michael Jackson, Anna Nicole Smith and Madonna than real heroes? The answer most definitely lies with this controlled media—a great weapon—greater in power than all the legions of Rome. Our people need positive role models again. We need heroes—brave and honorable—who are willing to fight for truth, justice and liberty. We must be willing to sacrifice, as Arminius did, for the preservation of freedom and an honorable way of life.

The Externsteine rocks are a distinctive formation located in the Teutoburg Forest region of northwestern Germany, not far from the city of Detmold. The formation consists of several tall, narrow columns of sandstone thrust up from the surrounding woods. The Externsteine are a natural outcropping of five pillars, the tallest of which is about 120 feet high. Together they form a wall of about 600 feet, in a region that is noticeably devoid of other rock formations. It is believed that the Externsteine were a center of religious activity for the Teutonic peoples and their predecessors prior to the arrival of Christianity in northern Europe. It is also said that Arminius prayed to the gods of his ancestors at the Externsteine before the great battle at Teutoburg Forest in A.D. 9.
Some of us, fearless or foolish enough to call ourselves Revisionists at a time when conformity is the prevailing *modus operandi*, are thinking of charting alternative ways to heal ourselves from falsehoods. Like many maxims that we used to take for granted but lately learned to question, perhaps the time has come to question this one, too. Just who might have an interest in keeping our spirits lethargic, in keeping us from learning who we are, where we come from, what we are really all about? Your guess is as good as mine.

Perhaps the very opposite is true. If we would ever see a truthful portrait of our past and trace our steps back to our exceptional forebears—what they believed, what powered them, why they would gamble on the muscle of the racial spirit that waxed and waned, according to the challenges of time—perhaps we might yet discover the Fountain of Youth. By that I mean not only beauty of body and infinite health but racial youth, ancestral energy, political vigor, the everyday gusto of living that comes with *volkish* cohesion.

I say that one way to find back to our roots is to cherish our myths that give us a mock-up of heroes for us to emulate. Today, we live in an era depleted of myths and of heroes to nourish our souls, and it shows. We are yearning inside without knowing what it is that we lack. We feel vaguely that there is “something” we are missing, but our longing for that “something” does not even have a name. Science helps us to understand parts of the real world—to wit, that healthy soil needs minerals to keep bodies from getting too flabby, but few of us have even an inkling that our souls will grow anemic if there is lack of proper food-stuff for the spirit. To simplify a complex need, let me propose that we need cryptograms in our folkish memory of heroes of our past, to be called forth as models we can emulate in times of mortal combat.

Few people are aware a war is waged against Western societies’ myths, as real as a war using cannons. We are in the midst of wall-to-wall war against spirit. The weapons against the folkish spirit are ridicule, demonization, derision, mockery, slander and scorn. We all feel the assault, day in and day out, but we can’t seem to reach for our weapons of defense. Clarity of strategy against covert assault aggressively destroying the very essence of our being is a rare commodity these days.

Yet souls have to breathe, and myths provide the oxygen. Where there’s no oxygen, there is no life as we know it. Nature instructs by example that all things that have life “want” to live. A life force exists—perhaps that is why helpful legends persist and myths refuse to die. Our myths are ours for the asking to rekindle the spiritual flame—if only we know what they are. They are our folkish treasure and need to be passed on—more so in times of insidious spiritual malaise.

One such is the saga of an extraordinary man called “Arminius” in books not yet forbidden but hardly known and cherished. Some politically incorrect Germans of the olden mold still call him “our Hermann”—fearful of even uttering the phrase without having to look over their shoulders. For such is the clout and command of PC in much of our Western world infested by an alien spirit that passes for our “pal.”
How is it possible that we have become so washed-out as a people? That this has happened was no accident—in Germany it even has a name. It’s called re-education.

Who was Arminius, this mythical hero of our past we are hoping to bring to the screen? I was “introduced” to him, though not by name and only as a fleeting phantom, as a small, hungry child in postwar Germany. I sat by the window of an unheated room in a small village near Detmold, Westfalia—and if I strained hard and squinted to see better, for I was born severely nearsighted, I could “see” a towering statue in the far distance on a mountain range called the **Teutoburg Forest**. It was November 1946—the sky outside was dreary. Mama sat on our raggedy couch, Oma to her left, my little sister, Wally, on her lap, all three as cold and as hungry as I.

“If we could climb the mountain and gather beechnuts, 11 pounds would trade us a liter of oil,” announced Mama.

This was a time when all of what was left of Germany was rubble, its people struggling to survive on hunger rations—as I remember it, 900 calories a day. Our staple food was potatoes that we kept at night in our beds—that’s right, beneath our blankets.—so that they would not freeze and, thus, become inedible. Our food ration coupons allowed us to trade for some very salty fish—**Buecklinge**, we called them.¹ (*Nomen est omen*—“the name is fitting”—now that I think of it, a “**Bueckling**” is not just a smoked herring; it’s how you genuflect or bow. . . .) Even with food, the Allies kept Germans on a very short leash. I remember very little else we ever had to eat for three long postwar years except, in my case, a once-a-day watery cereal our one-legged teacher ladled into my rusty can in a school for the gifted in Detmold.

**Segestes was a noble of the Germanic tribe** of the Cheruski who openly sided with the Romans in their attempts to conquer northern Germany during the reign of Emperor Augustus. Segestes turned against Arminius when Germanicus invaded northern Germany in A.D. 15 in a renewed attempt to establish Roman rule in the area. Besieged in his stronghold by his own countrymen, Segestes appealed for help to Germanicus, who relieved him, and Segestes then handed over his pregnant daughter Thusnelda, Arminius’ wife, to Germanicus as a prisoner. That moment is shown in the detailed engraving shown above.
I asked him once where his other leg was, and he said he had left it in Russia.

"On the bloody eastern front of that unholy war," is how he put it quietly. I pondered that. His voice was calm, but his face was grim. "You are precocious," he added wistfully and put a heavy hand on my head.

I tucked a brand new word ("precocious") away into my treasure trove of words that helped me make sense of my world. I was 10 years old and had hardly ever been to school, a skinny refugee from Soviet Russia. Today I know that teacher was an angel in disguise. He was reluctantly PC, because only those Germans who kowtowed to the Allied version of the war were allowed to be teachers.

That one-legged teacher gave me something priceless. He let me know that being "precocious" translated to an obligation to make something useful of myself. I did not understand it then, but now I know that this was done by means of an abiding respect for the myths and past heroes of our culture, because all earthly goods had vanished irrevocably in the mountains of war rubble. Myths were to be the firewood for our minds and souls to help us forget we were hungry.

Thus our one-legged teacher, whose name I have unfortunately forgotten, taught us the myths of our ancient past such as the Iliad, the Odyssey and a fantastic chronicle, the Nibelungenlied, the story of a handsome hero who fearlessly confronted a dragon, decapitated him with his sharp sword, then took a bath in the dragon's blood to make himself invincible—except for one small spot between his shoulder blades, where an oak leaf had landed and stuck to his skin. That was the spot, we learned, where he was stabbed by his "best friend" and follower, a member of his tribe turned traitor.

The name of this hero was "Siegfried"—translated literally, "peace after victory." (Sigurd in Scandinavia.)

To come back to Mama’s plan for us to gather beech tree seeds so we could fry up our precious potatoes with honest-to-goodness, real oil: One dreary afternoon, we braved the clammy misery outside, the four of us, to climb the mountain near where the statue stood depicting a Germanic hero of the long-ago past. I remember that day very well. A thick carpet of wet, decaying beech leaves covered the slopes. An icy wind howled through our coats, and then it started to snow. It is a memory too dismal to even describe.

We didn’t last long. In a matter of minutes, my little hands were frozen, and I started to wail, as loudly as I could. Poor Oma was gray in the face. Wally, five years of age, had a terribly runny nose. Mama collapsed on a stump. I don’t think we even gathered one measly pound of those slimy beechnuts—it was just too hard and too daunting. Defeated, we slunk back into our unheated apartment consisting of two tiny rooms, where the four of us crept into blankets in one huddled heap to thaw out. To this day, our brief foray to the foot of that stately monument of Hermann der Cherusker is painful to recall.

### JUMP TO PARAGUAY

New sequence and new setting: The place was a religious colony called Volendam, in the depths of the Paraguayan jungle where 1,900 Russian-German Mennonites had landed on a rickety river barge in 1948 at Puerto Mbopicua, translated “Cave of Bats.” And no wonder. It was the opposite of what we left behind—unbearably hot, prickly, infested with insects galore, devoid of water fit for drinking, intellectually a wasteland of thorns.

There I spent several years, a teenager so hungry by then, not for potatoes but for some nourishment for my young mind, I thought that I would lose my bearings. Don’t ask me why or how—but I became a storyteller. Many a night my young friends and I would gather under paraiso trees where I would regale them with snippets of the Nibelungenlied and the amazing hero who had slain a dragon and bathed in his blood—and then, because of this one vulnerable spot between his shoulder blades, he lost his glorious life to a dreadful traitor of his tribe. When I made my friends cry, I was proud. That’s what it meant to be precocious. I had an identity. See?

Spin forward 60 years, four decades of which I spent on this continent. I hardly ever thought of Siegfried anymore except in passing, and it was only recently that I discovered that the dash- ing hero of my youth called "Siegfried" was actually a mythic transformation of Arminius, the man who drove the Romans out of what is now called Germany and whose magnificent statue still towers to this day above the Teutoburg Forest.

By then, I had become an ethnic novelist, and Ernst, my husband, in a German prison for speaking truth to power, kept urging me to do a documentary about a legendary German prince because an anniversary was coming up, and our folk, he pointed out, were starved of truthful history and needed a bona fide hero. Only then, maybe two years ago, did I realize that the saga of "Arminius" aka "Hermann der Cherusker" who lived 2,000 years ago, gave birth to the myth around the Nibelungenlied and “Siegfried”—"born" after a thousand years had passed.

I stand in awe of the power and longevity of myth. The hunger of our people for heroes has kept that myth alive.
In our day and age, where we no longer know our roots and our ancestry, it is politically incorrect to state with pride and admiration that one of “us,” a talented composer, Richard Wagner, transformed myth into music in the late 19th century. I bet you know the reason why that amazing gift for our cultural treasure trove by one of our own is hardly known to your young—its force of emotion brought tears to a much-maligned dictator’s eyes.

There is another word I love—it’s “serendipity.” Webster’s Dictionary defines it as “the faculty for making desirable discoveries by accident.” It must have been that faculty that led an experienced motion picture producer to me, or vice versa. His name is Merlin Miller. We started having intense meetings about what it might take to make Arminius come alive on a motion picture screen. Between us, we had little other than a dream, but a lot of faith in the power of myths—and our people.

You are invited to have a front seat. There is still an inherent magic in myths. If it catches on, we are on our way. Since this myth has already endured 2,000 years, we won’t let it die in America. It is up to all of us to make it come alive in the hungry souls of our people.

A COLORFUL CAST OF CHARACTERS:

ARMINIUS, a handsome prince of the Cheruskan tribe, the classic leader of a suppressed, downtrodden people. Re-educated by the Romans as a child with a false history, he is sent back to Germany to do the Romans’ bidding. Will he succeed? Or will he be brought low by his own tribal members’ treachery and perfidy?

Arminius, as I see him on the screen, will be a marvel of charisma, youth, good looks, a man of principles, a very quick study. Though badly mistaught by his people’s occupiers, who hope to use him for their own benefit to keep his own people enslaved, he still has the leadership instincts he needs. Watch him unite his folk.

His counterpart is VARUS, the Roman governor sent to Germany to run the occupation. He is the jolly tyrant who will smile jovially while hoarding his ill-gotten gains. Varus exemplifies the stereotype of a dishonest bureaucrat, bloated with wealth, corrupt to the core yet limp and flabby of spirit.

MARBOD, King of the Markomanni, a neighbor of the Cheruskans. We see a self-made man, selfish and hungry for power, easily threatened, unwilling to share.

SEGESTES, a Cheruskan nobleman. Segestes is the craven creature compromising for the benefit of Rome, doing its bidding, drooling subservience. Segestes will walk over corpses to get where he intends to go. He is willing to rape his own spirit to stay there.

TIBERIUS, emperor of Rome and the richest man on earth. Tiberius is a cold and calculating ruler, incapable of giving or receiving love, paranoid to the hilt—yet a superbly practiced
Roman strategist who has that rare capacity to discern where the limits of power might be.

INGOMER, uncle of Arminius—your stereotype turncoat, thrown off his haunches as a candidate to legitimate succession as the designated leader of his tribe when a young and determined Arminius arrives at the scene.

THUSNELDA, wife of Arminius. She is the quintessential Aryan woman—highly intuitive, utterly loyal, steadfast in good times and bad, willing to sacrifice her happiness for the man she respects and adores.

FLAVUS, brother of Arminius—a devoted supporter of Rome. Flavus repeats every platitude that Rome puts in his mouth, unaware that he is merely a pawn in the game.

GERMANICUS, supreme military commander of the Roman army and fleet. Your typical invading psychopath—bloodthirsty, reckless, arrogant, determined to run down and sully the Germanic tribes he despises. To his own detriment, he doesn’t factor in Arminius who fights as though there is no tomorrow—and gets the upper hand.

Let us do likewise, friends. There won’t be a tomorrow for us and our children, unless we get the upper hand by reclaiming our heroes—and with our heroes to emulate, our rightful place in the sun.

ENDNOTES:

1 Kippers.—Ed.
2 Known in America as Texas umbrella tree or chinaberry tree, among other common names. The scientific binomial is Melia azedarach.—Ed.
F ew military battles stand out as brightly in the history of Western civilization as the Battle of Thermopylae, fought in 480 B.C. Its importance lies on several levels, not least of which was the bravery of Leonidas and the 300 Spartans. Knowing that they had no chance against the Persian army, 1,000-10,000 times greater in numbers, the Spartans nevertheless fought valiantly till the end, for their gods, country, race and family. Even though every single one of them perished, their struggle was not in vain. Their bravery inspired the Greeks to band together and give it their all to decisively destroy the Persian superpower and send the Persians home licking their wounds.

Several generations later, another great Greek, Alexander of Macedonia, put the whole issue to rest by conquering the Persian empire and most of the known world at that time, spawning the Hellenistic Age, which defined Western Civilization for over 300 years.
years until the Romans took over and continued on a similar path of basically Hellenistic values for another 500 years.

Another significant outcome of the Greek victory against Xerxes and his Persians was that in the wake of that victory in 480 B.C. the Greeks produced the “Golden Age” of Pericles.

Much of what we know and admire about classical Greece happened between 480 and 429 B.C., including building the Parthenon. Philosophy, science, democracy and the arts found their ultimate expression during that period.

Socrates lived at that time. He tutored Plato, who in turn tutored Aristotle, who molded the psyche of Alexander the Great, and laid the cornerstone of Western Civilization for the next two millennia. Civilization as we know it would not have developed had the Persians defeated the Greeks in 480. This is the ultimate significance of the Battle of Thermopylae.

A BIBLICAL PERSPECTIVE

Now let’s look at history from a parallel perspective of those times. Let’s examine it from a biblical perspective.

The proto-Jews, perhaps better referred to as Israelites, at that time were under what they refer to as the “Persian captivity.” The Persians, being the superpower of the time, were that period’s link in a chain of several “captors” the Jewish “race” has experienced.

There was the Egyptian captivity, the Babylonian captivity, the Roman captivity and other captivities and persecutions under the Christian era until their alleged “genocidal persecution” under the “Hitlerian captivity.”

Because of those so-called captivities they felt justified in their books for exacting revenge on their captors and instituting national holidays to commemorate their devious victories against them.

The holiday of Passover commemorates their revenge on the Egyptians and the death of tens of thousands of innocent Egyptian children. That of Purim celebrates their revenge in the massacre of 70,000 Persians. The latter story is told in the infamous Book of Esther.

The story of Esther is set at approximately 500 B.C.—the height of the golden age of Greece. The king’s name is Ahasuerus, and when I first read the story I presumed that it was complete fiction because no such king existed historically.

But upon examining the King James Bible closely it is clearly spelled out that King Ahasuerus and Xerxes are one and the same. If so, the king who sent his massive army to destroy the Greeks in 480 B.C. was the same king Esther was married to.1

In a nutshell, the book tells the story of Esther, who was orphaned and adopted by her relative Mordecai, at a young age. [Esther was the daughter of Avichayil, who was the uncle of Mordechai. Thus the girl was Mordechai’s cousin.—Ed.]

She was extremely beautiful, and I shudder to think what her relationship to cousin Mordecai was like in light of Talmudic references to attitudes toward infant girls.

Nevertheless, Mordecai managed to capitalize on his young cousin’s beauty and promoted her to become King Ahasuerus’ queen while she secretly remained loyal to Mordecai and concealed her Jewish background.

So Mordecai, a champion of Judaism, was his cousin’s puppet master who in turn had access to the king’s ear. The king had succumbed to her irresistible beauty while being ignorant of her Jewish faith and her cousin’s string-pulling behind the scenes.

When Haman, the king’s prime minister, discovered a Jewish fifth column within the king’s court and planned to eradicate it in the interest of patriotism, Mordecai intervened and had his cousin convince the gullible king that Haman was the real traitor, at which time the king, blinded by his traitorous queen’s sexual manipulations, had Haman sent to the gallows instead, along with 70,000 of his loyal soldiers and lieutenants.

CELEBRATE MASSACRE

The Jews celebrate this act of treacherous massacre down to today in their holiday of “Purim,” where they eat bread shaped like (as they imagine it) Haman’s ears to rejoice in the slaughter of 70,001 human beings.

According to some experts, it was the same Queen Esther through the control of Mordecai who surely was an agent of the Pharisees, Sadducees or whatever form united Jewry took at that time, that coerced King Ahasuerus /Xerxes to attack the Greeks in 480 B.C.

Xerxes’ ancestors, Cyrus the Great and Darius the Great, had created the great empire of which he found himself the heir. Clearly he was in over his head in his attempt to maintain that empire. The perfidious Jews understood that all too well.

But Persia and Egypt were by no means the only “enemies” in the view of the ancient Jews. There are old Jewish documents that declare “eternal hatred by the children of Israel toward the children of Hellas” (Greece). I’m not quite sure what the root of that hatred is. It probably transcends recorded history and goes back to the “Elohim” and the “Nephelim,” God and Lucifer, the forces of light and darkness, good and evil.

The Greeks represent the white race and Western Civilization and non-Judaic thinking. The Jews seem to be of another race,
inimical to the Aryan race, with creeds mired deep in Judaic lore. They seem to have an agenda of world domination through stealth, deceit and financial conquest.

We see their hidden hand of subversion since antiquity throughout history and into the present day.

**SNAKE OF ZION**

The “Protocols of the Elders of Zion” detail that plan at the stage it was at the end of the 19th century.

Although the Jews have declared the Protocols a forgery, there have been similar documents discovered throughout history, such as the little-known “Aylva Curiose” of 1492 and others, which are very similar in their declared goals and means of attaining them—and completely authenticated.

There is also a very interesting section of “The Protocols” as published by Sergius Nilus in 1905 (presumably written in 1881) called “The Symbolic Snake of Judaism.”

This section which was an epilogue to the 40 or so pages detailing the 24 Protocols, is itself only a couple of pages long, but is very revealing in that it lays out the Jewish plan of world domination since its inception in the days of the legendary Solomon in 900 B.C.

It explains how a secret plan has been laid out since that time by a handful of initiated Jews for the “peaceful” conquest of the whole universe by Zion.

They would accomplish this with the slyness of the Symbolic Snake of Judaism, whose head represents those initiated into the cult. The body represents the ordinary Jewish people, who themselves are not aware of the secret plans of the elite, but are merely foot soldiers (sayanim) for the plan.

The symbol for this snake has been the “Ouroboros snake,” a circle created by the snake consuming its own tail.

Inside the circle are the countries of Europe that the snake is to conquer through any means necessary, undermining all the non-Jewish power within those states by economic means.

When the snake has completed its “work of ages” it will return to Zion, from where it will rule the world.

There was a map drawn at the time this was written (presumably 1881) charting the course the snake had traversed up to that time with the head pointing toward its next victim which at that time was St. Petersburg and Russia in general.

One can’t help but think of what happened in Russia 36 years later. [See TBR September/October 2008.—Ed.]

An interesting thing is to see the snake’s victims prior to that,
going back to antiquity. The first victim they boasted of was Greece in 429 B.C. in the age of Pericles, in Athens. The second stage was in Rome in the time of Augustus in 69 B.C. The third stage, in Madrid, took place in the time of Charles V, in A.D. 1552. The fourth stage, in Paris, took place about 1790, in the time of Louis XVI. The fifth stage, in London, was denoted from 1841 onward (after the downfall of Napoleon). The sixth stage, in Berlin in 1871, after the Franco-Prussian War. The seventh stage, over Russia, as mentioned earlier.

However, it is shocking to see that they boasted of the destruction of Athens in 429 B.C. What happened in 429 B.C. in Athens? I looked into it and found out that it was the Peloponnesian War, between Sparta and Athens—and the plague.

PELOPONNESIAN WAR

Here was Athens at the peak of its glory, 50 short years after its monumental victory over the Persians, embroiled in a war with Sparta, the other great power in Greece whose nationalistic pride and bravery had saved the day against the Persians.

What had gone wrong?

And how could the Jews, an insignificant nation in Asia, boast of having achieved this war?

The traditional history of the causes of the Peloponnesian Wars did not seem to explain anything about Jewish involvement, or even remotely mention anything about the Jews.

However, some reading about how money was then and what it has come to be today, since the days of the barter system, provides some clues. To understand the power that rules the world, inevitably one has to understand money.

The whole subject is mired with conceptual pitfalls, and is really meant to be confusing because that confusion is what gives the money creators their enslaving power.

This essay was not meant to go into a long dissertation about the illusion of money, and the subject at hand cannot fully explain the deceit in a few short paragraphs. Suffice it to say that the prerogative of money creation has to rest with the king or sovereign, who represents his people.

When that power is taken away by private interests, the king becomes their puppet and ceases to represent the interests of his people.

Sparta at the time of Leonidas had not yet succumbed to the death of Pericles. It is interesting that the “Protocols” specifically state the year 429 B.C. was the year they destroyed Athens. The Peloponnesian wars actually started in 431 B.C. The Spartans were superior by land, but the Athenians dominated the seas. The Athenians’ plan was to barricade themselves within the city walls which included Piraeus, their port. The Spartans had surrounded the city and burned all the fields and orchards, but could not breach the city walls. The Athenians had stockpiled supplies within the walls and would replenish them with new supplies brought from around the Mediterranean with their ships. Wheat, a basic staple, was brought from Egypt, a major grain exporter in antiquity. In 430 B.C., Athens was struck with a plague. Similar to the bubonic plague of medieval Europe, it killed one-third of all Athenians and completely demoralized the city, over a two- or three-year period. Furthermore, unprecedented lawlessness and chaos became rife. People weren’t sure if they would be the next victims of the fatal disease. Whether it was the Spartans, the plague or the 429 death of Pericles (pictured above) that caused it, the result was that Athens would never again rise to the glory it enjoyed during the Age of Pericles.
the machinations of the international bankers and moneylenders, who were already at work trying to convince the powers of that time to accept gold and silver coins, of which they controlled the supply, for use in international trade.

Because of Sparta’s use of primitive locally produced money during Leonidas’s time, the values of religion, race, country and family remained strong and uncorrupted.

Once private interests take control over money creation, they can easily influence national policy by debt control, and turn one nation toward war with another.

War is always the biggest moneymaker for the bankers and the fastest way to get a nation deeper in debt and further under their financial control.

As Amschel Rothschild famously said: “Give me control of a nation’s money supply and I care not who makes its laws.”

A great book on this subject is the late David Astle’s *The Babylonian Woe*, which sheds a lot of light on the subject of money in general and in ancient Greece in particular. What I have attempted to explain in a few sentences, Astle devotes the whole book to illustrate in detail. With poetic insight and depth he makes clear how we have been unwittingly corrupted since antiquity by the Money Power, through liberalism, luxury peddling, cosmopolitanism and pride.

In short, once the Greeks agreed to accept a commodity over which foreign interests maintained control, they were soon at that interest’s mercy.

In summary, Jews like Esther and Mordecai have been at work deceiving emperors and kings for much longer than we think. But as the metaphor of the Symbolic Snake of Judaism illustrates, the real Satanic Power is the head of the snake, which clearly is, has been and will be the “international bankers.”

The real challenge is to understand “the nature of their game.”

ENDNOTES:
1 Some authorities think the “Ahasuerus” of the Bible may instead represent Artaxerxes I. There is no historical evidence that there ever was a Jewish queen of Persia.—Ed.
2 Available from TBR BOOK CLUB, 645 Pennsylvania Ave. SE, Washington, D.C. 20003, hardback, 250 pages, $15, $20; call 1-877-773-9077 to use Visa or MC.
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UNCENSORED MODERN GREEK HISTORY

STABBED IN THE BACK: THE WESTERN BETRAYAL OF GREECE

Greece today is a tiny country, about 1/70th the size of the 48 Contiguous States of the U.S.A. At one time, however, under Alexander the Great of Macedonia, Greece ruled much of the known world. Greece is, of course, the mother country of Western civilization. But that has not stopped the West from betraying the Greek people, more than once. Perhaps it all goes back to the Jews, or their forerunners, singling out the Greeks as their “enemy No. 1.”

By John Tiffany

Allegedly, the controversial Learned Elders of Zion thought out a scheme in theory for a conquest of the whole planet as early as 929 B.C.¹ See The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion. Protocol III opens with a reference to the Symbolic Snake (Ouroboros) of Judaism.²

A map of the course of the Symbolic Snake is shown as follows: Its first stage in Europe was in 429 B.C. in Greece, where, about the time of Pericles, Ouroboros first started eating into the power of that country. The second stage was in Rome, in the time of Augustus, about 69 B.C.

The Peloponnesian Wars, lasting 27 years, began in 431. Sparta was the winner over Athens. But its aftermath left a vacuum that prompted the rise of Macedonia.

Rome, as we know, conquered Greece militarily in 197 B.C., and again, finally, in 146 B.C., making it into the Roman province of Achaea.

However, culturally Greece may be said to have conquered Rome and remained a source of annoyance to the Jews for thousands of years. Rome in turn went downhill and collapsed in the mid-5th century. But the eastern part of the empire survived as Greek Byzantium for another thousand years or so, until 1453. Then the Turkish empire arose, and Greece went into eclipse.

The Turks are a branch of the Aschin Huns, or Kushuns, a Mongol tribe that nearly defeated the Roman empire. After A.D. 552, they controlled all the Central Asian tribes for about 100 years. In the 1000s they seized Persia (modern Iran), and then took over Asia Minor, which was mostly Greek at the time.

The Greeks rose against the Ottoman Turks in 1821 and declared independence in January 1822. For the next five years, Greeks fought against Turkish efforts to regain control of Greece, and many Europeans and Americans sympathized with the Greek struggle for freedom. In 1827, Greece received the belated support of Britain, France and Russia, and the Turkish fleet was defeated at the Battle of Navarino, off the Peloponnesus, October 20, 1827.

Later Greece gained the Ionian Islands, inhabited by ethnic Greeks, from Britain, in 1864, and gained Thessaly from Turkey in 1881, as a result of the Congress of Berlin. In 1897, Greece
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tried to seize the island of Crete from Turkey, where members of the Greek Orthodox Church had revolted against the Ottomans, but was defeated. It is said that only the assistance of Russia, Britain, Austria-Hungary and Germany saved Greece from complete ruin at that time.

The Balkan Wars followed: In 1912, Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Montenegro formed an alliance against Turkey and defeated the Turks in two separate wars in 1912 and 1913. Greece at this time won much of Macedonia and many Aegean islands, including Crete.

THE FIRST BETRAYAL: THE HOLOCAUST IN SMYRNA

When World War I broke out in 1914, Greece declared complete neutrality. The people were largely sympathetic with Britain and France, while the Greek royal family was tied to the German royals. So-called liberals, led by Eleutherios Venizelos, overthrew King Constantine and put his (evidently more pliable) son Alexander on the throne. Under the guidance of Premier Venizelos, Greece entered the war on the side of the so-called Allies and fought Turkey and Bulgaria.

One of the reasons put forth by the Greek government for launching its Asia Minor expedition was that there was a sizable Greek Christian population inhabiting Anatolia that needed protection from the Turks. Greeks have lived in Asia Minor since antiquity, and before the outbreak of World War I, up to 2.5 million Greeks lived in the Ottoman lands.

Fear for the safety of the Greek population was not ill founded. In 1915, an extremist group called the Young Turks, allegedly Jewish controlled, enacted genocidal policies against minorities in the Ottoman empire, slaughtering hundreds of thousands of Armenians alone (according to some authorities, 1.5 million were killed). While the Armenian massacre is the best known of these events, there were also atrocities against ethnic Greeks in Pontus and western Anatolia.

World War I ended in November 1918, on the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month. After World War I, the peace settlement awarded the city of Smyrna (Izmir) to Greece. This city in Asia Minor had been a Greek colony since hundreds of years B.C.

By 1919 the ruling classes of the former “Allies” were unsure as to how to proceed. They had little to no military presence in Asia Minor, but felt that Kemal Ataturk’s Turkish rebels, who
wanted to take back what Turkey had lost, and who had close ties with the murderers of the Armenians, had to be contained. (Ataturk himself was Jewish.)

On the other hand, they wanted no part of having to call their troops back into action, especially after just sending them home. Politically it was out of the question. Besides, wasn’t World War I supposed to have been “the war to end all wars”?

Britain’s rulers proposed that the Greek army should be deployed into Smyrna to secure the area and deal with any rebel outbreaks during the interim. The so-called Allies (described by wags as the “All-Lies”) would have to fund this operation and supply the munitions, as Greece was neither financially nor logistically capable of mounting such a campaign on its own.

On the morning of May 15, 1919, Greek troopships made their way into Smyrna harbor amid happy crowds of ethnically Greek well-wishers. They were greeted at the quay with blue-and-white Greek flags and a blessing from Smyrna’s Metropolitan Chrysostomos. Many Greek parts of Turkey welcomed the news with great joy and envisioned the prospect of better days. However, this move also served to rouse the rebels to a fever pitch.

Surprisingly, the Greek army did well, winning nearly every skirmish with the rebels and increasing their territory month by month. This caused much consternation among the “Allies,” especially France and Italy, whose ruling classes had no intention of seeing Asia Minor become Greek controlled. Their vision was of dominating Asia Minor, to cash in on its resources, but this greedy dream was fading. So they flip-flopped and sought a way to withdraw their support of the Greeks.

Meanwhile, back in Greece proper, as it happened, the Greek people, tired of war, voted Venizelos out of office and put the old king back on the throne (his son had died). The so-called Allies seized upon this situation as an excuse to cut off their support of the Greek army.

From that moment on the Allies styled themselves as “neutral observers” and cast the struggle in Asia Minor as merely an unfortunate Greco-Turkish war. The Greek soldiers were soon thereafter to find spent shell casings on the battlefield, coming from Turkish positions, bearing French markings. Italy and France had in fact been making profitable deals with Kemal for some time, secretly supplying the Turks with materiel, behind the backs of their former allies.

The Greeks nonetheless managed to hold off the rebels for another year, without benefit of Allied supplies. So, as the Greeks weakened, Kemal’s forces were being fortified.

With the interior now under rebel control, Kemal’s stated objective, “to push all of the Christians into the sea,” was at hand. The Greek front collapsed on August 26, 1922, and the Turkish irregulars, called the chettes (“volunteers”), invaded the city of Smyrna on September 9, in a frenzy of rape, murder, mutilation and holocaust, setting the city ablaze as they went (except for the Turkish quarter). The onslaught went on for days. Desperate parents hurriedly disguised their daughters as boys, praying they would escape the ogling and unspeakable acts of the roving hordes of savages.

The city aflame forced the population down toward the wharves at the water’s edge, huddled in a mass of humanity two miles long. Pregnant women gave birth prematurely, and horrendous acts were committed on those who happened to be in the chettes’ path. Many never made it to the shore, falling victim to flailing scimitars.

Horses, crazed by the smoke, flames and heat, trampled people, pushing some into the sea. Those who tried to escape in small watercraft were hosed down by the Turks as they tried to get away. But the hose sprayed kerosene, not water, and they were set ablaze.

Others gave up hope after swimming out to one of the ships, only to be turned away or met with a pot full of scalding water.

In the interior region, countless others perished in the columns of death marches.

Kemal discovered that he could not only snatch victory away from the victors but rid Turkey of its Christian population at the same time, without any outside interference.

Metropolitan Chrysostomos declined several offers to escape the carnage on one of the last ships departing Smyrna harbor, citing his solemn duty as a priest: “to remain with [his] flock in times of tribulation.” He would suffer a gruesome death at the hands of a crazed mob, and died an exemplary Christian martyr.

No one knows how many Greeks perished throughout the entire country. The death toll in Smyrna itself was estimated to have been about 200,000.

“...The death toll in Smyrna itself was estimated to have been about 200,000. Another 250,000 or so Greeks were massacred in the Pontus area on the Black Sea with about two years of this holocaust.”
deals with the Turkish rulers.)

The harbor was filled with so many corpses that the ships could no longer navigate without catching bodies in their propellers.

The more than three dozen Allied ships witnessing this holocaust wound up serving as a cruel prop. People, desperate for relief, looked to the multinational armada as a source of protection and reasoned that surely no harm would come to them before the eyes of such an international audience. To the discredit of our allegedly civilized Western society, the primary issue here was money, not mercy; and those who had hoped for rescue were sadly mistaken.

THE SECOND BETRAYAL—CYPRUS HOLOCAUST

The next betrayal of Greece by the West was the mess in Cyprus. Written by investigative journalists Brendan O’Malley, foreign editor of the Times Educational Supplement, and Ian Craig, political editor of The Manchester Evening News, the book The Cyprus Conspiracy: America, Espionage and the Turkish Invasion blows a whistle on the forces underlying the Turkish invasion of Cyprus on July 20, 1974.

Turkey’s seizure of about one-third of the island followed hot on the heels of a coup backed by the CIA and the Greek military junta that toppled Archbishop Makarios III, the president of Crete. This led to the de facto partitioning of Cyprus, which continues to this day.

Having accomplished the Americans’ dirty work, the junta was jettisoned by its CIA “friends” and fell soon after. The British policy of “divide and rule,” perfected in India under the Raj, was recycled in Cyprus, but this time more at the behest of the Americans than the British themselves. In fact, the history behind these incidents is a turning point in the latter stages of the decline of the British empire and the rise of the Zionist-controlled American empire in its stead.

The Suez crisis of 1956 was a good marker of Britain’s post-war feebleness. “Old Blighty” found itself economically and militarily weakened by the disastrous war with Germany and Japan. Withdrawing from the Suez Canal, Britain was forced to seek the help of the United States and the CIA. Eventually British control of Cyprus and swathes of the Middle East would end up being handed over to the U.S.-Zionist empire on a silver platter.

The O’Malley/Craig book understates Zionist American animosity toward the remnants of the British empire, saying: “Though they had been ambivalent toward the . . . empire in the past, the Americans believed that, in many areas, such as the Middle East, the British performed important security functions that no other nation could take over.”
Nevertheless, it continues, “Britain had secured for itself an extraordinary array of military facilities and rights on Cyprus, which, under the terms of the [1960] Treaty of Establishment [setting up the Republic of Cyprus], the British could not hand over to Washington if they pulled out.”

Despite its waning power, the motives for British involvement are set out with admirable simplicity and directness as early as page 7 of the book, quoting Anthony Eden: “No Cyprus, no certain facilities to protect our supply of oil. No oil, unemployment and hunger in Britain. It is as simple as that.”

For centuries, various occupiers of Cyprus have used the island’s strategic location for their own purposes. O’Malley and Craig draw together many facts from official records to reach the conclusion that the 1974 division of Cyprus was no accident but a carefully orchestrated maneuver by the U.S. government to consolidate its high-tech spying facilities on the island to spy on Russia.

Britain won Cyprus as part of the Ottoman breakup in 1914, although one would think in justice it should have gone to Greece, since most of the islanders are ethnically Greek. In 1925 it became a “crown colony.” But by then the Cypriots had had enough of being a pawn of the major powers and started agitating to secede from the British empire. Many Greek Cypriots wanted “enosis,” that is, unification with Greece. By 1950, the Cypriot Orthodox Church and 96 percent of Greek Cypriots wanted enosis. About 18 percent of the population of Cyprus was Turkish. The rest was almost entirely Greek, with sprinklings of Armenians, Jews and others. The Turks’ ancestors mostly arrived after 1571 or so, and thus the Turks are viewed as Johnnies-come-lately if not downright invaders by the Greek majority.

In response, Britain proposed a new constitution, accepted by the Turkish minority but opposed by the National Organization of Cypriot Fighters, who wanted enosis or nothing. So began a drawn-out guerrilla struggle against the British.

In 1960, Britain granted Cyprus its “independence,” but this was a sham. So much detail of the 1960 agreement is devoted to guaranteeing Britain’s continual use of military intelligence facilities on Cyprus—56 pages of the 103-page treaty establishing the “independent” republic for example—that it is easy to conclude this was what the settlement was really about.

Archbishop Makarios became the first president of Cyprus. By 1964 Makarios was moving toward closer ties with Greece and his Arab neighbors. He was also too confident in his ability...
to play off one superpower against the other during the Cold War. A telling comment emerges from an interview conducted by O’Malley with Machiavellian U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who said he was not so much worried about Makarios’ alignment, but by his confidence in his ability to steer these dangerous reefs.

Things came to a head when a CIA coup overthrew Makarios and replaced him with a puppet selected by the Greek military junta. Turkey responded five days later with an invasion of Cyprus. The British and Americans stood by and did nothing.

The Turks occupied the northern third of the island, and expelled 180,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes there, a situation that continues today. About 100,000 Turks were expelled from the south, and atrocities were committed by both sides.

After the Turkish attack, Makarios said: “The United States is the only country that could have exerted pressure on Turkey and prevented the invasion.”

Kissinger said he could do nothing to stop the occupation of northern Cyprus because the Watergate crisis (1972-4) required his attention. But the O’Malley book cites ample evidence of a conspiracy by Kissinger and Turkey to engineer the division of the island.

A contributing factor was that Makarios sympathized with the Palestinians and other Arabs, whereas the Americans were, of course, trafficking intimately with Israel. The CIA’s top priority was to keep the island’s strategic value for Zionist interests, even if it meant partitioning the island, with a holocaust of ethnic Greeks, to maintain their military and intelligence concerns foremost, along with those of Turkey, their regional pro-Zionist ally.

At the height of the U.S.-USSR arms buildup, the CIA wanted to monitor Soviet missile launches in Central Asia and fill the growing vacuum created by the shrinking British tentacles, and thus gradually expand the CIA’s influence in the Middle East.

The plot eventually hatched was essentially one dreamed up by the ruling class Brits 10 years earlier. It had nothing to do with self-determination by the people of Cyprus but rather reflected the belief of British and American strategic planners in 1964 that the military facilities would be better protected in a divided Cyprus than in a unitary, independent state, or for that matter a province of Greece. By 1974, the growing arms race between America and the USSR, along with the need to monitor Soviet nuclear missile tests and provide early warning of a possible nuclear attack from the Soviet arsenal, and Britain’s waver ing commitment to stay on Cyprus, had raised the stakes.

Cyprus remains divided, with no end clearly in sight. In March 2003 the deadline for agreement from both sides on a UN-sponsored reunification deal passed unheeded. When the plan was put to a referendum, Turkish Cypriots supported it while Greek Cypriots did not. Only the southern part of Cyprus, the Greek part, joined the European Union in 2004. Ironically, it looks to its union with the EU and Turkey’s similar aspiration as the potential circuit breaker to Cyprus’s division and the 35-year occupation of northern Cyprus.

Greek Cypriots resented the fact that a UN plan was imposed on them when then-Secretary General Kofi Annan was given the authority to “fill in the blanks” where the leaders failed to agree.

The autonomy of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is recognized only by Turkey, and the status of northern Cyprus remains a stumbling block in Turkey’s relationship with the EU. A new initiative from Republic of Cyprus President Demitris Kristofias, however, could provide a resolution to the standoff, and President Mehmet Ali Talat of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is ready to negotiate the future of the island. He advocated a “bizonal” federal solution, with political equality of the two peoples on the island—sort of a Mediterranean Switzerland.

Kristofias entered into fresh peace talks after a four-year stalemate on the understanding that the UN would only mediate and not dictate a solution.

The U.S. government says that it hopes a historic breakthrough to end the decades of division on Cyprus can be achieved by the end of 2009.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:
Betrayal and Barbarity: Asia Minor 1922, speech by George Makredes, at http://www.hellenicconservate.com/makredesgeorgespeech.html

ENDNOTES:
1 The Plans of Baphomet: An Ancient Enemy Uniting Nations (formerly Conspiracy to Destroy the Christian West).
2 The Ouroboros is a symbolic snake that circles around and seems to swallow its own tail. Ironically, it was originally a symbol of ancient Greece.
3 Another 250,000 or so Greeks were massacred in the Pontus area on the Black Sea within about two years of this holocaust.
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Recently TBR’s Peter Papaheraklis had the opportunity to interview a leading Revisionist author, Konstantinos (Kostas) Plevris, at his home in Athens, Greece.

***

TBR: TBR is here at the home of Mr. Konstantinos Plevris, to interview him, and learn about his beliefs and specifically about the very big and important book, The Jews: The Whole Truth (not yet available in English) and try to get more insight about his life and politics. Mr. Plevris has some introductory remarks:

PLEVRIS: Three years ago, I published in Athens my book The Jews: The Whole Truth. (Picks up the book and shows it to the camera.) This is 1,400 pages. This book is full of facts, proofs, references to 270 authors, writers, other books and of course photos. Immediately after the publication of my book, the Central Council of Jews in Greece and the European Jewish Congress started a campaign against me. They went to the prime minister of Greece asking me to be condemned, they went to the Justice Department, and, after three years of legal fights, finally I have won 100% in the Supreme Court of Athens. Justice prevailed, and the court proved itself to be independent and not under Jewish influence.

TBR: What do you think of the Jewish “holocaust” historical hypothesis?

PLEVRIS: I don’t believe in the “holocaust.” Of course many Jews died during WWII, but there is no proof the Germans planned to exterminate them.

TBR: We understand that you do not now believe in the Jewish “holocaust” of World War II. But did you at any point in your life believe it?

PLEVRIS: No, I never believed in the “holocaust.” That is the reason that I have examined the figures that they have given. In 1968, more than 40 years ago, I published a book on it with the title The Myth. According to the evidence that we have, it was impossible to have killed 6 million Jews; because in all the countries that were occupied by Hitler there were only 4,200,000 Jews according to the official statistics. Even if he arrested all of them, he still could not come up with 6 million. But Hitler never planned to kill the Jews. He only wanted to transport them to the island of Madagascar or some other place. Anyway, almost 3,300,000 Jews have received money from West Germany in the past because they claim that they were arrested and put in concentration camps. All this is explained in detail in my book.

TBR: Have you ever been to Auschwitz or related sites?

PLEVRIS: Of course. I have been to Dachau, Auschwitz, all of them. There are no gas chambers in any of them.

TBR: Is it illegal in Greece to question the “holocaust” theory?

PLEVRIS: No. Absolutely not. In Germany and in Austria, they feel guilty for the Jews, and there it is illegal. Not here. Here we have freedom of speech. You are free to express your ideas and to state your opinion.

TBR: Did not the ancient Greeks almost invent freedom of speech?

PLEVRIS: Yes, of course. Don’t forget that here we believe in dialog. You speak, I give my answer, and we discuss things. Many times I called the Jews [representatives of organized Jewry.—Ed.] to come on my TV program to speak in a public, free dialog, and they refuse. Why? Because they know that they are wrong and I am right. And it’s not only the [Jewish “holocaust” of World War
II. Most of my book involves the crimes the Jews committed against the Greeks throughout history.

TBR: WWII was a terrible time. How many Greeks died in the war?

PLEVRIS: During all the war, from October 1940 till October 1944, a half-million Greeks; 520,000, to be exact.

TBR: What other holocausts have the Greek people survived?

PLEVRIS: We had the 1922 genocide in Pontus [area around the Black Sea]. . . . You know, . . . around Greece there are these states: Albania, Skopje (Macedonia), Bulgaria and Turkey. All these states were founded on Greek territory, and they enslaved the Greek populations. So, there we had genocides. Real genocides. And of course, no one gave us any money. The Jewish “holocaust” for me is an enterprise; it has an economic goal; the Jews gained money from it. In Auschwitz, I remember, 30 years ago, that it was written that 4 million were killed. Later, they changed it to 1 million. But the Jews collected money for 4 million.

TBR: What about Turkey in 1920-21? Was there an attempt of a Greek genocide there?

PLEVRIS: Yes. A very big genocide. There were two genocides within that time frame by the Turks against the Greeks of Asia Minor. In the first, 300,000 were killed. In the second, 250,000. As a result, 1,500,000 Greeks had to flee to Greece as refugees.

TBR: What was the population of “Greece proper” at that time?

PLEVRIS: Five million.

TBR: So Greece had to absorb a huge population of refugees, 30% of its own numbers. That would be the equivalent of the U.S. having to take in about 100 million refugees today.

PLEVRIS: That is correct.

TBR: The Roman historian Lucius Cassius Dio Cocceianus, who lived from about A.D. 155 to after 229, and is known in English as Cassius Dio, Dio Cassius, or just “Dio,” says that in the 2nd century A.D., the Jews killed 220,000 Greeks in Cyrene and 240,000 in Cyprus. What do you think about that?

PLEVRIS: Yes, it is not only Cassius that says this, but modern historians also, such as Gibson. It is a fact. Perhaps the numbers are somewhat exaggerated, but it is a fact.

TBR: What details of the Holocaustian myth do you call into question?

PLEVRIS: First of all we have to use common sense. If the
Jews are saying the truth, if they are right, they don’t need to have legal penalization of “holocaust deniers.” If you are right about something and someone denies it, you can prove that he is wrong. But they use the penal law. This is unbelievable to me. I can say that the American Revolution never happened. Does that mean that I should be condemned? That I should go to jail because I expressed my opinion? If the Jews are right, they are obliged to accept a public dialog, and they refuse. It’s not only forbidden to deny the “holocaust” that is a crime, but even to doubt it.

In Germany and Austria you are not even allowed to express any doubts about the “holocaust.” Unfortunately, there is no more Deutschland; instead there is “Judenland.” If you go to Germany you will see “holocaust” monuments and memorials everywhere.

TBR: Are there any other specific details you call into question?

PLEVRIS: Look, I always use either scientific arguments or common sense. The Germans came to Greece in 1941. They went to some town in Greece. They arrested some Jews. They put them in train cars. They sent them somewhere in Poland or Germany, where there was a concentration camp. For what reason? The Jews say, “to kill us.” I’m asking: Why didn’t they kill them in Greece? Is it necessary to go through all the trouble of organizing the camps, and the trains, and all that? So it comes down to common sense. It just doesn’t add up.

TBR: How has your latest book The Jews: The Whole Truth been received by the Greek-reading audience?

PLEVRIS: Now, after three years, it is in its fourth edition.

TBR: It is indeed a massive work.

PLEVRIS: Yes, it definitively closes the case. And don’t forget that my victory in the Greek court is final. There are no more appeals. Also, this is the first time in Europe that the Jews lost a case.

TBR: How do you feel about the way that the Israelis have been treating the Palestinians, Lebanese, and others in the Middle East, such as the holocaust against the people of Gaza?

PLEVRIS: I have inside my book more than 50 photos, unbelievable photos of Jews killing children; and they wanted to kill them. If you look, all the proof is inside the book. Of course, this is a war crime. But there is no new Nuremberg, to organize a trial against the Zionists—unfortunately.

TBR: I really was struck by the photograph in your book of the two Palestinian children throwing rocks at an oncoming tank. That picture speaks a thousand words.

PLEVRIS: Yes, exactly . . . and don’t forget that anyway, had the Jews not crucified Jesus no one would know about them. No one would mention them. Of all the ancient Greek historians, not one has a reference of them. There were 200,000 of them, in the desert; nomads—nomads without civilization, without culture. They didn’t have philosophy, they didn’t have sports; they didn’t have politics. We have never found a building of theirs, an archeological construction . . . nothing, there is nothing. They didn’t have coins. You know . . . the ancient Jews did not know cheese . . . they didn’t know horses . . .

TBR: Did they have any important buildings?

PLEVRIS: No, nothing.

TBR: Did they have anything equivalent to the Greek Parthenon?

PLEVRIS: No, no, no. . . (chuckles). It is ridiculous to say this. . . . I repeat that the Jews have not contributed anything to the civilization of humanity, and in history they have had no influence whatsoever. At one time, the history of humanity was the history of Greece. For instance, during the Byzantine empire, or during the time of Alexander the Great. . . . Where were the Jews? There is no mention of them . . . .

TBR: Nothing is mentioned about them in the chronicles of their time?

PLEVRIS: What we know for sure about the Jews is that they were slaves. Slaves to the Assyrians. Slaves to the Babylonians. Persians and Greeks. Slaves to the Romans and Arabs. Slaves to the Germans.

TBR: Do you believe that the biblical figures of Abraham, Moses, Isaac etc existed, or do you think they were part of the Jewish mythology?

PLEVRIS: This is mythology, and illogical mythology at that. For instance, the Jews say that the creation of human beings happened 6,000 years ago. But science proves that thousands of hundreds of thousands of years ago humans were on the Earth. And now they believe that the Messiah will come after 30 years; and they believe that all humanity will have one religion—the Jewish religion—secondly, one king; a Jewish king and third; that all the nations will be under the domination of Israel.

TBR: Do you believe there was ever a Solomon and the famous Solomon’s Temple?

PLEVRIS: Never. Not only the temple, but Solomon himself never existed. We have no proof they did. The Jews, only, say this. The only proof we have is that the Jews say this. . . .

TBR: No historians of that era ever mention the existence of this temple.
a great temple?

PLEVRIS: Never. Never. Only the Jews say it. And we are “obliged” to believe this. And if we don’t accept it, then we are “anti-Semites.” We have committed a “crime.” . . .

TBR: Are you aware of the Israeli attacks on the USS Liberty in 1967 and on Rachel Corrie and other Americans, as well as some Europeans and Japanese newsmen? Can you comment on that?

PLEVRIS: Yes. For the Liberty I have a chapter in my book because the Jews don’t have any gratitude for the American help. There are many Jews convicted as spies against the United States. I believe that the Jews—and when I say “Jews” I don’t mean all Jewish people, because there are also good Jews. I am referring to the Zionists; the Jewish Zionists. So, if there is a Jew that does not believe in the Talmud, of course I don’t have a problem with him. But I don’t personally know a Jew who does not believe in the Talmud, and who does not believe in the chosen people. So, [during my trial] I said to the court: “Look, these people claim that they are God’s chosen people, and they have the nerve to accuse me of being a racist?” How can I be the racist when it is they who claim they are chosen by God? Anyway, when I say something I try always to prove it. For this reason, the solution of all these cases concerning the Jews is only one. Free public dialog. Everything in light. Everything clear, to see it and discuss it. The Jews . . . they refuse. For this reason I suspect that something is wrong. Because they refuse the free dialog. . . .They refuse!

TBR: When you and the newspaper Eleftheros Kosmos, were sued recently for “anti-Semitism,” many people feared it might signal the beginning of the end for freedom of the press in Greece. Apparently the Jews claimed that they were somehow being defamed by your book. Is that right?

PLEVRIS: Yes. The newspaper Eleftheros Kosmos, which means “Free World,” and myself were accused, and we were innocent; not guilty. Even if you see what the decision says it gives us absolute right. Nobody can stop us from speaking. Nobody. And after this decision, the Jews were very angry, and they sent letters to ministers, to deputies, complaining that the Greek justice system didn’t support them . . . etc. I have to repeat that we don’t speak in general for all the Jewish people. Because I have nothing against any Jews that are my colleagues in the same profession as lawyers. Many times I ask them, “Do

The First Balkan War, which lasted from October 1912 to May 1913, pitted the Balkan League (Greece, Serbia, Montenegro and Bulgaria) against the Ottoman empire. The combined armies of the Balkan states overcame the Ottoman armies, freeing most remaining European territories under the control of the Turks. These lands were partitioned among the allies. The European victory also led to the creation of an independent Albanian state. However, Bulgaria soon showed dissatisfaction with her share of the Balkan pie and attacked her former allies resulting in what is known as the Second Balkan War (June 16, 1913–July 18, 1913). Greece and Serbia repulsed the Bulgarians, but now Romania and the Ottomans were in the fray. The Bulgarians asked for peace in 1913 when Romanian troops approached the capital, Sofia. By 1914, World War I was under way, with another Balkan state, Serbia, having played a major role in igniting that conflict. Above: A popular lithograph of the evzone attack on Deskaite. Below: Ottoman prisoners of war in Greek hands. The Greeks took 21,000 Ottoman POWs at the Battle of Giannitsa in 1912.
you believe this, that you are chosen by God?,” and they laugh.

TBR: Was this strictly a civil lawsuit? I believe there was a similar matter in August or September 2007. You and some others were charged of having “publicly, through the medium of the press, with intent, and acting in concert, incited deeds and actions that could provoke discrimination, hatred and violence against persons and groups of persons, solely because of their racial and ethnic origin and specifically against Jews in general; the first of them (yourself) carried out these actions persistently.” What happened with that case? Were you convicted and then able to win on appeal? And is the current matter a spin-off from that case?

PLEVRIS: This law was enacted in 1979, after 30 years. It was an application only against me. . . . After 30 years, there was no other application. It was a first-degree court, with three judges. The prosecutor said, not guilty. One member of the court said not guilty, and his opinion was based on 32 pages, written, that I am not guilty. The president was against me. After the process, I was condemned to 14 months in prison [suspended]. After this, because this judge acted absolutely illegally I made a counterattack against him, and now he is out of the justice department. He left the justice department. I made the appeal, and it was in a superior court of five judges, and a prosecutor. The five judges unanimously ruled that I was not guilty of this charge. Never, in my book, did I say, “Do something illegal, or violent against Jews.” Never. I said only the truth, and I proved that I said the truth; and if the Jews were able to discuss my book and to prove that I am wrong, they would do it. But they are not able to prove that I write lies, and not the truth. They cannot prove it. Because this is the truth. So they followed the way of the justice [legal proceedings] and they have totally, definitely lost.

TBR: What was the role of Andrea Gilbert, and the Central Board of Jewish Comm. . . ?

PLEVRIS: Please! . . . I will not carry out a discussion about a lesbian! Because a woman that will not respect her own nature, will have no respect for the truth. Not only is she a lesbian, she is the president of the Lesbian Federation. [Andrea Gilbert is a member of OLKE, the Homosexual and Lesbian Community of Greece—Ed.]

TBR: So what is the KIS or Central Jewish Council of Greece?

PLEVRIS: The KIS went against me and they said that, “When Plevris published this book. . . . after its publication. . . . someone went to the city of Patras and desecrated the Jewish cemetery there, by painting swastikas on the Jewish graves.” I asked “Has the perpetrator been arrested?” He had been arrested, and he was the son of a rabbi.

TBR: So it was reported in the news that he was the perpetrator?

PLEVRIS: Absolutely. He was a provocateur—an agent provocateur.

TBR: Also, what is the role of the “Anti-National Socialist Initiative”?

PLEVRIS: This is two or three persons, not more, who claim they want to save Greece from national socialists. But that type of danger does not exist in Greece. The Jews organize different organizations with the same persons. All they do is rent another office and buy a new rubber stamp.

TBR: What is the Virus Group (“IOS”) of journalists of the newspaper Eleftherotypia?

PLEVRIS: They, too, are supporting the Jews. They are three or four persons. We know them. They are against me. They are not only against me, but against all nationalists, all those who believe in God, all those who love their country.

TBR: You lost at the trial, and yet you were able to win in an appeal. How were you able to turn things around? What was the secret of your victory?

PLEVRIS: There is no secret. I was right, and I said the truth. Nothing else. The Jews are very sad, because through my victory I proved that they are not as powerful as people think they are.

TBR: That is a very uplifting statement. What happened to Dimitrios Zafeiropoulos, Theodoros Hatzigogos and Mihail Georgilas who were defendants with you in this affair?

PLEVRIS: Zafeiropoulos is the owner of the newspaper Free World, and the other two are journalists. All three were acquitted since the first trial.

TBR: Of the 1,400 pages of your large book, the condemnation encompassed how many paragraphs? Was another meaning given to the words and the truth distorted due to the alteration of phrases?

PLEVRIS: Yes. It was unbelievable, what they say in court about those phrases. For instance, I said in one phrase, that “the men of the Waffen SS fought with bravery.” They wanted to condemn me for that. Condemn me for what? That was an expression of an opinion. They say that I write in my book that “we have arrested these Jews and that they should be executed within 24 hours.” Yes, that was said, but not by me. It was said by [Georges] Clemenceau, during World War I. The Jews had taken money from the French, and Clemenceau when the war ended, said that if the Jews don’t give the money back in 24 hours he would have them executed. This was said by Clemenceau. I had the reference in the
book, yet the Jews were claiming that I said it. The court examined all this and it was exactly 45 phrases. But all 45 were rejected and it was proven that I said the truth.

TBR: Adonis Georgiadis testified as a witness for your side. In his sworn statement did he support your book and the comments in it about the alleged holocaust?

PLEVRIS: Adonis Georgiadis is a deputy of Athens, and he has a program on television channel “Teleasty,” and spoke about my book. That’s all.

TBR: So you do not sanction or incite anyone to violent acts against the Jews? Nor do you justify similar practices that others have done in past?

PLEVRIS: I don’t agree with violence. When you have 100% truth you don’t have a reason to follow the road of violence. Anyway, what violence? The Jews accuse us of violence? They are the first teachers of violence. Look at what is happening in Palestine.

TBR: It seems your enemies were extremely selective in what they quoted from your works. For example, I believe your most notorious book contains extensive quotations from the Talmud, and a huge stock of historical evidence of Jewish anti-Christian and anti-Hellenic policies. Of this, they said not a word—among other things. Can you comment on that?

PLEVRIS: The Jews are afraid of any public dialog. I mentioned that earlier. When someone does not discuss with you, when you don’t exchange opinions, when you don’t have an open debate of ideas, this is not an element of civilized persons. Our civilization, our culture, accepts dialog. The Jews refuse it. It is unbelievable.

TBR: Tell us about your son and his affiliation with the “Laos” Party.

PLEVRIS: My son is a doctor of law in the law school of Athens and also at the university of Heidelberg in the faculty of law. He is deputy in Athens and he is a member of parliament for the “Laos” party. [That is the right nationalist party of Greece (Popular, Orthodox Party). He subsequently won a seat at the European Parliament also, on June 7 EU Elections.—Ed.]

TBR: How do you see the political future of Greece?

PLEVRIS: The future of Greece is very difficult because we have many problems. National and social problems. Two million immigrants have come into Greece, from Albania, from Pakistan, from Africa, from everywhere. They came to Greece, and we have a big problem, because they are here, and they have changed the national composition of the population of this country.

TBR: What is the population of Greece, currently?

PLEVRIS: We are 11 million, and almost 20% are foreigners. We don’t want them. We don’t accept them. They have to return to their countries. But the political parties play the game of parliamentarianism and human rights. Human rights for the others, not for the Greeks. There is a racism in Greece from the foreigners against the native Greek population. The national problem is this: We have around us Turks and the problem in Skopje. They want to be called “Macedonia,” but they are not Macedonia. Macedonia is a Greek term. Alexander the Great didn’t speak a Slavic language. Aristotle, who was from Macedonia, wrote his books in the Greek language. But the Slavic Skopjens have taken the name of Macedonia; I don’t know why. The United States supports them. If I open a car factory and I give my car the name “Cadillac” or “Ford,” these companies from the United States will protect their names. So we have the name “Macedonia.” They took that name from us. They don’t have any relation with this name.

TBR: Do you think that the United States had some vested interest in supporting the adoption of the name “Macedonia” by the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), or what we would call the Republic of Skopje?

PLEVRIS: Personally, my family and most of the Greeks, we
are pro-American. We love America, we like the United States. There are over 1 million Greeks and Greek-Americans there. They have made wonderful progress. And we are always with the Americans. When the Slavs and the Bulgarians and the Skopjens were with Soviet Russia, we Greeks were the only country in the Balkans supporting the United States. For this reason we complain when the United States are not friendly to us. We gave our friendship to the United States, and we want also to have the friendship of the United States.

TBR: Many Americans are Philhellenes, although our government does not always reflect the views of the American people. Can you tell us about the riots a few months ago when the police killed a teenager?

PLEVRIS: It was an accident. The police in Greece are not like the police in the United States. Here, the police have no rights. If a Pakistani in Greece says “I went to the police station, and they treated me badly,” the commander of the police station will be immediately arrested.

TBR: Do you think there are any political interests that made more out of the case than was there?

PLEVRIS: No, it was an accident. There was a group of young persons that threw an object, maybe a stone, at the police; they exchanged some words, and after that the police officer shot his gun up in the air, but the bullet ricocheted and killed the teenager. It was clearly an accident, and the policeman was sentenced and went to jail, according to the law. But because of one accident, by one officer, it is not good to characterize the entire police force.

TBR: Do the police now have a bad name on account of that incident?

PLEVRIS: No, because there was a Gallup poll of popular opinion and first at the top was the army, second was the justice department, third was the police, in the confidence of the people; and at the very bottom were the political parties. No one respects the political parties.

TBR: I understand that you wrote about the “holocaust” in 1968. Can you tell us more about that book?

PLEVRIS: The book’s title, as I mentioned earlier, was The Myth. This was an explanation and some proofs that what the Jews claim about the holocaust, never happened.

TBR: So, at the time you wrote this book in 1968, you were one of the pioneers on this subject worldwide?

PLEVRIS: Yes, that is true. Of course, the Jews complained, but at that time I didn’t care about them; I was very strong then. I was general secretary of the Ministry of National Security, and I didn’t pay any attention to them. Also I was only 28 years old, and when you are 28 you are not afraid of anyone.

TBR: Are you still a member of the political entities you created: the 4th of August and the Front Line? And are these entities still in existence?

PLEVRIS: Yes. The one is a political organization and the other is a political party. We have a house of edition, we have a newspaper, we publish books . . . we have some activity.

TBR: What is the significance of the 4th of August?

PLEVRIS: On the 4th of August 1936, Gen. Metaxas took power, and four years later he stood up to the Italians, as you probably know, 1940–1941. And his regime was the focus of nationalism in Greece. It was the peak of nationalism.

TBR: Are you a fan of Gen. Ioannis Metaxas?

PLEVRIS: Yes. Of course, we belong to different nations, but us—the white race—is the first thing we have to keep intact. The white race. This is our war. The first thing we have to protect is our race; our right to be white.

TBR: How well has your book The Jews: The Whole Truth been received? Is there a particular number of sales so far that you know of?

PLEVRIS: I think about 20,000 to 30,000 have been sold.

TBR: Is there anything else you would like to say for our audience, which is mostly American, but also worldwide?

PLEVRIS: Yes. Of course, we belong to different nations, but most of us are white. But white, red, yellow or black, our race is the first thing we have to keep intact. The Jews want all the non-Jews to be blended into a “universal goy.” I am not a racist under the bad meaning of the word, because it is not by my choice, or the choice of any mortal, that we have people being mostly black in Africa, mostly yellow in Asia, and mostly white in Europe and North America. Rather, it is the natural order of things for the races to be geographically separated. So, the first thing we have to protect, for all non-Jews, is our race; our right to be white, yellow, black or whatever race we are.

TBR: Mr. Plevris, thank you very much for your time.

Peter Papherkakis is an immigrant from Greece, who, having come here as a young boy with his family during the time of the military junta, is fluent in both English and Greek. He is currently the promotions director at AFP and has joined TBR’s board of contributing editors.
No Bone Unturned: The Battle for America’s Oldest Skeleton. Journalist Jeff Benedict takes us inside the world of forensic science as seen through the eyes of a leading specialist, Doug Owsley. Just days before Owsley was to begin studying the Kennewick skeleton, federal authorities seized it and announced it would be handed over to the Indian tribes who claimed it as their own—even though it was Caucasoid. For six years Owsley fought to study the skeleton. Softcover, 304 pages, $19.

Who Were the Early Israelites & Where Did They Come From? William Dever explores the controversies regarding the nature of ancient Israel and presents the archaeological evidence for assessing the accuracy of the well-known Bible stories. Dever draws on 30 years of fieldwork in the Near East, amassing hard evidence for his own compelling view of the development of Israelite history. Featuring 50 photographs, this book provides an authoritative statement on the origins of ancient Israel. Softcover, 280 pages, $18.

Reckless Rites: Purim and the Legacy of Jewish Violence. Purim is the Jewish holiday spawned by the Old Testament’s Book of Esther—a holiday based on the massacre of 70,000 Persians. According to the author, Elliot Horowitz, this Jewish celebration of genocide has impacted negatively upon the Judaic attitude toward the “goyim” and vice versa to this day. Hardback, 322 pages, $35.

Jewish History, Jewish Religion. By Israel Shahak. To the author—a former professor at Hebrew University in Jerusalem and a former inmate of Bergen-Belsen concentration camp—the ideology of Israeli racial separatism and supremacy is unacceptable. Brief quotations from the Talmud in regard to how Jews should treat non-Jews are disturbing. #246, softcover, 120 pages, $23.

March of the Titans: A History of the White Race. The complete and comprehensive history of the White Race, spanning 500 centuries of tumultuous events from the steppes of Russia to the African continent, to Asia, the Americas and beyond. This is their inspirational story—of vast visions, empires, achievements, triumphs against staggering odds, reckless blunders, crushing defeats and stupendous struggles. Compiled over 25 years by Rhodesian author and scholar Arthur Kemp. High-quality softcover, 592 pages, #464, $42.

ORDERING FROM TBR BOOK CLUB: TBR subscribers may take 10% off above prices. Add S&H: $5 on orders up to $50; $10 on orders from $50.01 to $100. $15 S&H on orders over $100. Outside the U.S. email TBRca@aol.com for best shipping method to your nation. Send payment using the form on page 74 to TBR BOOK CLUB, P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003.
World War II History . . . Without the Political Correctness

**Fighting for Freedom.** By Richard Landwehr. One day, the abysmal general ignorance and misconceptions regarding the Waffen SS will be replaced by the truth. Then, the contributions of Richard Landwehr to history will be recognized. This is his latest book, the story of the Ukrainian Volunteer Division, which fought side by side for a free Europe with other volunteers from countries around the globe. #49, hardback, 224 pages, $25.

**Stalin’s War of Extermination: 1941-1945.** By Joachim Hoffmann. The best book on Stalin’s plan for a World Revolution by conquering Europe in a war of extermination. Hitler, aware of Stalin’s plans, launched Operation Barbarossa to stop the massive Soviet invasion. When published in Germany, the book became a bestseller as it was the first book ever that explained “who really started WWII.” #282, hardback, 415 pages, $40.

**The Black Book of Communism.** A team of French historians chronicles the crimes of Communism wherever it has attained power in the world. Gassings in forests; execution of military officers and intellectuals by the tens of thousands etc. The authors put the number of victims at 85 million—and this may be underestimated by 20 million! It became a bestseller in Europe when first published in 1997. #235, hardback, 1,120 pages, $45.

**Gold in the Furnace.** A vivid and moving account of life in occupied Germany after World War II. “Indo-Aryan” nationalist Savitri Devi is scathing in her description of Allied brutality and hypocrisy: millions of innocent German civilians murdered from Allied firebombings and millions more driven from their ancestral homelands by Soviets, Czechs and Poles. More than 1 million POWs—many of them non-combatants—perished from purposeful starvation and exposure to the elements in Eisenhower’s death camps. Softcover, 292 pages, #430, $45.

**Truth for Germany: The Guilt Question of the Second World War.** By Udo Walendy. The author has been banned in Germany but is available here in an updated edition. Correspondence between FDR, Churchill and other politicians clearly paints a disturbing picture of Allied intentions toward the German nation before the outbreak of hostilities. Softcover, #1S, 530 pages, $42.

**Myth of the 20th Century.** By Alfred Rosenberg. Rosenberg was a deep thinker and brilliant writer during Germany’s National Socialist era. He was the lone author hanged at Nuremberg—executed for the contents of this book and others. He wrote about race, religion, ethnicity and cultural identity as they related to the evolving German state. This book, along with Hitler’s Mein Kampf and Goering’s Germany Reborn, was a foundation for the super nationalist rebirth that drove Nazi Germany to brink of European leadership. Softcover, 8.5 x 11 format, #417, 528 pages, $35.

**The Roosevelt Red Record & Its Background.** First published in 1936 by Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, this well-documented book explores the rampant Communist infiltration of America in the 1930s & 1940s through the administration of FDR. Shocking how many Communist organizers and politicians were supported by FDR and his wife during their time in power. A real shocker! Softcover, 439 pages, #383, $20.

**Patton and Rommel: Men of War in the 20th Century.** By Dennis Showalter. A side by side biography of both famous warriors of two opposing nations. The two men never met in combat but both not only earned the loyalty of their own men but that of the enemy as well. Both lives ended tragically but both left their marks on future generations of soldiers. Great gift for a veteran. Hardcover 441 pages, #479 $25.
**Memoirs of the Confederate War for Independence:**

By Heros von Borcke. This is a power-packed and highly detailed personal memoir of von Borcke’s adventures with dashing cavalry leader Gen. J.E.B. Stuart. A giant of a man, von Borcke carried a huge broadsword that sent fear into the opponent. He was in the thick of every scum and was entrusted with secret assignments by Stuart. Softcover, 399 pages, #516, $23.

**The East Came West:**

While researching material for the writing of *The East Came West*, author Peter J. Huxley-Blythe discovered why the Cossacks and many Russian people do not trust the U.S. or Great Britain after what they experienced after WWII. When the war ended, millions of Russian men, women and children in the West met terror face to face. They were physically beaten into submission and shipped like cattle back to the Soviet Union to face Stalin’s executioners, or to serve long sentences at hard labor in the death camps of Siberia—with the tacit approval of the American and British “Allies.” This little-known war crime was called “Operation Keelhaul” and constitutes one of the darkest chapters in Western history. Softcover, 224 pages, #434, $20.

**Churchill’s War: Volume 2 . . . Triumph in Adversity.**

Using never-before-published diary records from secret British government archives, British historian David Irving takes a close look at how Winston Churchill’s decision to prolong the war with Germany led to the destruction of the British empire. No mere repeat of the usual historiography. Hardcover, 1,000+ pages, 59 photos, #447B, $45.

**Books & Tapes on Dresden**

**The Destruction of Dresden: Apocalypse 1945**

By David Irving. A brand-new revised version of the 1995 book classic, now in hardcover, has just been published. With many photos to back up the underlying message of terror and destruction, it is Irving at his best. The destruction of the city of Dresden—and other German civilian centers—has entered into the “book of inhumanity” as one of its very worst chapters. Hardcover, 320 pages, #480, $50.

**The Fire: The Bombing of Germany, 1940-45**

By Joerg Friedrich. Overwhelming in its emotional scope but not maudlin, a book about the destruction of Germany by aerial bombing is told in harrowing detail. Published in the U.S. by Columbia University Press, it is a great accomplishment in historical research. After 53 years, this book is the first to be published in Germany detailing the bombing of Germany during WWII. It broke a literal taboo of that subject and became an instant bestseller. Friedrich, not a Revisionist but a good historian in this instance, grew up in post-war Germany, writing various books “exposing” policies of the National Socialist period. Perhaps an attack of conscience propelled him to finally tell the truth of the bombing of Germany and the great suffering it brought. A must read for all, a great present. Hardcover, 530 pages with many photos, #478, $35.

**Firestorm Over Dresden**

Here is an accurate video account of the firebombing of Dresden from eyewitnesses who somehow escaped the most dastardly and cowardly attack on a civilian population ever perpetrated. Historian David Irving combines these interviews with archival pre-war film footage and information from Winston Churchill’s private diaries to help explain the event of unbridled terror—a war crime of untold proportions. In addition to the great loss of lives, a massive amount of irreplaceable art and architecture was destroyed in Dresden—once known as “the Florence on the Elbe.” VHS, #90V, 77 minutes, $30. DVD, #90D, 77 min., $30.
BOOKS & TAPES ABOUT

ADOLF HITLER

Called the greatest film of all time . . .

*Triumph of the Will, Germany, 1934.* Still banned in Germany, this extraordinary blend of art, directing and cinematography by the famous Leni Riefenstahl is a marvel one won’t come across again. The subject of the film is the 1934 session of the Nazi Party congress at Nuremberg. Awe-inspiring in its dimension, it is a “must see.” English subtitles. A printed translation of the speeches is also included as an extra bonus. #115, VHS, 115 min., $30.

This 2-Video Set was produced by TBR with the blessing of Mrs. Leon Degrelle . . .

*Hitler’s Blitzkrieg—Part 1 & 2.* Gen. Leon Degrelle of the Waffen SS gives you his uncensored personal accounts and insights into the Third Reich and world leaders as he takes you along on Hitler’s Blitzkrieg, vividly describing the tumultuous events of the war’s early years. In PART ONE, ride along as the fast-moving German armies stormed across Poland in a brand new type of warfare. And in the blockbuster PART TWO, the Nazi armed forces blitz Holland, Belgium, France, Greece and Yugoslavia—described as ONLY Gen. Degrelle can describe it! Both videos are 90 minutes. Each retails for $30. Part 1 as a DVD is #421A; Part 1 as a VHS is #421B. Part 2 as a DVD is #440A. Part 2 as a VHS is #440B. (Please remember to indicate item numbers for desired format.) BONUS: Buy BOTH Part 1 and Part 2 for the combo price of $50.

The most comprehensive book presentation—pictures and text—of Hitler’s headquarters

*Hitler’s Headquarters.* By Aaron L. Johnson. More than 350 wartime photos illustrate the most in-depth discussion of Hitler’s WWII headquarters. Fascinating, detailed information assembled in one volume for the first time. The book takes you into the bunkers where Hitler conducted the German war effort. Meet Hitler’s personal guard. See Hitler and his generals. Full color hardback cover. Top quality paper inside. Hardback, #204, 239 pages, $36.

Book details the Jews who fought for Hitler . . .

*Hitler’s Jewish Soldiers.* By Bryan Mark Rigg—The author, an American Jew who volunteered with the Israeli Army, concludes that 150,000 soldiers of Jewish ancestry served in the German army during WWII. He also says that these Jewish soldiers did not know of the so-called “holocaust.” Many pictures of Jewish soldiers and officers. #330S, softcover, 443 pages, $17.

Hitler’s core beliefs defined . . .

*Mein Kampf [My struggle].* By Adolf Hitler. Written while Hitler was in jail for “sedition,” this book needs no introduction. Although available through bookstores, TBR BOOK CLUB has decided to include it on its book list. #123, quality hardcover, 384 pages, $27.

An analysis of Hitler’s military abilities . . .

*Hitler: Bungling Amateur or Military Genius?* By A.V. Schaerffenberg. Adolf Hitler’s detractors say he ruined the German war effort, micro-managing every move his generals made. Other say Hitler was centuries ahead of his time. What is the truth about his military skills? We learn that Churchill was no match for Hitler; that the French were no peace lovers; that Hitler’s Operation Barbarossa saved Europe from brutal Soviet domination; and how the breaking of the Nazi codes gave the Allies an incalculable advantage in battle. We also learn much about Goering, Guderian, Rommel, Mussolini, the disposition of the Waffen SS etc. Softcover, 172 pages, 80 illustrations, #442, $13.
David Irving's

Nuremberg: The Last Battle

By agreement of the Allied powers, major German and Italian leaders were to be identified as war criminals, tried, prosecuted, found guilty by whatever means necessary, and duly punished. World War II had been claimed by the victors to have been a “Good War,” and the war crimes trial at Nuremberg was rigged to prove the triumph of good over evil. Were the victors free of the stain of war crimes? Or was the imposition of kangaroo justice over the vanquished just a cover-up of the victors’ own crimes?

As one American member of the Nuremberg Tribunal privately advised his colleagues, “It is, in my opinion, offensive to our concept of justice to punish a man for doing exactly what one has done himself.” And in fact, there would be few crimes listed on the indictment at Nuremberg of which one or other of the four prosecuting powers was not itself guilty. In the cause of defeating Hitler, civilian populations had been burned and blasted, murdered, brutalized, intimidated, deported and enslaved; aggressive wars had been launched; neutral countries occupied by pretext and deceit; and the unalterable paragraphs of international conventions flagrantly violated. Using the unpublished diaries and papers of the principal actors—the judges, lawyers, and the “war criminals” themselves—David Irving has pieced together the remarkable history of the trial of the century, the inside stories, personal letters, poignant moments and the travesties of justice.

David Irving’s Nuremberg: The Last Battle (hardback, 377 pages, item #445, $45 minus 10% for TBR subscribers) is available from TBR BOOK CLUB.

Comments:

“I’ve read all of Mr. Irving’s WWII books and have always found them to be refreshingly original in their portrayal of events I had often questioned in my own mind. Through his collected works he effectively demolishes the myth of the Nuremberg trials, shows what a redeemed hero Hermann Goering became, shows how Britain squandered its real chances for peace with Hitler and generally debunks and confronts all of the force-fed patronizing propaganda we’ve been spoon-fed since birth. He even prods gentle fun at Rommel who is the only German soldier deemed acceptable to the Allies.”

—NIALL FERGUSON from www.pzg.biz/books

“Only David Irving could have put together a book of such scope, such importance and such unbiased research. It is no wonder the powers that be want him locked away from those thirsting for truth about WWII.”

—WILLIS CARTO, THE BARNES REVIEW

“David Irving attracts credibility and attention by his indefatigable energy, intelligence and resourcefulness.”

—TOM BOWER, Daily Mail

$45

Minus 10% for TBR subscribers.
Fascinating Vignettes of American History from Top Scholars

Don’t Tread on Me. 400 Years of America at War—from Indian Fighting to Terrorist Hunting. Author H.W. Crocker III takes us on a whirlwind tour of American political and military history and details our conflicts with other nations and our own Indian populations for the last 400 years. A riveting book, the author presents many fascinating details you may not know. Softcover, 464 pages, #497, $17.

Blacklisted by History: The Untold Story of Sen. Joe McCarthy. M. Stanton Evans dismantles the myths surrounding Joe McCarthy and his campaign to unmask Communists, Soviet agents, and flagrant loyalty risks working within the U.S. government. Evans’ revelations completely overturn our understanding of McCarthy, McCarthyism, and the Cold War. Hardback, 672 pages, #498, $30.

Body of Secrets. By James Bamford. The author, an intelligence expert, has written this book on the National Security Agency. He delves into many clandestine operations, few ever discussed in print before. Also contains a lengthy analysis of the Israeli attack on the USS Liberty and an investigation into the crimes of the Mideast mini-state. Rare to see such candor in a mainstream book. 720 pages, #286a, softcover, $15.

Judas Goats: The Infiltration & Subversion of the American Nationalist Movement. Here is Michael Collins Piper’s latest blockbuster. Exposes the Mossad, CIA, FBI and SPLC sabotage of patriotic and nationalist groups throughout the last 75 years. Some real shockers in this uncensored expose including: J. Edgar Hoover ran chapters of the KKK and Communist Party USA; federal agents in Oklahoma City at the time of the bombing; McCarthyism vindicated; FDR’s Sedition Trial; much more. Softcover, 375 pages, #465, $25. NOW $19.

Great Video on the ‘Liberty’ Attack

Attack on the USS Liberty. June 8, 1967: America’s most sophisticated intelligence-gathering vessel—virtually unarmed—was subjected to six hours of relentless assault by Israel in international waters, leaving Liberty with 821 rocket and cannon holes, thousands of 50-caliber armor-piercing bullets in her hull, a huge hole in her side and napalm on the decks. Thirty-four Americans were killed and 172 badly wounded. Before the end of the massacre, the cover-up had already begun. By filmmaker Tito Howard. VHS, 1 hour, color/black & white, VHS, #371, $30.

The Rising Tide of Color. By Lothrop Stoddard. Written almost 90 years ago, this book is even more important today. Explains why the author sees tough times ahead for the white race as it continues to be swallowed up in a tsunami wave of non-white immigrants. Softcover, indexed, 320 pages, #475, $22.

The Anglo-American Establishment. By Carroll Quigley. This is the author’s little-known book that explores how the conspiratorial nexus of secret societies works, its personalities, aims and organizations—such as the CFR—that are only touched upon in Tragedy and Hope. Indexed. Deluxe edition. Softcover, #199, 354 pages, $14.

Tragedy and Hope. By Carroll Quigley—This famous history of the world in our time, published in 1966, immediately became an object of suppression. The author, a history professor, exposes the secret world of government. The Council on Foreign Relations tried to stop publication. #37, hardback, 1,348 pages, $40.
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON AMERICAN ICONS

Who Was the Real John Muir?

By Michael Hoffman

A
braham Lincoln probably cringed when he heard The Star Spangled Banner played. Why? Francis Scott Key, the author of The Star-Spangled Banner (originally titled Defence of Fort McHenry), was the close friend and legal colleague of Roger B. Taney, the future chief justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Taney was hated by Lincoln. (Taney wrote the Dred Scott decision, universally maligned in our time as the “wickedest” court ruling of the ages.)

Justice Taney even married Francis Scott Key’s sister, Anne. Taney is also justly renowned for having courageously obstructed Lincoln’s despotic suspension of the writ of habeas corpus (cf. Ex parte Merryman). But there’s more.

In May of 1861, Lincoln came close to imprisoning the chief justice—but did not. President Lincoln did in fact imprison Francis Scott Key’s grandson, the journalist Francis Key Howard, editor of Baltimore’s Daily Exchange newspaper. For writing the truth about Lincoln, Francis Key Howard was jailed in degrading conditions of Lincoln’s despot’s suspension of the writ of habeas corpus (cf. Ex parte Merryman). But there’s more.

I reached Fort McHenry about 2 o’clock in the morning (of Sept. 13, 1861). . . . On that day, 47 years before, my grandfather, Mr. F.S. Key, then a prisoner on a British ship, had witnessed the bombardment of Fort McHenry. When, on the following morning, the hostile fleet drew off, defeated, he wrote the song so long popular throughout the country, Star Spangled Banner. As I stood on the very scene of that conflict, I could not but contrast my position with his. . . . The flag which he then so proudly hailed, I saw waving, at the same place, over the victims of as vulgar and brutal a despotism as modern times have witnessed.

THE ATTRACTION OF REVISIONISM

It is historical tidbits like this one which, in the space of a paragraph or two, have the power to undermine an entire mythos—in this case the legend of Lincoln as the consummate man of conscience and sage defender of freedom—that give Revisionism its magnetic attraction to the curious seeker after inconvenient truths and hidden realities. The Revisionist is not surprised by revelation, though he is often delighted by it. He knows that many facts yet to be excavated will one day serve to correct so-called “history.”

This is true in all subject areas, including the field of conservation philosophy and history, in which, for example, the New England transcendentalist Henry David Thoreau looms large. John Muir was a remarkable conservationist who was instrumental in the founding of our national park system, who didn’t give a fig for Thoreau. Muir was a visionary nature-lover and a giant in today’s “green” movement, whose philosophy and biography have been “shaped,” suppressed and even in certain respects falsified, in order to clean up his image for promotion by politically correct environmentalists who have commissarized his life and legacy.

John Muir (1838-1914) was raised in a strict, conservative Christian home in Scotland and later in Wisconsin. Muir was not “diminished” by his traditional Christian upbringing unless you think a work ethic that would make Hercules look like a lazy fellow was a bad thing, or that the joy of living and personal kindness he personified are indications of the evils of Christianity.

One of the books that most inspired Muir’s early environmental enthusiasm was Alphonso Wood’s 1856 A Class-book of Botany. For Wood, who was the principal of a Christian school in Brooklyn, New York, the study of botany reinforced faith in God.

Moreover, Muir held some decidedly inconvenient views on race and the origins of mankind that have been censored from his diaries and papers. The official history of Muir is of someone who was diminished by a brutal father and a sadistic religion and who was conventionally liberal on the same issues in which his 21st-century explainers and presenters are liberal. The real Muir is someone else entirely.

The words “dark” and “dour” usually precede the word “Calvinist” to describe the supposed travails of a child raised in such an “abusive” environment, even though some of America’s most accomplished and intrepid men and women shared this background. Yet Muir’s upbringing produced him, according to his roommate at the University of Wisconsin, “the most cheerful, happy-hearted man I ever knew.”

What was the source of this happiness and cheer? Did Muir have a string of erotic girlfriends, a fat wallet or any of the other emoluments and accouterments our era regards as prerequisite for personal fulfillment? In fact, Muir was poor and chaste, described by his college friends as: “a high-minded Christian gentleman, clean in thought and action and of a most loving and gentle disposition.”

Continued on following page
MUIR’S VIEW ON RACE

At first Muir wanted to study medicine, relieve human misery and invent useful machines. He was a first-rate mechanic and tinkerer who could seemingly repair or improve any mechanism. He also had a powerful curiosity about the origins of mankind and the role of race in human affairs, most of which have been policed out of posthumous publications attributed to his authorship. Writing at age 29 to his brother Dan, Muir stated, “remember the nation to whom you belong . . . its streets must not be trodden by black Gentile (Hindus) and pagan Turks, but by the white . . . loving people of the sons of Japeth” (the Biblical patriarch Noah’s third son).

The published account of his famous 1867-1868 hike from Indiana through the American Southland during Reconstruction, which he recorded in his traveling journal, has been censored by the environmental movement: “[T]hat journal . . . became the core of his posthumously published book A Thousand Mile Walk to the Gulf. The published version . . . softens a few of his more caustic remarks. . . .” (Donald Worster, A Passion for Nature.)

On his walk, Muir called Kentucky “the greenest state I have seen” and a “paradise of oaks.” He was hiking a trail that is today Kentucky’s State Route 90, the “John Muir Highway.” His estimation of Tennessee was equally high: south of what is now the Great Smoky Mountains National Park he peered on vast forests, “the most sublime picture his eyes had ever beheld.” He wrote, “Such an ocean of wooded, waving, swelling mountains and grandeur. . . . Oh, these forest gardens of our Father! What divinity in their architecture!”

The former clock and lathe inventor was repelled by whites dwelling in the mountains, for the most part, even though they showed him many kindnesses. They were unlettered, lacked technological sophistication and demonstrated “not the faintest sign of that restless spirit of speculation and invention so characteristic of the North.” Donald Worster observes:

Such mountainers were, like himself, of old English, Scots or Scots-Irish stock, but in their coarseness of manners, their negative attitude toward work and innovation, they were nearly another species. . . . [H]is travels through the South had not always evoked a strong, egalitarian identification with poor, back country folks. . . . [O]ften he was shocked by the degraded lives of . . . the “mudsill,” or bottom-most class of white Southerners. . . .

He had created his own social hierarchy based on the standards he had been taught from Dunbar (Scotland) days on, for judging others: the best people were those of any class or nationality who pursued cleanliness, industry, thrift, mechanical aptitude and literacy. He measured rich and poor alike by those standards. Anyone who fell short or had never tried to achieve them, Muir tended to regard as an inferior human being.

Black people do not figure to any great extent in his journal. Muir paid no heed to civil rights issues in places like Savannah, Georgia. He thought the white people of Georgia were the most impressive of all the Southerners he had encountered. He met a dark-complexioned black family while camping in Florida: “Seen anywhere but in the negroid South, the glossy pair would have been taken for twin devils.” In his uncensored journal he wondered what this family might reveal about the origins of humanity and whether the different races had a common ancestry, or not.

Muir enjoyed amicable relations with worthy members of all races, and he reserved a particular antipathy for what he termed “Lord Man,” those who believed that God had placed them above all others, with the Earth as their footstool—the arrogant hunter who does not eat the food he shoots, the avaricious farmer who strips the soil, the capitalist who views nature as a commodity to be merchandized. For Muir the personification of what he execrated as “Lord Man” was the British aristocracy, as represented by the claims of the British empire to moral superiority, which Muir had witnessed—and despised—growing up in Scotland.

An uncensored narrative of John Muir’s life shows him to have been a Christian conservationist, a freethinker on matters of race and racial origins and an independent who saw through the self-aggrandizing claims of powerful people and empires. Those who would sanitize Muir’s views in order to make him presentable to narrow-minded atheist and pagan environmentalists and equalitarians are part of a familiar and decidedly Orwellian streak in modern history which prefers legend over reality, appealing to a herd that demands subservience to liberal dogma over raw truth.

Muir and his philosophy might have even more attraction and a higher estimation in the eyes of like-minded truth seekers, if his authentic ideas were better known and studied, rather than obscured and suppressed.

ENDNOTE:

1 The truth about the Dred Scott decision can be found in The Politically Incorrect Guide to American History, by Thomas E. Woods Jr., available from TBR BOOK CLUB, P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003. Softcover, 380 pages, #424, $20 minus 10% for TBR subscribers. Add $3 S&H inside the U.S. Outside U.S. email TBRca@aol.com for S&H rates to your nation. Call 1-877-773-9077 toll free to charge to your Visa or MasterCard. See more books and videos online at www.BarnesReview.com.
German people! National Socialists! Weighted down with heavy cares, condemned to months-long silence, the hour has now come when at last I can speak frankly. When on Sept. 3, 1939, the German Reich received the British declaration of war there was repeated once again a British attempt to render impossible every beginning of a consolidation and thereby of Europe’s rise, by fighting whatever power on the continent was strongest at any given time.

That is how England ruined Spain in many wars. That is why she conducted her wars against Holland. That is how later she fought France with the aid of all the rest of Europe and that is how at the turn of the century she began the encirclement of the Kaiser’s Reich and why in 1914 we had the “Great War,” the “World War.” Only on account of internal dissension was Germany defeated in 1918, with terrible consequences.

After hypocritical declarations that the fight was solely against the Kaiser and his regime, the annihilation of the German

At right, an artist’s rendering of Adolf Hitler as he greets a crowd. Hitler was never afraid to move amongst the crowds, unlike so many other leaders of the time who feared assassination at the hands of their own citizens. It was traitors in the German military he had the most to worry about.
Reich began according to plan, after the German army had laid down its arms.

While the prophecies of the French statement, that there were 20 million Germans too many; in other words, that this number would have to be exterminated by hunger, disease or emigration; were apparently being fulfilled to the letter, the National Socialist movement began its work of unifying the German people and thereby initiating resurgence of the Reich. This rise of our people from distress, misery and shame bore all the signs of purely internal renaissance. Britain was in no way affected or threatened by this.

Nevertheless, a new policy of encirclement against Germany, born as it was of hatred, recommenced immediately. Internally and externally there resulted that plot familiar to us all between Jews and democrats, Bolshevists and reactionaries, with the sole aim of inhibiting the establishment of the new German people’s state, and of plunging the Reich again into impotence and misery.

Apart from us the hatred of this international world conspiracy was directed against those people who, like ourselves, were neglected by fortune and were obliged to earn their daily bread in the hardest struggle for existence.

Above all the right of Italy and Japan to share in the goods of this world was contested just as much as that of Germany, and was denied.

The coalition of these nations was, therefore, only an act of self-protection in the face of the global combination of power and pelf threatening them.

As early as 1936 Prime Minister Churchill, according to statements by the American Gen. Wood before a committee of the American House of Representatives, declared Germany was once again becoming too powerful and must therefore be destroyed.

In the summer of 1939 the time seemed to have come for England to begin to realize its intended annihilation by repetition of a comprehensive policy of encirclement of Germany.

The plan of the campaign of lies staged for this purpose consisted in declaring that other people were threatened, in tricking them with British promises of guarantees and assistance, and of making them march against Germany just as it did preceding the great war.

Thus Britain from May to August 1939, succeeded in broadcasting to the world that Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Finland and Bessarabia as well as Ukraine were being directly threatened by Germany.

A number of these states allowed themselves to be misled into accepting the promise of guarantee proffered with these assertions, thus joining the new encirclement front against Germany. Under these circumstances I consider myself entitled to assume responsibility before my own conscience and before the history of the German people not only of assuring these countries or their governments of the falseness of British assertions, but also of setting the strongest power in the east, by especially solemn declarations, at rest concerning the limits of our interests.

National Socialists, at that time you probably all felt that this step was bitter and difficult for me. Never did the German people harbor hostile feeling against the peoples of Russia. However, for over 10 years Jewish Bolshevist rulers had been endeavoring from Moscow to set not only Germany but also all Europe aflame. At no time ever did Germany attempt to carry her National Socialist Weltanschauung into Russia, but on the contrary Jewish Bolshevist rulers in Moscow unswervingly endeavored to foist their domination upon us and other European peoples, not only by ideological means but, above all, with military force.

The consequences of the activity of this regime were nothing but chaos, misery and starvation in all countries. I, on the other hand, have been striving for 20 years with a minimum of intervention and without destroying our production, to arrive at a new socialist order in Germany which not only eliminates unemployment but also permits the worker to receive an ever-greater share of the fruits of his labor.

The success of this policy of economic and social reconstruction of our people, by systematically eliminating differences of rank and class, has a true people’s community as the final aim.

It was therefore only with extreme difficulty that I brought myself in August 1939, to send my foreign minister to Moscow in an endeavor there to oppose the British encirclement policy against Germany.

I did this only from a sense of all responsibility toward the German people, but above all in the hope after all of achieving permanent relief of tension and of being able to reduce sacrifices which might otherwise have been demanded of us.

While Germany solemnly affirmed in Moscow that the territories and countries enumerated—with the exception of Lithuania—lay outside all German political interests, a special agreement was concluded in case Britain were to succeed in inciting Poland into war with Germany.

In this case, too, German claims were subject to limitations entirely out of proportion to the achievement of German forces.

National Socialists, the consequences of this treaty which I myself desired, and which was concluded in the interests of the
German nation, were very severe, particularly for Germans living in the countries concerned.

Far more than 500,000 German men and women, all small farmers, artisans and workmen, were forced to leave their former homeland practically overnight in order to escape from a new regime which at first threatened them with boundless misery and sooner or later with complete extermination.

Nevertheless, thousands of [ethnic] Germans disappeared. It was impossible ever to determine their fate, let alone their whereabouts.

Among them were no fewer than 160 men of German citizenship. To all this I remained silent, because I had to. For, after all, it was my one desire to achieve final relief of tension and, if possible, a permanent settlement with this state.

However, already during our advance in Poland, Soviet rulers suddenly, contrary to the treaty, also claimed Lithuania.

The German Reich never had any intention of occupying Lithuania and not only failed to present any such demand to the Lithuanian government, but on the contrary refused the request of Lithuania to send German troops to Lithuania for that purpose as inconsistent with the aims of German policy.

Despite all this I complied also with this fresh Russian demand. However, this was only the beginning of continually renewed extortions which kept on repeating ever since.

Victory in Poland which was won by German troops exclusively caused me to address yet another peace offer to the Western Powers. It was refused, owing to efforts of international and Jewish warmongers.

At that time already the reason for such refusal lay in the fact that Britain still had hopes of being able to mobilize a European coalition against Germany, which was to include the Balkans and Soviet Russia.

It was therefore decided in London to send Mr. Cripps [Sir Stafford Cripps] as ambassador to Moscow. He received clear instructions under all circumstances to resume relations between the English and Soviet Russia and develop them in a pro-British direction. The British press reported on the progress of this mission as long as tactical reasons did not impose silence.

In the autumn of 1939 and spring of 1940 the first results actually made themselves felt. As Russia undertook to subjugate by armed force not only Finland but also the Baltic states she suddenly justified this action by the assertion, as ridiculous as it was false, that she must protect these countries from an outside menace or forestall it.

This could only be meant to apply to Germany, for no other power could even gain entrance into the Baltic area, let alone go to war there. Still I had to be silent. However, those in power in
the Kremlin immediately went further.

Whereas in the spring of 1940 Germany, in accordance with the so-called pact of friendship, withdrew her forces from the eastern frontier and, in fact, for the most part cleared these areas entirely of German troops, a concentration of Russian forces at that time was already beginning in a measure which could only be regarded as a deliberate threat to Germany.

According to a statement that Soviet Foreign Minister and then-Premier Vyacheslav Molotov personally made at that time, there were 22 Soviet divisions in the Baltic states alone already in the spring of 1940.

Since the Russian government itself always claimed it was called in by the local population, the purpose of their presence there could only be a demonstration against Germany.

While our soldiers from May 5, 1940 on had been breaking Franco-British power in the west, Russian military deployment on our eastern frontier was being continued to a more and more menacing extent.

From August 1940 on, I therefore considered it to be in the interest of the Reich no longer to permit our eastern provinces, which moreover had already been laid waste so often, to remain unprotected in the face of this tremendous concentration of Bolshevist divisions.

Thus there resulted a British-Soviet Russian cooperation intended mainly at the tying up of such powerful forces in the east that radical conclusion of the war in the west, particularly as regards aircraft, could no longer be vouched for by the German High Command.

This, however, was in line with the objects not only of the British but also of the Soviet Russian policy, for both England and Soviet Russia intend to let this war go on for as long as possible in order to weaken all Europe and render it progressively more impotent.

Russia’s threatened attack on Romania was in the last analysis equally intended to gain possession of an important base, not only of Germany’s but also of Europe’s economic life, or at least destroy it. The Reich, especially since 1933, sought with unending patience to gain states in Southeast Europe as trading partners. We therefore also had the greatest interest in their internal constitutional consolidation and organization. Russia’s advance into Romania and Greece’s tie-up with England threatened to turn these regions, too, within a short time into a general theater of war.

Contrary to our principles and customs, and at the urgent request of the Romanian government, which was itself responsible for this development, I advised acquiescence to the Soviet Russian demands for the sake of peace and the cession of Bessarabia.

The Romanian government believed, however, that it could answer for this before its own people only if Germany and Italy in compensation would at least guarantee the integrity of what still remained of Romania.

I did so with heavy heart, principally because when the German Reich gives a guarantee that means it also abides by it. We are neither Englishmen nor Jews.

I still believe at this late hour to have served the cause of peace in that region, albeit by assuming serious personal obligation. In order, however, finally to solve these problems and achieve clarity concerning the Russian attitude toward Germany, as well as under pressure of continually increasing mobilization on our Eastern frontier, I invited Mr. Molotov to come to Berlin.

The Soviet minister for foreign affairs then demanded Germany’s clarification of an agreement to the following four questions:

Point one was Molotov’s question: Was the German guarantee for Romania also directed against Soviet Russia in case of attack by Soviet Russia on Romania?

My answer: The German guarantee is a general one and is unconditionally binding upon us. Russia, however, never declared to us that she had other interests in Romania beyond Bessarabia. The occupation of northern Bukovina had already been a violation of this assurance. I did not therefore think that Russia could now suddenly have more far-reaching intentions against Romania.

Molotov’s second point: That Russia again felt menaced by Finland. Russia was determined not to tolerate this. Was Germany ready not to give any aid to Finland and above all immediately to withdraw German relief troops marching through to Kirkenes?

My answer: Germany continued to have absolutely no political interests in Finland. A fresh war by Russia against the small Finnish people could not, however, be regarded any longer by the German government as tolerable, all the more so as we could never believe Russia to be threatened by Finland. Under no circumstances did we want another theater of war to arise in the Baltic.

Molotov’s third question: Was Germany prepared to agree that Russia give a guarantee to Bulgaria and send Soviet Russian troops to Bulgaria for this purpose, in connection with which he—Molotov—was prepared to state that the Soviets did not intend on that account, for example, to depose the king?

My answer: Bulgaria was a sovereign state and I had no
knowledge that Bulgaria had ever asked Soviet Russia for any kind of guarantee such as Romania had requested from Germany. Moreover, I would have to discuss the matter with my allies.

Molotov’s fourth question: Soviet Russia required free passage through the Dardenelles under all circumstances and for her protection also demanded occupation of a number of important bases on the Dardenelles and Bosphorus. Was Germany in agreement with this or not?

My answer: Germany was prepared at all times to agree to alteration of the [1936 Treaty] of Montreux in favor of the Black Sea states. Germany was not prepared to agree to Russia’s taking possession of bases on the straits.

National Socialists, here I adopted the only attitude that I could adopt as the responsible leader of the German Reich but also as the representative of European culture and civilization and conscious of my responsibility.

The consequence was to increase in Soviet Russia the activity directed against the Reich, above all, however, the immediate commencement of undermining the new Romanian state from within and an attempt to remove the Bulgarian government by propaganda.

With the help of the confused and immature leaders of the Romanian Legion (Iron Guard) a coup d’etat was staged in Romania whose aim was to overthrow Chief of State Gen. Antonescu and produce chaos in the country so as to remove all legal power of the government and thus the precondition for an implementation of the German guarantee.

I nevertheless still believed it best to remain silent.

Burning buildings are shown in the background as German troops enter the city of Smolensk on their drive to Moscow in August 1941. While the initial successes of the Wehrmacht were stunning, the objective of capturing Moscow swiftly was not achieved. The advance of the German troops was stopped and the Germans, equipped for summer fighting, were left to fend for themselves in the bitterly cold months ahead.

Immediately after the failure of this undertaking, renewed reinforcement of concentrations of Russian troops on Germany’s eastern frontier took place. Panzer detachments and parachutists were transferred in continually increasing numbers to dangerous proximity to the German frontier. German fighting forces and the German nation know that until a few weeks ago not a single tank or mechanized division was stationed on our eastern frontier.

If any final proof was required for the coalition meanwhile formed between England and Soviet Russia despite all diversion and camouflage, the Yugoslav conflict provided it.

While I made every effort to undertake a final attempt to pacify the Balkans and in sympathetic cooperation with Il Duce invited Yugoslavia to join the Tripartite Pact, England and Soviet Russia in a joint conspiracy organized that coup d’etat which in one night removed the then government, which had been ready to come to agreement.

For we can today inform the German nation that the Serb Putsch against Germany did not take place merely under the
British, but primarily under Soviet Russian auspices. As we remained silent on this matter also, the Soviet leaders now went still one step further. They not only organized the Putsch, but a few days later also concluded that well-known friendship pact with the Serbs in their will to resist pacification of the Balkans and incite them against Germany.

And this was no platonic intention: Moscow demanded mobilization of the Serb army.

Since even now I still believed it better not to speak, those in power in the Kremlin went still further: The government of the German Reich today possesses documentary evidence which proves that Russia, in order finally to bring Serbia into the war, gave her a promise to supply her via Salonika with arms, aircraft, munitions and other war materiel against Germany.

And this happened almost at the very moment when I myself advised Japanese Foreign Minister [Yosuke] Matsuoka that eased tension with Russia always was my hope, thereby to serve the cause of peace.

Only the rapid advance of our incomparable divisions to Skophie [in Macedonia] as well as the capture of Salonika itself frustrated the aims of this Soviet Russian/Anglo-Saxon plot. Officers of the Serb air force, however, fled to Russia and were there immediately received as allies.

The victory of the Axis powers in the Balkans in the first instance thwarted the plan to involve Germany this summer in months-long battles in Southeastern Europe while meantime steadily completing the alignment of Soviet Russian armies and increasing their readiness for war in order, finally, together with England and supported by American supplies anticipated to crush the German Reich and Italy.

Thus Moscow not only broke but miserably betrayed the stipulations of our friendly agreement. All this was done while the rulers in the Kremlin, exactly as in the case of Finland and Romania, up to the last moment pretended peace and friendship and drew up an ostensibly innocent démenti [official denial].

Although until now I was forced by circumstances to keep silent again and again, the moment has now come when to continue as a mere observer would not only be a sin of omission but a crime against the German people—yes, even against the whole of Europe.

Today something like 160 Russian divisions are standing at our frontiers. For weeks constant violations of this frontier have taken place, not only affecting us but from the far north down to Romania.

Russian airmen consider it sport nonchalantly to overlook these frontiers, presumably to prove to us that they already feel themselves masters of these territories.

During the night of June 17 to June 18 Russian patrols again penetrated into the Reich’s territory and could only be driven back after prolonged firing. This has brought us to the hour when it is necessary for us to take steps against this plot devised by the Jewish/Anglo-Saxon warmongers and equally the Jewish rulers of the Bolshevist center in Moscow.

German people, at this moment a march is taking place that, as regards extent, compares with the greatest the world hitherto has seen. United with their Finnish comrades, the fighters of the victory of Narvik are standing in the northern Arctic. German divisions commanded by the conqueror of Norway, in cooperation with the heroes of Finnish freedom, under their marshal, are protecting Finnish soil.

Formations of the German Eastern Front extend from East Prussia to the Carpathians. German and Romanian soldiers are united under Chief of State Antonescu from the banks of the Pruth along the lower reaches of the Danube to the shores of the Black Sea. The task of this front, therefore, no longer is the protection of single countries, but the safeguarding of Europe and thereby the salvation of all.

I therefore decided today again to lay the fate and future of the German Reich and our people in the hands of our soldiers. May God help us in this fight.

**The Thirty Years War**

By C.V. Wedgwood. Europe in 1618 was torn between Protestants and Catholics, Bourbon and Hapsburg, as well as empires, kingdoms, and countless principalities. After angry Protestants tossed three representatives of the Holy Roman Empire out a window in Prague, war spread from Bohemia with relentless abandon, drawing powers from Spain to Sweden into a nightmarish world of famine, disease, and seemingly unstoppable destruction. Experts estimate that in some areas of Europe, 75% of the population was wiped out. Softcover, 520 pages, #488, $22. Call 1-877-773-9077 toll free to charge. S&H charges apply. See page 74 of this issue.
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**“Thus Moscow not only broke but miserably betrayed the stipulations of our friendly agreement. All this was done while the rulers in the Kremlin up to the last moment pretended peace and friendship.”**

---

ANALYZING THE CAUSE OF GERMAN ATTACK ON RUSSIA

Documents show that World War II-era Germany had no chance for peace, being surrounded by imperialistic powers that were bent on her unconditional surrender and the annihilation of the German people. Germany’s only hope was a pre-emptive attack on the giant, menacing Soviet Union. It was a necessary but desperate measure that resulted in failure and the loss of World War II.

BY UDO WALENDY

Even now, nearly 65 years after the end of World War II, the most absurd and untruthful accusations of guilt for the 1941 campaign in Russia are spread about throughout the world—against Germany or Adolf Hitler, as the case may be—coming from the politicians, the media and “court historians’” books. Yet the Bolshevnik objective of world domination, the heavily armed military in the USSR and Stalin’s openly aggressive advance during 1939-1941 through Finland into the Baltic area, toward Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, were well known worldwide.

The Red Army’s gigantic troop deployment along the entire western front, for the invasion of Europe, had already been known to the cognoscenti in governmental circles in 1941 through secret services, the diplomatic corps and the press.

FDR and Churchill, in order to force a German-Soviet war, had already provided war materiel to the Soviet Union, prior to June 1941. International researchers later confirmed this in detail.

The most recent example of a “historian” enmeshed in overly zealous re-education opportunism was given by Bogdan Musial in his book Kampfplatz Deutschland—Stalins Kriegspläne gegen den Westen (“Battleground Germany: Stalin’s War Plans Against the West,” Berlin, Historische Tatsachen [HT], no. 103, 2008, pp. 3 ff).

Musial confirmed unequivocally from Soviet archive documents the globally unique industrial buildup, the deployment of Soviet military forces near the western national borders—“explicitly for the war of aggression against Germany” (ibid., p. 465). But then Musial made all these facts appear insignificant.
Russian Historian Blames Poland For Instigating Second World War

By the The Barnes Review Staff

The following was excerpted from the Russian Internet newspaper edition of VSGLAD (“View”) of June 4, 2009. Originally the article appeared on the website of the Russian Defense Ministry. It was removed at the request of the Polish government but has appeared in various publications in Russia since. The author, Sergey N. Kowaljow, is the head of research for military history at the Russian Defense Department. He writes as follows:

The position of the Soviet Union on the eve of the breakout of World War II has been subject of discussion for quite some time by politicians, researchers and specialists as well as the public. Anti-Russian articles are based on a falsified and distorted depiction of the Russian leadership during that time. The mass media proclaims that a new cold war has begun. Some Western authors write the following: “It is time to confront the bitter truth: Russia has returned; it is rich and strong and carries animosity toward the West—a new cold war has been started, and, just like in the 1940s, we realize it too late.”

Today’s falsifiers attempt to turn the Soviet Union into the instigator of World War II or at least blame “two bloody dictators” with equal parts of responsibility for unleashing it. A favorite argument is the non-aggression pact signed between the Soviet Union and Germany on August 23, 1939.

Judging the history of World War II without prejudice, one has to know that it was started with Poland’s refusal to accede to German demands. Less known is that the German demands were very modest: The return of the city of Danzig to the Third Reich and asking for permission to construct an autobahn and railroad in order to connect East Prussia with the main part of Germany were hardly unreasonable. The inhabitants of Danzig were almost all Germans, separated from Germany by the Versailles Peace Treaty. They sincerely desired to be united with their historic homeland. The demands for building the roads were reasonable, especially since no claims were made for territory in the “Polish Corridor,” which separated Germany into two parts. Germany had never accepted the territorial changes in the east as determined by the Versailles Treaty (as opposed to changes on its western borders).

For these reasons, the adjustment suggested by Germany to Poland on October 24, 1938 concerning Danzig and the Polish Corridor, was not considered to further complicate that situation. However, Warsaw answered gruffly and rejected the German suggestions. Poland aspired to major power status at the time and did not want to become a junior partner of Germany.

On March 26, 1939 Poland unequivocally refused to accede to German demands. Germany reacted by canceling on April 28, 1939 the German-Polish agreement of friendship and cooperation signed in 1934 and invading Poland on Sept. 1, 1939.

Thus he referred to production and organizational deficiencies in the structure of the Soviet state and “established” that Hitler had “suspected nothing” at all (ibid., p. 465) of Stalin’s dangerous preparations, but rather had instead been “possessed by his idea of the acquisition of ‘Lebensraum’,” and even of “world domination” (462), and that Hitler had, in an irresponsible way, made himself to blame for opening the two-front war for Germany. Hitler therefore had no right (according to Musial) to launch a preventive war.

Rather, he was the “criminal aggressor,” because he, in the end, had “started it.” For such conclusions, author Musial needed no evidence. Not once did he even find a need to take a look in the Akten zur Deutschen Auswärtigen Politik (“Official Documents of German Foreign Policy” or ADAP).

A look in these official German documents, which are today known to have been edited by representatives of the victorious Western powers at the end of the war (Great Britain, France, U.S.A.), would have sufficed to refute such nonsense.

With regard to the antecedent history of the Russia campaign, it is to be noted that already in 1941 masses of authentic documents had been made available to the world, that they would of themselves be sufficient to debunk the motives imputed to Hitler of “lust for war and conquest.” It is obvious that among the Allied editors of the Documents of German Foreign Policy for 1941, that—in contrast to what they had done in regard to the years 1938/1939/1940—the re-educators were doing the presorting.

In view of the massive documentary inventory for the year 1941, they had in the interim lost either the desire or the imagination (perhaps also the personnel, money or time) to develop the same intensity they had in their zeal for previous forgeries. For the year 1941, they seemingly contented themselves with excluding undesired papers.

Undoubtedly, it was clear to them that with this method one can likewise achieve the effect of a falsification of background. Both the one and the other—forgeries and exclusions—can be found in the ADAP as the official publica-
tions of the Foreign Office of today’s German federal government.

One finds numerous Soviet complaints about violations of Russian airspace sovereignty by German airplanes, but not a single German complaint about violation of German airspace by Soviet reconnaissance planes. Even the astonished question on June 21, 1941 of the Soviet foreign commissar, Molotov, directed to the German ambassador in Moscow, Count von der Schulenburg, is to be found in the ADAP, namely, that he could not at all understand the reasons why the German government would be so manifestly discontented with the Soviet government.

But one will search without success in Volume XII of Series D 1937-1941 (April 6 to June 22, 1941) for very decisive documents. Thus, as an example, the Memorandum der Reichsregierung (“Memorandum of the Imperial German Government”) presented to an international press conference by Reichsminister for Foreign Affairs von Ribbentrop in the early morning of June 22, 1941, which had been handed to Soviet Ambassador [Vladimir] Dekanosow in Berlin just a few hours before, about the grounds for the German military action against the USSR, is missing.

Likewise, the corresponding OKW (German High Command) announcements and the report of the Reichsminister for the Interior Dr. Wilhelm Frick and of SS-Reichsfuehrer Heinrich Himmler about the agitation, sedition and sabotage by Comintern inside the German sphere of influence are not listed.

True, the editors of the ADAP do indicate that one would be able to look up these documents in the Monatshefte fuer Auswaertige Politik (“Monthly Publication of the Foreign Office”) being published at that time, in Issue 7, 1941, 545 ff—but who is able to do that in the face of the systematically “cleansed” German libraries following 1945?

If one goes through this publication of documents [i.e., Dokumente der Deutschen Politik], one is astonished at the extensive and careful work connected with the collection, especially when one considers the desperate war situation in Germany in 1944.

Something else is striking: One finds nowhere any sort of defamatory agitation, or even lies about atrocities, regarding any of Germany’s opponents, but, on the contrary, exclusively objective argumentation. Documents reprinted in this issue of HT about the causes and background of the Russia campaign (as likewise all the remaining documents) show that:

- The entirety of Hitler’s foreign policy decisions resulted from the conclusions and consequences of the most varied information from other people and governments, and not a single one from some capricious, preconceived madness or “plan” developed on his own authority, which is supposed to be ascribed to him;
- Hitler never ordered a subordinate to spread any lies whatsoever, in order to pave the way for a “desired aggression”;
- No lies were needed and none were employed, in order to provide grounds for the preventive attack of the German Wehrmacht against the USSR on June 22, 1941. Rather, the state of affairs presented from the German side corresponded clearly with the facts. It changes nothing in the circumstances of the case that, for all that, those in Berlin were not able to recognize the full extent of the Soviet army’s military strength, nor sufficiently see through to the intensity of the political cooperation at that time between the USSR, Great Britain and the U.S.A.

Already in 1939, Germany was encircled by imperialistic powers desirous of war and annihilation of the German people. Their initiatives, before the outbreak of war on September 1, 1939, were directed toward the extermination of Germany or toward unconditional surrender.

There is not a single document from these imperial powers (Great Britain, the U.S.A. or the USSR)—if one disregards fraudulent and (in Lenin’s sense) “tactical” documents and agreements—that would substantiate any claim that, after the early summer of 1939, any chance for peace was left to Germany.

This is the translated introduction to the German version of Historische Tatsachen (HT or “Historical Facts”) no. 104, which contains extensive documentation on this subject. (The complete issue of HT no. 104, in German, is available; please call 202-547-5586 for more information.) Translated by P. Strahl.
SUVEROV: THE MAN WHO REWROTE THE HISTORY OF WORLD WAR II

WE HAVE BECOME ACCUSTOMED TODAY to view [June 22, 1941, the invasion of the USSR] as Hitler’s greatest blunder. It is quite obvious since the publication of Viktor Suvorov’s books that this aspect of World War II has to be reexamined. One can now understand how the preventive offensive actions of the German army begun against the USSR on 22 June 1941 actually constituted Hitler’s most brilliant military action, the high point of his military career. . . . Suvorov has opened an entirely new layer of our history. This is his greatest service. I am certain that others will now surface to correct, refine and amplify his work. But they will always be the second, third or tenth. Viktor Suvorov was the first. —Historian Yuri Felshtinsky, Boston

BY DANIEL W. MICHAELS

Declared by the former USSR Communist Party and government to be a traitor and sentenced to death in absentia, “Viktor Suvorov” (his real name being Vladimir Bogdanovich Rezun) is nonetheless the most popular and most widely read military analyst of the Russo-German war in Russia today. Much more than a Revisionist historian, Suvorov was the first, excluding of course the German leaders who were hanged at Nuremberg, to expose the conspiratorial activities of Stalin and his generals in planning a sneak-attack military takeover of Europe.

Suvorov has proved to most independent historians that Stalin planned to attack Germany in early July, only to have his plans upset by Hitler on June 22.

Mindful always that the first victims of Communism were the peoples of the Soviet Union, Suvorov writes with reverence for the millions of lives that were wasted in the insane plans of Lenin and Stalin for “world revolution.” He also recognizes that many Russians will despise him for his revelations. Suvorov explains:

I have challenged the one sacred thing the Russian people still cling to—their memory of the “Great Patriotic War.” I have sacrificed everything dear to me to write these books. It would have been intolerable to have died without telling the people what I have uncovered. Curse the books from which I have drawn my conclusions. Curse me. But even as you curse me, try to understand.

Before Suvorov’s most significant books on the prelude to and beginning of World War II, namely, Icebreaker, Mobilization Day (Day “M”), The Last Republic, Suicide and The Purge were published, it was as unthinkable to question the generally accepted version of the causes and prosecution of the Russo-German war, as it is today to question aspects of the so-called holocaust—almost a religious taboo.

Except for a very limited English-language edition of his Icebreaker published in the United Kingdom, none of Suvorov’s books has been made available in English. The first full text in any language appeared in German in 1989, while the first full Russian edition did not appear until 1992.

[Most of his books are available in Polish. Suvorov has written 18 books that have been translated into 20 languages.—Ed.]
Hamish Hamilton of London published the first and only English-language edition in 1990, but all copies soon mysteriously disappeared. To date, well over 4 million Russian-language copies, far more than any other historical work, have been printed in the Russian Federation.

Over the years, extensive abstracts of Suvorov’s books have appeared in two American journals: The Journal of Historical Review (JHR) and The Barnes Review (TBR). These have cast new light on the events leading to the outbreak of hostilities between Germany and the Soviet Union.1

Finally, an American publisher, the Naval Institute Press, has published a highly readable single volume of Viktor Suvorov’s World War II works, summarizing the contents of his four major works.2

Briefly stated, the official version of the causes for the war between Germany and the Soviet Union (National Socialism vs. Communism) in the Western democracies before Suvorov’s works became available could be phrased thusly:

Without warning or provocation, Hitler launched a surprise Blitzkrieg against the woefully unprepared Soviet Union, thereby violating a friendship pact made with its leader, the unsuspecting and trusting Stalin. The crazed German “Fuehrer” was driven by his lust for Lebensraum in the east and his mad obsessive hatred of the Jews, who he believed to be the dominant force in both Communism and capitalism. In Hitler’s treacherous attack, which was only part of his megalomaniac scheme for world conquest, the National Socialist hordes with their preponderance of tanks and aircraft initially overwhelmed the land of the Soviets.

 Needless to say, both the Russians and the Germans, whose war it actually was, have a more realistic explanation for the causes of it. Communism and National Socialism, while irreconcilable ideologies, were both revolutionary in the sense that

after World War I old Europe had vanished. The European monarchies were decimated, the empires were tottering, capitalism had collapsed into a world depression, Christianity appeared to have no answers, and young people in Europe were attracted to one or the other of the new ideologies—they were building a new world order to fill the vacuum left by the old.

Suvorov, by virtue of his experience as a former Soviet intelligence officer, has turned the ridiculous version of the Russo-German War prevalent in the West completely upside down. He proved that:

• It was Germany, not the Soviet Union, that was completely unprepared for war (the USSR, not Germany, possessed hordes of soldiers, tanks, aircraft, artillery etc);
  • It was the Communists, not the National Socialists, who sought world conquest;
  • The Germans did in fact issue a declaration of war, listing their reasons for doing so;
• Stalin had a timetable and plan for his intended sneak attack on Germany;
• Hitler, on the other hand, generally reacted to Soviet and Western actions. But he was determined that the Soviet Union would never massively attack Germany first;
• When war came, both sides planned for an aggressive offensive campaign;
• If he was to win, Hitler needed a short four-month Blitzkrieg campaign; and
• If his own surprise attack failed, Stalin favored a long war of attrition.

As it turned out, Hitler upset Stalin’s methodical plan by attacking first and winning the initial battles. Stalin, however, on the strength of Soviet industry’s mass production of war materiel and the endurance and toughness of his soldiery, prevailed, to win the war. Hitler’s Wehrmacht fought tenaciously, almost to the last man and last cartridge, but, after its failure to take Moscow, it could not win. Hitler’s allies—Romania, Hungary, Finland and thousands of volunteers, including some Britons and men from India—however brave and dedicated—could not match the strength contributed to the Soviet Union by Stalin’s allies: the United States, the United Kingdom (and her colonies), France (and her colonies), Poland and other “democracies.”

Suvorov agrees with historians A.J.P. Taylor, David Hoggan, Patrick Buchanan and others that Hitler neither wanted nor planned for a European-wide conflict in 1939. Even the British and French declarations of war against Germany did not necessarily mean a world war would ensue, especially since Germany continued to try to negotiate a peace during the Phony War (der Sitzkrieg; October 1939-April 1940) and even reduced her armed forces. Britain, however, would have none of it.

British diplomacy, intentionally or not, misled the Germans as to how the unfair provisions might be corrected. At first, and for some time thereafter, the British assured Germany that the inequities in the Versailles Treaty could all be rectified through peaceful negotiations. Then suddenly the British reversed policy and issued a war guarantee to Poland in the event Germany pressed her demands to undo decisions taken against her at Versailles. The Kremlin now knew that the world war that Stalin planned for had begun.

Lenin and Stalin, Suvorov argues, both believed the Communist world revolution could only be spread to Europe by means of another war. To this end, Stalin began early to fan Germany’s revanchist fires by permitting the Third Reich to train its armed forces on Soviet soil, actually helping Hitler to gain power with the hidden aim of eventually using Germany as a surrogate to conquer Europe. As the title of his most famous book Icebreaker implies, a vehicle or agent was needed to clear the path to war. Hitler, according to Suvorov, was to be that agent. Moreover, the Third Reich would also bear the onus of having instigated the war.

At the opportune time, i.e., after the National Socialists had subjugated Europe and all the belligerents (Germany, France, Poland and England) were exhausted, the Soviet Union would invade Germany with an irresistible, overwhelming surprise attack, thereby conquering and communizing not only Germany but all the nations of Europe under National Socialist control as well. The Soviets would then, as Stalin planned, occupy most of Europe as “liberators.”

Lenin said: “History progresses on the basis of wars of liberation.” Stalin said: “Revolution is exported on the points of bayonets.” Stalin’s closest associates, Molotov, Zhdanov, Mekhlis and Shcherbakov, constantly spoke of “expanding the boundaries of Socialism on the wings of war.”

The main principles of Soviet military doctrine in spring 1941 were: 1) The Red Army is an offensive army; 2) War must always be fought on enemy territory with minimum friendly losses and the total destruction of the enemy; 3) The working class in the enemy’s country is a potential ally and should be encouraged to rebel against the ruling class; and 4) War preparations must ensure that offensive capabilities are realized.

Suvorov fixed the date of the planned Soviet attack on Germany and Western Europe by analyzing the Soviet Union’s mobilization plans. On August 19, 1939, the same month the German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact was signed and before Stalin and Hitler had even invaded Poland, Stalin activated his secret mobilization plan in the Soviet Union calling for the Second Strategic Echelon, formed from units in the interior, to proceed to the western frontier to merge with the First Strategic Echelon that was already in their jump-off positions for offensive action.

Since this secret mobilization, as planned by Gen. Boris Shaposhnikov, would take two years to conclude, and since total mobilization in Russia is only undertaken when war is inevitable, Suvorov concluded that Stalin planned to attack Germany in the summer of 1941. Victory over Germany would also mean that the Soviet Union would occupy the West European countries that
Germany had conquered, as “liberators.”

Pursuant to the secret mobilization plan, by June 1941 the 74 divisions of the 2nd Strategic Echelon joined the 170 of the 1st Echelon already in position on the border, raising the total of Red Army men to 5 million. A total of 15,800 Soviet aircraft and 25,800 tanks had also been massed on the western border. Since the Red Army was concentrated in two threatening salients protruding into the west (Belostok in Belorussia and Lvov in Ukraine) in attack positions, it could hardly be withdrawn or disbanded. Nor could it remain in battle readiness indefinitely.

Suvorov asks the questions no Russian general or official has ever been able to answer: “Why were such enormous forces massed? And what else remained for them to do, but attack?”

Stalin very early (1930s) undertook to provide the armed forces of the Soviet Union with the best possible offensive weaponry to satisfy the requirements as defined in the Communist war philosophy and the Soviet military doctrine. The weapon systems so developed, according to Suvorov, always exceeded German military strength in numbers, and, with few exceptions, in quality as well. One of the best impartial descriptions of the comparative strengths of the armed forces of Germany and the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 and throughout the war that supports Suvorov’s contention may be found in Stalin’s Secret War by Robert W. Stephan.3

Among the many advanced arms and military equipment in the Red Army indicative of planned offensive action were an airborne assault force of almost a million men with about a thousand long-range TB-1 and TB-3 aircraft to deliver them; amphibious tanks (T-40), airborne KT (A-40) tanks, wheeled tanks for use on European highways; strategic bombers (TB-7), Su-2 (Ivanov) attack aircraft modeled after the Nakajima B5N2 used by the Japanese to attack Pearl Harbor, maps of border areas and targets in Romania and Germany; German-Russian military phrasebooks etc. The Zhukov Plan of May 15, 1941 for the invasion of Germany emphasized the crucial condition necessary for success:

In order to prevent a surprise German attack and to destroy the German army, I consider it essential that under no circumstances should the initiative for freedom of action be given to the German High Command.

I consider it essential to preempt enemy deployment, to attack the German army when it is still in the stage of deployment and has not yet had time to organize [its] front and the interaction between [its] service arms.

In the spring of 1941 when German military intelligence re-
ported that the Red Army had built up her attack force on the border in strength that could no longer be ignored and that the Communist juggernaut appeared poised to strike. Hitler had to decide: He could either wait for the Soviet Union to attack him, or he could take the initiative and attack the USSR preemptively, believing that if he defeated the Soviet Union, England would become more conciliatory. The first-strike plan Zhukov had proposed to Stalin for dealing with the Wehrmacht was precisely what Hitler used against the Red Army.

Barbarossa shattered Stalin’s methodically drawn-up plan to “liberate” (Communize) all of Europe. Suvorov contends that Stalin was disappointed in the outcome of the war, reminding a few Western generals visiting Moscow that, “Czar Alexander I had gotten as far as Paris.” He showed his disappointment, Suvorov believes, was that Barbarossa was an entirely irrational decision, which the thoroughly rational Stalin could not possibly have foreseen. But it is also possible that Hitler launched Barbarossa precisely because he knew Stalin would not expect it, thereby increasing the chances of success.

The importance, magnitude and effect of Suvorov’s indictment of Stalin as the primary instigator of the war in which some 31 million Russians and Germans perished are obvious. As a Russian, Suvorov cannot be expected to exonerate Hitler, but he does nevertheless understand why the German dictator undertook his “suicidal” attack on the Soviet Union. Hitler had to attack to have any chance of survival.

By refusing to negotiate for peace on the Western Front after Poland capitulated, British diplomacy succeeded in doomed Germany to a two-front war. At a meeting with British Foreign Minister Lord Halifax on November 19, 1937, Hitler ominously warned, “Only one country—Soviet Russia—can win in the event of an all-encompassing conflict.”

Apparantly in complete ignorance of the high state of Soviet military preparations, plans and weaponry (Suvorov considers the USSR at that time to have been the world’s first and only superpower), the United States in the late 1930s began supplying the Soviet Union with military hardware under a secret agreement made by President Roosevelt in 1938.

Then in February 1941, nine months before “neutral” America was even in the war and her own forces adequately armed, Congress passed the Lend-Lease bill ostensibly to “keep the British isles afloat” and, disregarding the advice of the U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union, to provide unconditional aid to the USSR.

In 1963 Marshal Zhukov said:

Today some say the Allies really didn’t help us. But listen, one cannot deny that the Americans shipped over to us materiel without which we could not have equipped our armies held in reserve or been able to continue the war. We did not have enough munitions, and how would we have been able to turn out all those tanks without the rolled steel sent to us by the Americans?

VICTOR SUVOROV is a former Soviet military intelligence officer who had worked undercover in the west before defecting in the 1970s to England and was sentenced, in absentia, to death. Since then he has become a prominent historian and has authored a number of important books challenging the official Russian histories and myths on WWII.

DANIEL W. MICHAELS was for over 40 years a translator of Russian and German texts for the Department of Defense, the last 20 years of which (1972-1993), he was with the Naval Maritime Intelligence Center. He is the author of various scientific reports and bibliographies in geo- and astrophysics and a contributor of book reviews and articles to geographical and historical periodicals. Born in New York City, he now lives in the Washington, D.C. area.
Suvorov sums up the attitude of the West in the face of the two aggressors:

The world hated Hitler and commiserated with Stalin. Hitler conquered half of Europe and the rest of the world declared war against him. Stalin conquered half of Europe and the world sent him greetings. To ensure that Hitler could not hold on to the conquered European countries, the West sank German ships, bombed German cities, and then landed a massive and powerful army on the European continent. To enable Stalin to conquer and hold on to the other half of Europe, the West gave Stalin hundreds of warships, thousands of military aircraft and tanks, hundreds of thousands of military vehicles and millions of tons of fuel, ammunition and supplies.

Understandably, the current Russian government cannot accept Suvorov’s Revisionism and indictment of Soviet policy because the country suffered some 27 million casualties in the war; and to tell the nation that their government not only planned for the war but also botched it terribly would be unthinkable.

In Germany, it is dangerous, under penalty of punitive legal action, to question the official views on the war and the “holocaust” as established by the Allies. To accept Suvorov’s thesis would also mean that the Western Allies were completely blind to Communism’s greater threat to Europe and to themselves.

Fully aware of the importance of Suvorov’s work and anxious to bring his findings to the greatest audience, Russia and Germany have produced an 18-part documentary on three DVDs, called The Last Myth. The “Kloto” Association took 10 years to produce the documentary. It might well be worth your time to take a look at this video series.

ENDNOTES:
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From Oslo to Iraq and the Road Map by Edward Said. This is Said’s final collection of essays, written between 2000 and early 2003. They offer his insightful commentary on the deepening crisis in the Middle East. Urgent and thought-provoking, it gives us a valuable and necessary perspective of the events of the last few years. Softcover, #495. 160 pages, $18. TBR subscribers may take 10% off the list price. Order from TBR, P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003. Use form on page 74 of this issue. Add S&H.
By focusing on the origin, history and importance of the wartime so-called “Lend-Lease” program to the Soviet Union, acclaimed historian Albert L. Weeks in his book *Russia’s Life-Saver: Lend-Lease Aid to the USSR in World War II* provides an excellent purview of the influences, Communist and British, at play in the immediate prewar period to get the United States involved in the war against Germany (and to satisfy Stalin’s wishes with respect to Soviet war needs). Even though it was Japan that had (foolishly) attacked the United States, the Roosevelt administration’s top priority remained the defeat of Germany. Consequently, for the first year or two of the war, American armaments production went primarily to build up our own forces at home and to help the British and the Russians.

Weeks credits Russian historians Boris V. Sokolov and Alla Paperno, as well as others, for having broken through the enforced silence surrounding the true extent and importance of Lend Lease to the Soviet war effort. Also, Weeks acknowledges the contribution of Russian historian Aleksandr Vyslykh in emphasizing the importance of Lend Lease in Soviet Russia’s victory.

Until quite recently most Soviet authorities insisted that American aid had played only a minor role in the Red Army’s victory.

But in 1963 even Marshal Georgy Zhukov confessed:
When we entered the war, we were still a backward country in the industrial sense, as compared to Germany. Today, some say the Allies really didn’t help us. . . . But listen, one cannot deny that the Americans shipped over to us materiel without which we could not have equipped our armies held in reserve or been able to continue the war. . . . We did not have enough munitions; and how would we have been able to turn out all those tanks without the rolled steel sent to us by the Americans?

Congress passed the Lend-Lease bill in February 1941 to, as President Roosevelt put it, “keep the British Isles afloat” and provide—against the advice of U.S. Ambassador Steinhardt—unconditional aid to the Soviet Union. Although the president had approved American Lend-Lease aid to Russia nine months before America was even in the war, the bulk of the shipments did not actually reach the USSR until about 1943, i.e., when the German advance had already been stopped and both sides were near exhaustion. The Lend-Lease materiel would give the Red Army the boost it needed to turn the tide and start the march to Berlin.

Thus, the Roosevelt administration had chosen to support the Soviet Union and the British absent any provocation on the part of Germany.

Weeks notes that, in the face of the American people’s opposition to intervention in the war, it took all of Roosevelt’s Machiavellian political skills and his soothing radio voice to convince Congress to aid Soviet Russia. A goodly number of leading senators, including Roosevelt’s own future vice president, Harry Truman, were of the opinion that America need only stay out of the war and watch the two totalitarian states bleed each other to death. But Roosevelt was encouraged by Winston Churchill, who needed both Russia and the United States as allies in the war Britain declared against Germany and to consider Stalinist Russia as a traditional defense-minded state rather than a revolutionary power bent on subverting and overturning the world order.

Meanwhile, as Weeks reminds us, hundreds of Soviet “agents of influence” and outright spies were already operating in the United States in the employ of the NKVD, NKGB and GRU in Moscow and their networks of resident agents (rezidenty in Russian). Among President Roosevelt’s closest advisers and friends were Henry Morgenthau, secretary of the Treasury, Harry Hopkins (later identified in the Venona intercepts as a Soviet agent of influence, and Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles, a “dove” with regard to the Soviet Union, later forced to resign because of a homosexual incident.

The assistant secretary of the Treasury, Harry Dexter White, one of the main drafters of the administration’s side of the Lend-
Lease particulars, particularly as they pertained to the Russians, was also later identified as an agent of the NKGB. The Venona documents established beyond doubt his treason in the Nathan Silvermaster spy ring (another Treasury official) and as an agent in a Soviet secret operation. The billionaire industrialist Armand Hammer, a notorious international fence for the Communists, also played a key role in laying the foundations of Lend Lease. Hammer acted as intermediary between Roosevelt, Hopkins and Stalin.5

Further, Weeks states that Soviet spy penetration within the upper echelons of the American government was incredibly extensive. In addition to the above mentioned individuals, there was the American diplomat and policymaking aide Alger Hiss; also Lauchlin Currie, Roosevelt’s economics assistant within the White House itself and a spy courier. Soviet agents operated in the War Department, the OSS,6 the Air Corps, the War Production Board, the Office of War Information, departments of Agriculture and Commerce and the administration of Lend Lease. Averell Harriman, another close adviser to the president, while not himself sympathetic to Communism, headed a firm that had been a large investor in the Soviet economy since 1918 and was therefore anxious that good relations continue between America and the Soviet Union. Says Weeks:

The very conception and eventual administration of Lend Lease was in large part made possible by officials under the influence—directly as spies or tangentially in their respective administrative agencies—of such Soviet underground activity by spy ‘illegals.’ . . . It is hard to deny that this widespread penetration of Soviet agents of influence, not to mention the many unnamed Soviet sympathizers in the American bureaucracy and at the highest levels in Washington, D.C., all became potent factors that led Stalin, before World War II, in the direction of accommodation with the U.S. government, which he calculated he could influence so well. As, in fact he did. (p. 45)

Both Maxim Litvinov, the ex-foreign minister who had been replaced to placate Hitler and then made ambassador to Washington, and S.A. Lozovsky, deputy commissar of foreign affairs, both Jewish, had plans for America. Early on, while ambassador, the prescient Maxim Litvinov had assured Stalin: “It is beyond all question that later on Roosevelt will be accessible to our influence.” His assurance proved golden. (Nonetheless, when Stalin had no further use for these gentlemen, he removed them. In 1952 during the anti-Jewish campaign Stalin had Lozovsky executed.)

It is interesting, Weeks observes, that both Stalin and Hitler were convinced that Washington was run by “Jewish money.” When Harry Truman, whom Stalin disliked at first meeting, replaced FDR as president, Stalin reasoned that a new, “non-Jewish” group was now in charge in America.

Churchill, in earlier days, had lamented that Communism, as a baby, had not been strangled in the cradle. Moreover, British diplomatic treachery and hypocrisy were well known to the world and especially to Stalin. Stalin had never really trusted Churchill and the English ruling class.

On the other hand, a genuine friendship appears to have developed between Roosevelt and the Soviet tyrant. According to Russian historian Yu.B. Basistov, whom Weeks cites, by 1939 Stalin considered the United States to be a “pro-Soviet” country. Stalin viewed Roosevelt as a foxy character and “politikan,” a shrewd politico, whom only he, Stalin, could outwit. It is obvious, of course, why Stalin would favor Roosevelt, but why the American president should have been so pro-Soviet remains a mystery. Was it because of the number of Communist sympathizers in FDR’s entourage?

To ingratiate himself with Stalin, Roosevelt often did so at the expense of Churchill and the British Foreign Service. Since Stalin well knew that both Western leaders before June 22 were publicly and undeniably committed to the notion that, of the two dictatorships, German and Russian, the latter was far less threatening to American and British interests, he was in the driver’s seat. The Russian dictator was also quite aware of the fact that both Britain and the United States needed Russian manpower in the war against Germany. The United States indeed became the “arsenal of democracy,” but Russia was to suffer most of the battlefield deaths.

By late 1940 and especially since the unsuccessful and disruptive visit of Molotov to Hitler, Stalin realized he would inevitably be allied with the United States and Britain against Germany, Weeks maintains. On the diplomatic front, in July 1940 Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles engaged in exploratory talks with Konstatin Umansky, the Soviet ambassador, on issues of mutual interest. Not long after, Umansky, certainly with Stalin’s approval, made the public statement: “Without doubt the Soviet Union and the United States will eventually be on the same side anyway.”

Weeks quotes Ya.Ye. Chadayev, an eyewitness to a Politburo meeting in the Kremlin on November 14, 1940, in which Stalin is reported to have said, among other things:
1. Germany is preparing to attack our country. The Fuehrer used the talks in Berlin in an attempt to cover up his true intentions.

2. The Soviets made their agreements with Nazi Germany merely to forestall an attack by fascist Germany. . . . This provided us with a temporary breathing spell.

3. Meanwhile the Reich’s ruling circles have increased their hostile actions toward us as though to accentuate the fact that the attack on the Soviet Union was a foregone conclusion.

4. So, what are the Fuehrer’s intentions with respect to further cooperation with the Soviet state? Can we assume that at some time Hitler would abandon the plans inscribed in Mein Kampf? Of course we cannot make this assumption.

5. Hitler has subdued six European countries [really four and two halves, considering that Russia took half of Poland and Hitler took only half of France—Ed.]. . . . This was of course a great strategic achievement for fascist Germany. Now Hitler has set task of settling matters with England. Yet this is not Hitler’s main goal. The main thing for him is to attack the Soviet Union. . . . We must always keep this in mind as we prepare to repulse the fascist aggression. (p. 95)

Ironically, on the day (March 11, 1941) FDR signed Lend Lease into law, V.N. Merkulov, the NKGB boss, issued a secret report stating that there was solid evidence from “many reliable diplomatic sources in Berlin that Germany was planning an attack on the Soviet Union that very likely will take place in the summer of this year.”

In another incident Weeks recounts that at a late-night party in the apartment of a Georgian friend G.A. Egnatashvili, someone expressed the fear that one day Soviet Russia would find itself at war with America. Hearing this Stalin blurted out: “My dear Liliya Germanova, we won’t be fighting America. We will be fighting Germany. England and America will be our allies. So don’t be worried.”

It is true that the Russian dictator did not believe Hitler would attack the Soviet Union while Britain was still in the war and reportedly told Marshal Zhukov in the spring of 1941, “Hitler is not so foolish as to think the Soviet Union is simply another Poland or France, or Britain, or all of them taken together!” That belief, however, would not preclude his making his own plans for the invasion of Germany. In fact, it might actually have encouraged Stalin to proceed with his aggressive plans.

Weeks states emphatically: “Stalin was kept well informed about German troop movements in the spring of 1941. To suggest that he simply ignored or repudiated all this espionage warning of German war plans is simply not credible. That Stalin, in fact, sought to exploit the information is credible.”

While Stalin appeared to dismiss the countless warnings of an impending German attack from his own intelligence sources as well as those from the UK and the United States, Weeks suggests the Soviet leader might have deliberately assumed that innocent and trusting posture for his public image at home and to mislead the Germans as to his true plans. To be sure, Soviet public policy (propaganda) before, during, and after World War II has been to emphasize the purely “defensive” nature of any Soviet entry into
the war (despite his attack on Finland). Stalin could hardly have announced publicly that he was planning an aggressive war against Germany. No doubt, if Germany had not upset the Russian planned attack (“Groza” = “Thunder”), the USSR would have invented a convincing pretext for the operation.

Total Lend-Lease aid exceeded $50 billion (in 1940 dollars or about $300 billion in current dollars), of which Britain received some $31 billion and the USSR $12.5 billion (about $80 billion in current dollars). Stalin himself, whom all historians including Weeks now emphasize was an exceeding competent man whose prodigious memory impressed everyone, took the lead, after consultations with his military leaders, in compiling his Lend-Lease want-list. By war’s end, he had received roughly 10,000 tanks; 10,000 artillery pieces; 14,500 aircraft; high-octane aviation fuel; 100,000 tons of nonferrous metals; 500,000 trucks; 2.3 million tons of food provisions; hundreds of ships; $3 billion worth of machinery, including whole factories; and military cloth sufficient to clothe 3 million Red Army men.

Weeks could neither confirm nor deny that some uranium had also been shipped to the Soviet Union. According to Sokolov, whom Weeks cites: “Lend-Lease shipments made up anywhere from 15 to 25% and in some cases upwards to 50% of what the Soviets themselves were able to produce. . . . Without these shipments under Lend-Lease, the Soviet Union not only would not have been able to win the Great Patriotic War, it would not have been able even to oppose the German invaders.”

Weeks also describes the technical details of Lend-Lease shipments including the four main sea lanes of communication, their traffic loads, safety considerations and scheduling.

President Truman attempted to discontinue Lend-Lease aid on May 8, 1945, when the war in Europe officially ended, but quickly reinstated it on the advice of Ambassador Harriman. Much of this matériel was to turn up in the Korean War in the hands of the North Koreans and Chinese, to kill American boys.

During the entire period Lend-Lease aid to the USSR was in force, President Roosevelt, acting on his weird “hunch” that Stalin was really a closet democrat and that the United States and USSR were converging toward moderate socialist democracies, insisted against the advice of his own ambassadors to the USSR (Lawrence Steinhardt, William Bullitt, Admiral William Standley) and the State Department (George Kennan, Charles Bohlen, Loy Henderson) that the Soviet Union should not be pressured to make any reciprocal gestures of friendship or appreciation to the United States.

Stalin even refused to cooperate with the United States in wartime tactics and strategy.

Stalin constantly pressed a compliant President Roosevelt to send ever more matériel even after Soviet victory was assured. Supporting President Roosevelt’s naïve approach to the Soviets were Harry Hopkins, Joseph Davies, and Philip Faymonville. Averill Harriman, who was intelligent enough to know that Roosevelt’s policy was wrong, never contradicted the president. Years later, Kennan voiced his opinion of President Roosevelt:

“The truth is—there is no avoiding it—that Franklin Roosevelt, for all his charm and for all his skill as a political leader, was, when it came to foreign policy, a very superficial man, ignorant, diletantish, with a severely limited intellectual horizon.”

ENDNOTES:
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A Requiem for Father Jozef Tiso

... Nearly Raises the Dead

While fellow Catholic clerics clamor for holocaust-denying Bishop Richard Williamson’s immolation at the stake, his unwillingness to recant has generated more media hysteria than a related controversy within the same church. About the same time he was deported from his parish in Argentina as “a dangerous heretic,” Vatican damage-control experts were forced to deal with a similar case in Eastern Europe.

By Frank Joseph

Last April 18, another bishop had just celebrated a requiem high mass, for Jozef Tiso, the Fascist leader of Slovakia during World War II. The ornate memorial was personally conducted by the archbishop of Trnava, Ján Sokol, to overflow attendance at Blumental Church in Bratislava to commemorate the 61st anniversary of Tiso’s execution in 1947 after Soviet forces occupied the same city. According to an article in The Slovak Spectator, “The requiem mass took place with Tiso’s portrait hanging behind the altar. Next to the portrait, the presidential standard of the wartime Slovak state was placed with the slogan: ‘Faithful to ourselves—concordantly advance!’”

At Archbishop Sokol’s invitation, Slovakia’s leading historian, Milan S. Durica, delivered an encomium on behalf of Monsignor Tiso. Beginning in 1996, Durica’s A History of Slovakia and the Slovaks has been placed as an educational supplement by the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic in the nation’s primary schools.

Jaroslav Franek, spokesman for Bratislava’s Jews, insisted that the requiem mass “could even be classified as a crime,” and was supported by Katarína Zavacká, lawyer for the Institute of Law and State of the Slovak Academy of Sciences. “During the Nuremberg trials,” she warned, “it was agreed that states would incorporate promotion of Fascism as a crime into their penal codes.” Undeterred by threats, Archbishop Sokol told the Slovakian television news channel, TA-3, “I respect President Tiso. I respect him very much, as I remember when I was a child, we were very poor, but during his times, we had a high standard of living. There was prosperity here. We did not want for anything, although it was wartime.”

Americans unfamiliar with the deeds of Jozef Tiso find it difficult to understand why his name still elicits such diverse response more than 60 years after his death. He was born on October 13, 1887, in Austria-Hungarian Ve ká Byt a (today’s Byt a) to Slovakian parents.

Deeply religious, Jozef early dedicated his life to the Catholic
Church, eventually graduating from Vienna’s prestigious Pázmáneum to minister as an assistant priest in three Slovakian parishes. With the outbreak of World War I in August 1914, Tiso became a field curate, a kind of chaplain on the frontlines, offering last rites to dying soldiers.

The aftermath of that conflict tripped the implosion of organized society across Eastern Europe, followed by the proliferation of Red organizers trying to exploit the starvation and desperation of the times. Tiso was shocked when Bela Kuhn, the Bolshevik master of neighboring Hungary, openly promised to replace Jesus Christ with his own god, Karl Marx, to a large, jubilant crowd in central Budapest. Kuhn’s incensed followers, trying to make good his word, broke into the city cathedral, and assaulted a priest trying to prevent them from looting the altar. Similar incidents erupting in Czech cities prompted Tiso to make a study of the Communist movement and especially of the men behind it—their origins and motivations.

During this chaotic period, he was appointed spiritual director of the Nitra Seminary, where he was additionally a schoolteacher. With social upheaval spreading like contagion, Tiso spoke out for the first time to denounce the Marxists, most of who were not Slovakian, and criticized government authorities unwilling or unable to save their country from disintegrating. His words were publicly well received, but when growing crowds of interested listeners were about to become activist followers, he was arrested and convicted on charges of “inciting to riot,” but let off with a warning. A second conviction earned him jail time, but he was released after a short term, because his bishop assured the court that the young priest would henceforward confine himself to religious duties.

Upon his release in 1923, Tiso returned to academic life as a professor of theology, leaving Nitra the following year to become the parish priest and eventually dean of Bánovce nad Bebravou, in Slovakia’s Trencin region, where he had been born. Even his hostile Wikipedia biographer admits, “His dedication to this parish would become legendary, and he would remain its very active priest even during his presidency.” But he could not indefinitely ignore the ongoing collapse of the outside world, and joined the udáks (Slovenská udová strana), or “Slovak People’s Party” (SPP). Founded by Father Andrej Hlinka in 1913, its adherents strove for Slovakian autonomy within a Czechoslovakian framework (although Slovak independence was the whispered, envisioned goal) and were strongly anti-Communist.

In 1925, the SPP became the largest political party in the country, largely through the hard organizing efforts of Jozef Tiso, who scored a breakthrough victory for the party when he won a legisla-
tive seat in the national election. His charismatic presence dominated Parliament—so much so, he was appointed minister of health and physical education two years later.

A YEAR OF CHANGES—1938

Nineteen thirty-eight was a year of great changes, however. Father Hlinka passed away; Tiso succeeded him as the Vodca, or “chief,” of udáks; and the Sudetenland—where 2,800,000 Germans had been stranded outside the borders of their country after World War I—was returned to Germany.

As Central Europe’s artificial Slavic state began to fall apart, Slovaks declared their autonomy, with Tiso as prime minister. The governmental form he created was a synthesis of Benito Mussolini’s Fascism, with its emphasis on corporate collaboration, and Adolf Hitler’s race-conscious National Socialism, tempered by some measure of political freedom: the udáks joined all other political organizations (except the Communist) in a new “Party of Slovak National Unity,” along with the independent Deutsche Partei and “Unified Hungarian Party” for German and Hungarian residents, respectively.

But it was not to last.

On March 9, 1939, Czech troops invaded and occupied Slovakia, squelching any further move toward real independence. When they learned Tiso had escaped to Berlin, where he obtained Hitler’s support, the Slovak Parliament was permitted to convene, and its delegates’ forthcoming majority decision on March 14 would be honored. Their declaration was unanimous, allowing Tiso to return as the president of an independent country. Slovakia immediately experienced a cultural and economic florescence unprecedented in its long history.

Mainstream historians’ common characterization of the Tiso regime as “a Nazi puppet state” is contradicted by some important distinctions. For example, the deportation of Jews from Slovakia, first undertaken in March 1942, was called to a halt by Tiso the following October after he had been pressured by the Vatican’s Holy See to intercede. The German authorities demanded resumption, but the monsignor refused, and they eventually backed down. In the words of Wikipedia, “Slovakia became the first state in the Nazi sphere to stop deportations of Jews. Between October 1942 and October 1944, an independent Slovakia even served as a safe last resort for Jews.”11 This hardly fits the characterization of “a Nazi puppet state.”

Moreover, Hitler did not call upon the Slovaks to participate in Operation Barbarossa, Germany’s invasion of the Soviet Union, on June 22, 1941, because he suspected their troops might fraternize with fellow Slavs in Russia. Tiso insisted, however, that his armed forces must make their contribution to the European crusade against Communism, and Hitler reluctantly gave his consent. To his surprise, the small Slovakian army fought with great determination throughout the campaign, while pilots of its miniscule Slovenske vzdušne zbrane went on to become high-scoring aces in some of the war’s most furious fighting above the Kuban bridgehead during 1943 and throughout numerous other combat zones.12 In August 1944, Slovakia suffered a major partisan offensive that was defeated by the intervention of German troops. According to Milan Durica, who addressed Bratislava’s requiem service last April, the insurgency was less a “national uprising” against Tiso’s hated regime, as once conflated by Communist propagandists and still inaccurately parroted by conventional scholars, than Moscow-inspired banditry. Even immediately after the war, “Tiso’s popularity among the Slovaks” threatened to cause “a rift between the Czech-dominated government and the Slovak minority.”13

Slovakia was crushed under the Red Army in April 1945. Two years later, the father of his country’s independence, dressed in clerical garb, died on the gallows. His gravesite was kept secret by the Soviets.

In 1997, again on the anniversary of his death, Bishop Ján Chryzostom Korec held the first requiem of its kind at Nitra, where Tiso had been a teacher and spiritual director early in life. More recently, in 2007, Cardinal Korec told Slovakian television, “As for President Jozef Tiso, I would say he foiled, and wanted to foil, many bad things.”14 Even before the first honorary mass, Korec formally unveiled a monument to Tiso at the secondary grammar school of Bánovce nad Bebravou, the martyred monsignor’s birthplace, in summer 1990. Ten years later, 40 of the 41 members of the Zilina city council voted to erect a memorial plaque to Tiso at the Catholic House, administered by nuns from the Sisters of Saint Francis. “As news of the upcoming dedication spread,” according to The Slovak Spectator, “both the U.S. embassy in Bratislava and the Jewish community of Slovakia protested against the decision of the council.”

The Federation of Jewish Communities denounced the decision as “an attempt to rehabilitate fascism.” Their pronouncement stated that the Zilina city council members’ majority vote was not an “isolated act by mentally sick persons, but a new attack against Slovakia’s efforts to be integrated” into the European Union, and a “gross violation of the law.” The Slovak Spectator went on to report that
“the American Embassy gave its support to the Jewish body’s statement.”

The Slovak government also unanimously condemned the decision by the municipal council in Zilina. The federal official in charge of human rights and minorities requested that the chief prosecutor investigate the town’s decision. A private lawyer has also filed a legal challenge against the town council.”

Due to these national and even international pressures, Zilina Mayor Ján Slota announced that unveiling the Tiso plaque, which had been completed by March 2000, would be indefinitely postponed. He cited mounting threats of physical violence against the Sisters of Saint Francis as the determining factor in his decision. Holocust museums and monuments to the Allied heroes of World War II have been raised by the hundreds around the globe. Yet, the existence of a single, small memorial to an anti-Communist Catholic priest at a nunnery in a remote corner of the world still elicits the hatred of his enemies. However, Monsignor Tiso’s case is not unique.

Just as hate-crazed hysteria was beginning to descend on Archbishop Sokol’s requiem mass, an incensed crowd in the Ukrainian city of Kharkov attacked a modest, old house bearing a recently installed plaque dedicated to another anti-Communist Christian, the Uniate patriarch, Joseph Slipyj. During World War II, he had been a chaplain in the 14th Waffen-SS Grenadier Galizien, composed of Ukrainian volunteers, in Germany’s struggle against the USSR. During early May 1945, Slipyj was captured by the Red Army and sentenced to hard labor in Siberia.

After years of abuse, he was among the exceptionally few prisoners released through persistent Vatican intercession, and brought in poor health to Rome, where he passed away on Sept. 7, 1984. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the patriarch’s remains were transferred at the request of his many followers to Lvov, where they were interred at St. George Uniate Cathedral in 1992. “At present,” reports the website “Voices from Russia,” “the process of beatification for the Metropolitan Slipyj is under way, as many Catholics seek his canonization as one of their saints.”

In 2008, mobs also broke into Moscow’s Russian Orthodox Church of All Saints, where the vandals used sledgehammers to smash a memorial inscribed with the names of White Guard patriots.

Erected in 1994, “the SS memorial slab” was supposed to have been the centerpiece of a re-dedication ceremony just prior to the monument’s obliteration. So far, another commemorative stone raised in honor of Gen. Vlasov has escaped the fury of mindless haters. As of this writing, it may still be visited at the Novo Deveevo Russian Orthodox convent and cemetery in Nanuet, New York. Twice annually, on the anniversary of Vlasov’s execution—August 2, 1946—and on the Sunday following Orthodox Easter, a memorial service is held for him and his comrades in the ROA.

The proscription and destruction of these memorials in Slovakia, Moscow and Ukraine is unknown in the outside world. By sharp contrast, vandalism of Jewish monuments, likewise deplorable, invariably generates intense media attention. But for more than students of modern history, the ghosts of the past are by no means dead, and still have the power to excite passionate, even violent controversy among the living.
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TRANSLATOR’S INTRODUCTION

In Part Two of our “Valkyrie” translations from Hermann Giesler’s book Ein Anderer Hitler, the thorough investigation into the latest attempt on Hitler’s life results in a surprising revelation of an even higher treason: the method by which the Soviet Union was able to know Germany’s military plans. According to Giesler, the Fuehrer found this discovery so revolting he refused to talk about it.

After a period of time reading the “Kaltenbrunner Reports” in Martin Bormann’s office at the Wolf’s Lair, Hermann Giesler was personally filled in by Hitler’s own SS briefers, a Brigadefuehrer and a security service captain (Rattenhuber and Hoegl).

The account they give to Giesler is surprising only in the revelation of the “double phone system” that was discovered at headquarters, using parallel or bridge switching that allowed a third party to listen in. This was a bombshell. The chief of communications troop at headquarters was Gen. Erich Fellgiebel who was one of the conspirators. It was this that turned high treason (plotting against the regime) into the even worse Landesverrat (passing state secrets to a foreign power).

Giesler recounts what the investigators told him in his usual careful, detailed way.

For background and clarification of “the story” as given to Giesler by the SS investigators, we offer the following:

There is some disagreement or uncertainty whether Colonel Heinz Brandt, who was killed in the explosion, was a member of the conspiracy. He was a senior staff member of army operations, the right-hand man of Gen. Adolf Heusinger, who was injured in the blast. Heusinger was likely aware that something was going on and, as his right-hand man, Brandt might have known also. That is the opinion of Rattenhuber and Hoegl, who say that Stauffenberg blew up one of his co-plotters “without consideration.” Peter Hoffmann, however, in his supposedly exhaustive book on the subject (The History of the German Resistance) does not mention Brandt as a member of the conspiracy.

When Stauffenberg arrived for the meeting in the map room on July 20th, he first reported to Field Marshal Keitel, and also met Gen. Fellgiebel. Stauffenberg was also presented to Hitler and they shook hands. Either before or after that, Stauffenberg pretended he wanted to change his shirt and went to the washroom, accompanied by his aide, Lt. Werner von Haeften. There they packed one of the two bombs Haeften had been carrying into Stauffenberg’s briefcase, in which he also had his papers for the meeting.

In the meantime, a sergeant named Vogel was sent to urge Stauffenberg back to the meeting, and also tell him there was a telephone call for him from Fellgiebel. Vogel remained standing outside the open door of the washroom. Nervous about arousing suspicion, Stauffenberg didn’t put the second bomb into his briefcase, but left it with Haeften. Vogel later testified that he saw Stauffenberg and Haeften taking something out of brown paper wrapping.

When Stauffenberg returned to the meeting room with his briefcase, he requested from Hitler’s adjutant, Gen. Rudolf Schmundt, a place closer to Hitler. Laying his briefcase on the end
of the table, he leaned on the top to release the bomb trigger. He then received the fake phone call from Haeften, calling him out of the meeting. Hoffman confirms that neither Staufenberg nor anyone needed an excuse to leave the meeting. All participants were free to leave and come back at any time, as all were prone to receiving phone calls during the meeting. Such a level of trust and freedom prevailing at Headquarters could explain to some extent how this conspiracy was able to develop and grow over such a long period of time.

There are different versions of whether Staufenberg placed his briefcase on the floor before he left to take his phone call (doubtful, but that’s what Hoffman says) or whether it was Gen. Schmudt who put it on the floor after Staufenberg left. However, it was placed there, and either the above-mentioned Brandt or Schmudt shoved it further under the table, against the table leg. This is the action that saved Hitler’s life, as he was now better protected from the explosion. Consider that both of these men were killed by what that briefcase contained.

When Staufenberg reached the phone, there was no one at the other end of the line. He left and went outside where he and Haeften watched the conference building from a safe distance.

Now we let Hermann Giesler tell what he calls “The Story” from his book, Ein Anderer Hitler. . . . [Translators’ comments from here on are in italics.—Ed.]

Giesler Details the 1944 Attack on Hitler

“For Brutus is an honorable man;
So are they all, all honorable men.”

THE CHIEF OF THE SECURITY DETACHMENT, SS Brigade-fuehrer [Generalmajor Hans] Rattenhuber and Kriminaldirektor [Peter] Hoegl, SS captain at the SD [Sicherheitsdienst (Security Service)], visited with me. Rattenhuber said Hitler sent them to inform me about matters connected with July 20th and the investigation after the assassination.

What they tell me is strictly confidential.

Hoegl meant that it might be better if we go outside. We walked up and down along the way between Bormann’s wood hut and the casino barrack.

The two men were very different: Rattenhuber in uniform, tall and strong; Hoegl in civilian clothes, small, sturdy, serious and with attentive eyes.

Rattenhuber narrates: “First the assassination attempt—well, Staufenberg waited for the explosion, standing by the car within the Sperrkreis (security zone) II.

“When the explosive detonated, Staufenberg drove immediately to the airfield with his adjutant. On the way, they threw a packet of explosives off the forest road into the bushes—strangely enough, they didn’t add it into the briefcase. The explosive and the igniter came from the English, and they surely knew of the planned assassination—the gentlemen had contact with each other for quite awhile. Staufenberg was taken by surprise when the time for the map room meeting (‘Lage’) was moved forward and he did not find the time to stuff additional explosives into the briefcase—otherwise everybody would have had it!”

Rattenhuber meant they were disrupted during their preparations. “I am sure of that. They went all out without any concern—Staufenberg blew his co-plotter Col. [Heinz] Brandt1 into the air.

“Lt. [Werner von] Haeften took Staufenberg out of the meeting with a faked call—it was carefully planned. Staufenberg laid the briefcase, with the igniter facing him, on top of the maps on the meeting table, then stood up, leaning on his briefcase and pressing down the igniter. A light bow toward the Fuehrer, excusing himself, indicating a telephone call, and then he disappears.

“The meeting continues. A village is named as a battle location—exactly where the briefcase sits. Gen. Schmudt puts the briefcase on the floor; then it is pushed to the table base.”

“That’s known to me,” I said.

“Well, now it gets interesting. Both are now out of Sperrkreis toward their car. Beside the car stands Felligiebel—you know him?—the general and chief of communications. They all look with suspense toward the meeting barrack.”

“How do you know about it?” I interrupted.

“Lt. Col. [Ludolf] Sander stood at their side—he was present. Now it happens, and Staufenberg with Haeften drives to the airport. They were convinced that they blew the Fuehrer and everyone at the Lage into the air. One had to have the impression they were all gone.

“You can imagine what was now going on here: security escort detachment, physicians, medics, officers, adjutants, Organization Todt workers from bunker construction sites, all confused. Seeing that, Felligiebel enters Sperrkreis I and observes all the emergency activities.

“When he then noticed that Hitler was alive and only slightly injured, helped by Field Marshal Keitel to exit the destroyed meeting barrack, he steps toward the Fuehrer and congratulates him for his escape. He—God knows—said, ‘That happens when you set up headquarters so close behind the front line.’
He stood to attention—Hosen in denselben (a military expression meaning trousers in his high boots)—pistol on his belt,” Rattenhuber said.

Hoseg continued: “The investigations revealed that, within the clique, it was specifically Fellgiebel who pleaded that the so-called ‘initial ignition’ for the revolt could only be triggered by Hitler’s assassination—successful, naturally. Once that no longer functioned, Fellgiebel must have known that his participation in the whole affair could not be hidden, without doubt he was done for. Why did he not draw his pistol and shoot? Nobody could have hindered him, because none of us could have that figured out. But for a real deed these people were cowards, and ready only for treachery.”

“Yes,” I interrupted, “all that is already known to me from reading the interrogation reports. The Fuehrer, however, gave me hints that there was much more beside the Fellgiebel affair and communication system, not only knowledge of and participation in the assassination and the Valkyrie putsch. He told me it was too disgusting for him to talk about it. You should tell me.”

“We’ll do it, just wait. Well, still a little dazed from the explosion, the Fuehrer asked, ‘What is Fellgiebel doing here?’ On this, he based his first suspicion. But, initially, it is pretty hard to believe that such a contemptible infamy is at all possible—for us they were ‘sacred cows’."

“Not for me anymore,” Rattenhuber responded, “since Seydlitz’ with his committee works for the Russians against the German front.”

“Well, well,” Hoegl said. “Anyway, at first, suspicion flew around in all directions until it was definite that a military clique had planned the assassination attempt Stauffenberg carried out. As part of this clique, Fellgiebel had the task of paralyzing the communication system. He was successful with the major wire lines, but for one reason or another, perhaps out of ignorance, some lines were not disconnected. That’s how Dr. Goebbels and Maj. [Otto] Remer could telephone the Fuehrer, and the Berlin putsch collapsed.

“It is strange, however, that Fellgiebel never tried to warn the clique in the Bendlerstrasse that, as far as killing Hitler was concerned, the plot failed. They tried to continue the putsch, which ended in ‘thin air’.” (For a more detailed account of these events, see “A Day at the Bendlerblock” following this article.)

“Yeah,” said Rattenhuber, “maybe Fellgiebel tried to camouflage himself by staying in the background, like the ‘Herr’ General [‘Fritz’] Thiele, his deputy and successor, did during the following days. All in all, the plot from ‘above’ was doomed to fail because they didn’t count the decent officers and soldiers, who did not take part, kept their oath and stood by their oath-bearer (commandant). They did not have even one company at
their disposal, and not one of the entire clique had the courage to draw his pistol against the Fuehrer. At first, we only knew that Fellgiebel belonged to the inner circle of the conspirators and that he insisted at the clique’s meetings on getting rid of the Fuehrer as a requirement for success with the ‘Valkyrie putsch.’ We arrested him.

“But then something very strange happened: A sergeant with the communication unit at the Fuehrer headquarters reported an unusual double switchboard: parallel or bridge switching. Messages, reports, operative directives and strategic details by ‘officers-only telephone’ could be listened in on by a third party by turning on that switch.

“This sergeant was an expert and knew the communication stuff. He became attentive, but strongly suspicious only after Fellgiebel was arrested. It emerged that by some kind of coupling, a direct connection from the Fuehrer headquarters to Switzerland, was established; through a switchboard in or around Berlin, messages and reports could be tapped.”

“Those treacherous reports went to Switzerland via wire,” Hoegl added, “and not wireless—that’s absolutely certain now. We believe that the Swiss secret service stood at the other end of the wire—some of them must have had connections with Soviet spy groups—and they radioed-in codes to the enemy. That went on for years.

“We knew all the time of Soviet wireless centers in ‘neutral’ Switzerland which were fed by various spy groups—they were exactly located by directing sound waves. They could only operate there with the knowledge and tolerance of a certain group of responsible members of the Swiss secret service who, knowingly or not, were in the service of the Soviets. [Walter] Schellenberg already negotiated and tried to disrupt that spy business in Switzerland.”

(Schellenberg was an SS officer in the SD who, as a master spy, was able to travel freely. Schellenberg moved up in the SS ranks under Heinrich Himmler and eventually replaced Abwehr Chief Adm. Wilhelm Canaris as head of the new, combined Secret Service in 1944. He was arrested by the British in Denmark in June 1945, while attempting to surrender to the Allies.)

“And what did you do then?” I asked.

“At first, nothing,” Rattenhuber said. “We did not wish to upset the whole thing right away. The Fuehrer said that Fellgiebel was not alone—he might have known about it. Hitler gave orders for secrecy and constant control of the switchboard; that paid off quite a bit, and a lot of things happened afterward.

“Well, now we will start with case No. 2. Fellgiebel was arrested at the time only for his participation in the plot and knowledge of the assassination attempt. We still didn’t have any information about how the communication system worked to constantly betray the fighting front, even though we had suspected it for a long time. On the suggestion of Field Marshal Keitel, Gen. Thiele, Fellgiebel’s deputy, succeeded him. As the new chief entrusted with communications, he was sworn in with the oath of allegiance and reported to the Fuehrer.

“In the meantime, the report of the sergeant from the communication unit came in. Secretly, the observation begins, and it did not take long before it is certain: the Herr General ‘played the flute’ with that macabre chapel. He knows of the secret switchboard—the technicians call it parallel switching.

(By “macabre chapel,” Giesler is referring to the Red Chapel [Rote Kapelle], the German cryptonym for a European-wide Soviet espionage network that transmitted information via radio directly to the Soviets. It was headed by a Polish Communist Jew, Léopold Trepper, and was first discovered in Brussels in 1941. In Germany, the leaders were Harro Schulze-Boysen, a desk officer at the Reich ministry of aviation, Dr. Arvid Hanack of the ministry of economics, and Rudolf von Scheilha, head of the foreign office information department. All three of these men had access to sensitive and/or secret information. Abwehr Chief Canaris and others estimated that the Rote Kapelle in Germany cost the lives of 200,000 German men. By the end of 1942, the leaders had been apprehended and the network shut down, or so it was thought.)

“Because one (Fellgiebel) is drawing in the other (Thiele), his membership in the conspirator clique is now obvious. And now it comes apart further at Communications: Fellgiebel’s chief of staff, a Col. Hahn, and the chief of the communication department from Mom’s Reserve Army, a Col. Hassel—they are all being arrested. With Thiele we did it, Hoegl and I, with all the politeness and respect to which a general is entitled.”

Something awkward happened then to the general. Rattenhuber mentioned it, but it does not belong in my script.

“Now, professor, you wonder why that is so revolting to the Fuehrer and why he did not want to talk to you about it. That treason against the fighting front took more out of him than the assassination. Recently, he told us that for some time he expected to be shot by one of that reactionary gang, but he never could believe that an officer would commit such a devious act, betraying the fighting soldiers who daily put their lives at risk for Germany.”

“How could they play their game for so long?” I asked. “Why
didn’t someone get wise to their deceit? Since 1939, the Chief hinted about treason in talks with me. After the capitulation of France, he told me that he now knows for sure that treason was rooted at a high military level, some details of which he already knew about in Winniza. I still remember his exact words: ‘Should I extend my distrust to the members of the Lage or are the traitors located at the seams?’ Certainly he was at that time already considering the communication center.”

Rattenhuber answered, “That’s exactly what depresses us so much, because we felt we were responsible for not only the Fuehrer’s security.

“But even so, limits were set for us. Up to July 20, everybody could approach the Fuehrer with a weapon, well, even with bulky explosives like Stauffenberg did with his briefcase—one only needed to be known or carrying a pass for the Sperrkreis I. Just the thought that an officer, even a general, could commit treason or assassinate the Fuehrer was, until now—how do you call it—a sacrilege. For all of us, that’s the big shock.”

“What’s going to happen now?”

“For the time being, a big silence. One cannot imagine what would happen if the front and the homeland knew about it. Only the Fuehrer will decide who will have knowledge of that treason-mess.”

(The report from the investigators over, Giesler continues with his personal observations about post-assassination changes at the sensitive communications center, and his own reflections on the legacy of the enormity of the treason.)

A lot of moving took place at communications now. Before the assassination attempt, Fellgiebel started to replace officers—the ones he did not trust, good soldiers who kept their oath and would not have participated in the infamy the clique wanted to start, exactly like many at the Benderstrasse, and also communications, who stopped it in time. Otherwise, the Valkyrie confusion would have extended further.

Naturally, caution was now demanded. Guderian proposed a new communication chief; he reported today to the Fuehrer. Towards evening, after the talk with Rattenhuber and Hoegl, I met Col. Gen. [Heinz] Guderian at the teahouse as I did several times already during the week, and to my surprise, Gen. [Albert] Praun.

Guderian—I liked him very much for his lively manner and soldier-like aura—was obviously under great tension. We carried on with a short, polite talk; I sensed that his thoughts were with faraway military problems. I had a longer discussion afterward with Gen. Praun, who was the brother of my co-worker, Dr. Theo Praun. I thought a lot of him; he was the head of the law department at my office “General Building Counselor, Munich”; then a leader within the OT group Russia North and Balticum, a job...
which Dr. Todt entrusted to me at the end of 1942.

In January 1944, Dr. Praun, together with the front leader Baerkessel, was murdered by partisans when they visited an OT unit in the 16th Army region. The murder has been “gloriously” reported by the Russian radio. At the funeral service of my co-workers, I met Gen. Praun. At that time, he was the commander of a division, and before that he became, because of his technical expertise, Guderian’s communication officer during the French campaign.

Now, on Guderian’s suggestion, the Fuehrer installed him as the new chief of communications. During our conversation I asked Gen. Praun about his impressions. He answered hesitantly and acted rather withdrawn. Cautiously, I addressed my questions to find out how much the Fuehrer had informed him about the treason affair. Gen. Praun said the talk was a short one; the Fuehrer pointed very briefly to the serious disruption at communications and asked him to put it back in order again.

I had the impression that the first veil had already fallen over the macabre treason affair. Gen. Praun tried hard to trace the rumors about the treason whenever they trickled through. I know he talked with Kriminaldirektor Hoegl, who referred him to Kaltenbrunner’s investigating group. He might have asked around some more, but any additional information about Fellgiebel, Thiele, Hahn and Hassel has been withheld.

Strange—but for me very understandable—was the behavior of Hoegl, who referred Praun to Kaltenbrunner, who gave him the reasonable advice to have Fellgiebel questioned by staff officers, and finally of ‘Gestapo Mueller’ [this was a way of referring to Gestapo Chief Heinrich Mueller—Ed.], who refused Praun any information on Fellgiebel, Thiele, Hahn and Hassel.

I was not surprised that the raid-like checking of the parallel connection showed no results; it was removed long before.

But the treason was there; it was permanent and of an unbelievable scope. When German soldiers overran Russian battle stations, they found there their own operation and attacking plans. Most of the responsible and carefully planned strategic and tactical German operations, advancing with fighting and sacrificing spirit, were beaten back by the enemy’s counterac-

thought or serious plans of how to proceed if the putsch succeeded. There was just no personality there. Civil war and hate would have followed a successful assassination and putsch—for generations. Nothing would have changed the relentless enemy.

Therefore, it could not be a revolution from the top; there was no necessity for it, there was nothing there, no substance, no program that could claim to be taken seriously, no sparkling attempt? It fluctuates between high treason and Landesverrat. Hate, craving for admiration, lack of character and a stick-in-the-mud reactionary attitude were the reasons for an unbelievable conspiring with the enemy, an enemy whose goal it was to destroy Germany. Naturally, the traitors interpreted their action as necessary and in the interest of a higher humanity. They didn’t offer themselves as a sacrificing gift, but instead the German soldier, who paid for it with his life.

ENDNOTES:
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trusted generals of the Third Reich waited nervously in their offices at the Bendlerblock—Berlin headquarters of the OKW Home Command and General Army Office (AHA)—for the call from Col. Claus von Stauffenberg that the bomb had this time exploded and killed Adolf Hitler.

Notable among them were: Col. Gen. Ludwig Beck (retired since 1938); Col. Gen. Friedrich Fromm, chief of the Home Army Command; Gen. Friedrich Olbricht, Chief of the AHA and his chief of staff Col. Albrecht Mertz von Quirnheim; Gen. Fritz Thiele, deputy chief of communications (under Gen. Erich Fellgiebel); Col. Gen. Erich Hoepner, retired but now in uniform again; and Hans Bernt Gisevius, ex-Gestapo man just in from Switzerland.

Shortly after 1 p.m. the message came in from Wolfsschanze, and it was Fellgiebel’s voice: “Something fearful has happened; the Fuehrer’s alive.”

Gen. Thiele and Gen. Olbricht listened on the phone. Fellgiebel, chief of communications at headquarters, did not tell them that, shortly before, hoping to avoid serious complications for himself, he had congratulated Hitler on his escape. The two didn’t know what really happened—if the bomb didn’t explode or Stauffenberg failed to place the briefcase that contained it. They didn’t convey the message to anyone else either, but instead decided to wait and went to lunch, or—as Thiele was said to do—walked uneasily through the nearby Tiergarten Park.

By 3 p.m. they were back at Bendlerstrasse, still very cautious, unsure what to do. Rumors of a failed bomb attempt were floating.

A photo taken outside of the Bendlerblock on July 20, 1944, shows two German officers in front of a line of armed guards. **Right:** Col. Gen. Friedrich Fromm, who controlled the Replacement Army, wasn’t a principal in the conspiracy, but looked the other way until he found out Hitler hadn’t been killed. **Left:** Gen. Friedrich “Fritz” Thiele, deputy chief of communications under Fellgiebel, had the task at Bendlerblock of severing communications between loyal officers and field units. He wasn’t implicated immediately; he took over as chief of communications until arrested on Aug. 11.
Communication between different army offices and headquarters went on, causing further confusion—the telephone line from Wolfsschanze remained open (an error by Felligiebel), so Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel and Lt. Gen. Wilhelm Burgdorf were able to call various Wehrkreise and individual commanding officers to counteract the Valkyrie order.

Stauffenberg landed at Berlin-Rangsdorf airport shortly after 3 o’clock and called Bendlerstreet with the message: “Hitler is dead.” When the colonel arrived after 4 p.m., Gen. Olbricht was still hesitant to act. Without his authority, his chief of staff Col. Mertz von Quirnheim initiated the first written and verbal orders of Valkyrie. “He railroaded me,” Olbricht said later to Gisevius.

Stauffenberg and Olbricht together entered the office of Home Army Chief Fromm and informed him of Hitler’s death, then requested that the Army take over as the governing authority of Germany. Fromm expressed strong doubts. Olbricht, now convinced that Stauffenberg was telling the truth that Hitler had been killed, suggested that Fromm might call Field Marshal Keitel at Wolfsschanze to find out. Upon doing so, Keitel assured him that Hitler was alive.

A highly dramatic exchange of words, blunt confrontations and even physical encounters with drawn revolvers followed.

Fromm: “Keitel told me Hitler is alive!”
Stauffenberg: “Keitel is a liar—he has lied often in the past. I saw Hitler carried out dead.”

Olbricht: “We issued Valkyrie.”

At that Fromm exploded. He raised his fist, accused the three of high treason and put them under arrest. Stauffenberg turned it around and tried to put Fromm under arrest—a comic situation except for the seriousness of it. Stauffenberg shouted, “I activated the bomb—Hitler is dead.” Fromm countered: “You shoot yourself, the assassination failed.” Stauffenberg moved toward Fromm; Fromm jumped up and threatened Stauffenberg. Now von Kleist and von Haeften, Stauffenberg’s aides, rushed in with drawn pistols, and the turbulence settled at once.

No longer in authority, Gen. Fromm was given another chance to change his mind—he did not. He and his adjutant, Capt. Bartram, were locked in his office with their telephone blocked and Col. Gen. Hoepner took over. Now the new commander of the Home Army, Hoepner, had been stripped of his army command a few years ago and had arrived at the Bendlerblock in civilian clothes, carrying his uniform in a suitcase.

In the meantime, the teleprinters had started to dispatch the Valkyrie code and follow-up orders to all the 16 Wehrkreise. It was a slow process as the order sheets had to first be coded, and then decoded at the other end; some Wehrkreis offices didn’t receive it until the whole affair was over.

Gen. Paul von Hase, the Berlin city commander, was now supposed to move the various military units in and around Berlin—to occupy or cordon off all the places, offices and ministries, according to the Valkyrie plan.

Between 4:00 and 5:00 p.m., the Bendlerblock saw many new arrivals. It began to look like a gathering of the old Reichswehr, with the Prussian/Bavarian/Silesian nobility: Ludwig Beck, retired colonel general and former chief of staff, now designated commander of the revolt government, dressed in civilian clothes; the counts von Schulenburg, York von Wartenburg, von Bismark-Schoenhausen, von Schwerin-Schwanenfeld, von Hammerstein, and Berthold von Stauffenberg (brother of Claus); Klaus Bonhoeffer and Dr. Otto John. Shortly afterward, Berlin’s Chief of Police Wolf-Heinrich Count von Helldorf arrived with Hans Gisevius.

Only Carl Goerdeler, the future chancellor, and Field Marshal Erwin von Witzleben, the new chief of the Wehrmacht, were missing. Goerdeler’s whereabouts was unknown; he had gone into hiding several days before. Beck asked about Witzleben and was told by Gisevius that he was on his way to Zossen (OKH - Oberkommando Heer/Army Supreme Command) to take over command of the Wehrmacht.

The commander of Wehrkreis III-Berlin, Gen. Joachim von Kortzfleisch, was called to Bendlerstrasse and told by Olbricht that Hitler was dead, the army was taking over and the troops in Berlin should be dispatched according to Valkyrie plans. Kortzfleisch refused and shouted, “The Fuehrer is not dead—Fuehrer is not dead!” When he tried to leave the offices, he was detained at gunpoint. Gen. von Thuengen took over for Kortzfleisch, going to his headquarters at Hohenzollerndamm, where he was not involved in any further action.

Olbricht gave chief of police Helldorf the order to alert his police forces and await further instructions; after a short while Helldorf left for the police headquarters and Olbricht returned to his office. Increasingly impatient, Gisevius asked Beck to call Lt. Gen. Wagner, the deputy chief of staff in Zossen, and order him to proceed according to the Valkyrie plans.

But at Zossen, Lt. Gen. Wagner informed Witzleben that Hitler was alive. When Witzleben arrived at the Bendlerblock around 8:00 p.m. he was furious about the course of events. “This is a fine mess,” he said, and vehemently argued with both Stauffenberg and Beck, banging his fist on the table. He left for Zossen in a rage; the conspiracy was without its military commander—the commander never had any troops. Witzleben was not seen again; he realized the putsch was over.

The talking, arguing and telephoning continued. Beck quietly
overlooked the operation, not saying a word. Stauffenberg feverishly telephoned the Wehrkreise to get Valkyrie activated. Gisevius urged “action now” and argued for forming assault parties of officers to go into the field, pending the arrival of troops. Soon after, he left for Helldorf’s police headquarters to answer Helldorf’s urgent request to know the situation at Bendlerblock.

In the middle of all the turbulence, an unbelievable scene occurred: The silver-black uniformed SS Oberfuehrer Pifrader from the RSHA (Reichs Sicherheits Hauptamt-SS Security chief) walked in and requested that Colonel Stauffenberg accompany him for an interview at the RSHA office. He was immediately apprehended by the conspirators and put under guard.

**REAMER’S DECISIVE MOVE**

The Guard Battalion “Grosseutschland,” commanded by Maj. Otto Ernst Remer, was an elite troop of battle-hardened soldiers and highly decorated front officers. It was divided into four companies of about 1,000 to 1,200 men. Remer dispatched three companies to cordon off the center of the city, according to Gen. Hase’s order. He kept one company in reserve at the Lustgarten area. As a good soldier Remer obeyed the order, but when Gen. Hase gave him a lieutenant colonel as a liaison, he became suspicious.

By 6 p.m. the platoons were all in their positioned places. Remer checked them out and returned to Hase’s headquarters at Unter den Linden. When he overheard a muffled talk between Hase and his chief of staff Lt. Col. Schoene to arrest Goebbels, he knew there was something fishy going on. He called his officers to a meeting.

Josef Goebbels was gauleiter for Berlin and minister for propaganda and cultural affairs, but also Reichs defense commissioner for the Gau-Berlin. Lt. Hagen, one of Maj. Remer’s officers who worked for a time at Goebbels’ ministry, suggested he visit Goebbels at his residence immediately. Remer was suspicious that perhaps Goebbels was involved in a party conspiracy against Hitler, and Goebbels was not sure about Remer. After a dramatic verbal exchange between the two at Goebbels’ apartment, Remer was handed the telephone and heard the Fuehrer at the other end of a direct line to Wolfsschanze, never blocked by Fellgiebel.

“Do you recognize my voice, major?” asked Hitler, and Remer acknowledged that he did, having spoken privately with Hitler not long ago. Hitler gave him the order to snuff out the plot with all his might and energy. He made Remer the de facto commandant of Berlin until the newly appointed commander of the Home Army, Reichsfuehrer SS Himmler, arrived. At Goebbels’ invitation, Remer set up a new command post in the downstairs room of the house. It was 6:30 p.m.

**‘ALEA IACTA EST’**

By that time, the teleprinter and telephones at Bendlerblock had ordered the Wehrmacht units located in and around Berlin to their

---

**OTTO ERNST REMER TO THE RESCUE**

Born in 1912, Otto Remer was not quite 32 years old when he played a decisive role in putting down the Valkyrie coup in Berlin. Because of his loyal and quick-witted response, Remer was afterward promoted to colonel and put in charge of the Fuehrer escort commando. Before his posting to Berlin, he commanded a battalion of the Grenadier Regiment Grossdeutschland, was wounded several times and earned the Knight’s Cross, later receiving the Oak leaves to the Knight’s Cross and the Silver Close Combat badge (hand-to-hand fighting), among other awards. Following the assassination attempt, Remer fought at the Battle of the Bulge. Relocated back east and made a major general in 1945, Remer now commanded a division that was given only the toughest jobs. Suffering high losses, he and his men successfully broke through a Soviet encirclement at the end of the war. He was captured by a U.S. army unit and kept in a POW camp by the British until 1947. Though never a member of the NSDAP or the SS, Remer immediately became politically active in right-wing politics, founding the Socialist Reich Party in 1950 (which was banned in 1952). After that, he lived in exile for several years in Egypt and Syria, became President Nasser’s military adviser, and wrote two books. As a staunch Revisionist and gas chamber denier, he put out his own publication from 1991-94, for which he was sentenced to prison. After exhausting his appeals, he went into exile again in Spain, where he died in 1997 at the age of 85. His personal motto was “Ich folge meinem Gewissen” (I follow my conscience). Otto Remer is dishonored in his occupied homeland today, while traitors are made into heroes. Remer personally addressed the Revisionist Conference in Costa Mesa, California, in 1987.
specified areas. When most of the marching military units reached the areas cordoned-off by Remer, his officers contacted the commanders of the arriving units and they were put under Remer’s command. For a short while a serious problem occurred—Remer’s platoons were confronted with an armored group from Kramptnitz, a suburb of Berlin. Their tanks were on standby not far away from Goebbels’ residence. It took some talking, telephoning and some pushing by Remer’s subalterns before they learned that the unit would only obey orders from Col. Gen. Guderian, and Guderian was on Hitler’s side. Clear road all the way.

Remer sealed off the whole district around the Bendlerblock and set guards at all street corners and building entrances; he issued strict instructions to accept orders only from his command post. Lt. Schlee, one of Remer’s platoon leaders who guarded the front and main entrance of the Bendlerblock, was shutting between Remer and Olbricht, receiving different orders. He was detained at one point by Col. Mertz von Quirnheim, but when Quirnheim left the room, he walked out without being checked or held up. He immediately reported to Remer the situation there, including discovering Gen. Kortzfleisch locked in an upper story room, and that none of the orders of Fromm’s Home Army had been dispatched. (The men in the communications center, starting to catch on, deliberately delayed sending the messages, or in some cases didn’t dispatch them at all.) This report convinced Remer that the center of the conspiracy was located in the building on Benderstrassee.

Col. Gen. Fromm and his adjutant Capt. Bartram were still locked up at Fromm’s office without a telephone connection, but with a functioning radio, which told them that the assassination failed. A small, little known exit in their office made it possible for Bartram to slip out several times and deliver a counteraction order from Fromm to the staff officers of the AHA on a different floor of the building. Fromm was also allowed by Olbricht to move to his apartment in another part of the building.

Herbert, von Heyden, Pridun and Harnack—officers of AHA not in the conspiracy—were ordered to Olbricht’s office for guard duty. They instead requested answers about the tumultuous goings-on in his offices and the Bendlerblock entrance. Olbricht’s answer was halting and evasive. The four officers refused cooperation and let Olbricht know their soldier’s oath to Hitler was binding. They left the office without any hindrance.

All of a sudden, shots were fired. A dozen officers entered with weapons—Herbert was shooting, Pridun was shot by Stauffenberg, who in turn took a hit in his arm. Bullets were flying; blood was on the floor—an unbelievable tumult.

During all this tangled confusion, Lt. Col. Herbert was able to get Fromm out of his apartment and back to his office, where Beck, Stauffenberg, Hoeppner, Olbricht, Mertz von Quirnheim and Haeften were held at gunpoint by the AHA officers. Fromm then said to them, “Well, gentlemen, I am now going to do to you what you did to me this afternoon.” They were disarmed and a court-martial was set up. Gen. Beck asked to keep his revolver; he was granted permission, with Fromm telling him to “hurry.” He raised his gun and shot himself through the temple, but the wound was not fatal. He staggered and, helped by Stauffenberg, tried again, collapsed, but remained alive.

Fromm ordered Capt. Bartram to form a firing squad and gave the five men time to write their last words and wishes. Olbricht immediately began writing, while Hoeppner asked Fromm for a man-to-man talk. After a half hour, Fromm urged them to finish.

In the meantime, the order was given by Major Remer to the lieutenants Schlee, Arnd and Schady to enter the Bendlerblock and arrest the leaders of the conspiracy. When they approached the building, a scuffle began with a group of officers guarding the entrance. Fists were swinging, bodies pushing, but no shots exchanged. The officers who tried to block them were locked up in the porter’s lounge. When Schlee entered the hall, shouts and shots echoed through the floor and ceilings.

Informed that Schlee’s Guard Battalion soldiers were entering the building, Fromm quickly announced, “In the name of the Fuehrer . . . (naming the accused) . . . are condemned to death.” Stauffenberg then spoke, trying to take responsibility for the whole thing, saying the others were only following his orders, to which Fromm said nothing. The condemned men, except for Hoeppner, who was taken away to a military prison after his private meeting with Fromm, were marched out of the office. Fromm now ordered a staff officer to give Gen. Beck the mercy shot and left the building for Goebbels’ residence.

In the courtyard of the Bendlerblock, shortly after midnight, under the glare of some automobile headlights, Valkyrie found its bloody end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Wilhelm Mann is a WWII scholar who served in the Wehrmacht from 1938-45.
PRECOLUMBUS MAP OF AMERICA REAL

A 15th-century Norse map of Vinland, which shows parts of North America, is real, says Danish researchers, indicating that Vikings almost certainly sailed to the New World years before the famed voyage of Christopher Columbus. American scholars carbon dated the map to around 1440, some 50 years before Columbus “discovered” America in 1492. Scholars believe the map was produced for a 1440 church council at Basel, Switzerland. “All the tests that we have done over the past five years—on the materials and other aspects—do not show any signs of forgery,” Rene Larsen, rector of the School of Conservation under the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, told a wire service reporter.

9-11-01 WASN’T THE FIRST TIME

The first terror-by-airliner plot aimed at America wasn’t Muslim or Arabic in origin. No, in fact, in 1974 Samuel Byck (right), a Jewish salesman from Baltimore, embarked on a suicidal scheme to kill President Richard Nixon, blaming Nixon for the fact that he was unable to get a loan from the Small Business Administration. Byck murdered a security guard at the Baltimore-Washington International Airport, stormed into a jetliner and demanded of the pilots that they take off and follow his orders. His intent was to crash the plane into the White House and hopefully kill Nixon. Byck murdered one of the two pilots (who were technically unable to accommodate him) and injured the other, before he was, in turn, besieged by the authorities and killed. He had come to the attention of the Secret Service in 1972, but they decided he was harmless. Sean Penn, himself of Jewish origin but very independent in spirit, made a movie about the event, yet it has been virtually suppressed. It has been discovered that columnist Jack Anderson—a longtime conduit for Anderson (heir to smear baron Drew Pearson)—who bragged of his “high-level government contacts,” never told the Secret Service or the FBI about Byck’s criminal intentions.

BLOOD ON THEIR HANDS FOR ETERNITY

“We mustn’t forget that some of greatest murderers of modern times were Jewish,” writes Sever Plocker in a recent report in the Israeli news outlet Ynet News. Plocker then goes on to detail the murders carried out under the Cheka in the early years of the Soviet Union by the likes of Genrikh Yagoda, “the greatest Jewish murderer of the 20th Century, the GPU’s deputy commander and the founder and commander of the NKVD.” Yagoda carried out the so-called “collectivization orders” and personally oversaw the killing of at least 10 million people. It was his Jewish deputies that maintained the Gulag system, where an untold number of Russians were sent to their death. When Yagoda fell out of favor, he was eventually executed and replaced by Nikolai Yezhov, the bloodthirsty “Dwarf.” Yezhov may not have been Jewish, but his wife was. Finally, writes Plocker, there was Leonid Reichman, the NKVD’s chief interrogator, who was infamous for his cruelty and sadism. Some 38.5 percent of those in senior posts in the Soviet security apparatuses were Jewish, says Plocker. “Many Jews sold their soul to the devil of the Communist revolution and have blood on their hands for eternity.”

HOLOCAUST DENIAL LAW REJECTED

Hungary’s lawmakers in early July rejected a constitutional amendment that would have made questioning the Jewish “holocaust” a criminal offense. The proposal had been introduced by the ruling Socialist government, but it garnered fewer than half the votes it needed to be passed as an amendment to the country’s constitution. Hungary’s populist, conservative Fidesz Party joined forces with the Liberal Free Democrats to reject the proposal. Had Hungary passed the amendment, it would have joined 13 countries where it is currently illegal to investigate the “holocaust.” These include Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Israel, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Switzerland. In the past few years, a number of states in Europe have either decriminalized or rejected laws banning questioning the holocaust. The United Kingdom has twice rejected attempts to criminalize holocaust denial. Denmark and Sweden also have rejected holocaust denial legislation. In 2001, Slovakia made holocaust denial a crime, but repealed the legislation in May 2005. Spain decriminalized holocaust denial in October 2007. In 2007, Italy rejected a holocaust denial law, which proposed a prison sentence of up to four years.

WIESENTHAL A FRAUD?

A lengthy excerpt of the new book Hunting Evil by Guy Walters published in the July 19 edition of The London Times does a good job of exposing the blatant contradictions, apparent exaggerations and outright lies that have been voiced over the years by “holocaust” shyster Simon Wiesenthal (pictured). The article, titled “The Head Nazi-Hunter’s Trail of Lies,” says his entire life is most likely complete hogwash. From his formative years in what is now Ukraine, to his education, to his arrest by National Socialists, to his stay in multiple concentration camps, to his first-hand accounts of mass executions of Jews—nothing that Wiesenthal has ever said about his life can be taken as gospel. “His reputation is built on sand. . . . He was a liar—and a bad one at that,” notes the article. “There are so many inconsistencies between his three main memoirs and between those memoirs and contemporaneous documents, that it is impossible to establish a reliable narrative from them. Wiesenthal’s scant regard for the truth makes it possible to doubt everything he ever wrote or said.”
Continued from previous page

KILL GERMANS WITH POISON DARTS

In the final stages of World War II, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill mulled dropping millions of poisoned darts on German troops, according to secret files recently made public for the first time. Developed by British and Canadian scientists, the darts would have been jammed into bombs and indiscriminately dropped from bombers flying over Germany. It was estimated that the darts would have killed or maimed anyone—soldiers and civilians alike—within 10,000 square yards of the drop zone. The plan was so close to being rolled out that the Singer sewing machine company had been approached by British officials to manufacture the needles for the weapon. Studies conducted on livestock indicated that death would have occurred to anyone who had been hit by a dart if it stayed in the body for more than 50 seconds. If it was taken out before then, the victim might have been able to survive the poisoning. The files, which were obtained in early 2009 by the British press under a freedom of information lawsuit, gave no indication as to why the plan was never actually carried out.

* * *

OLDEST MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

Archaeologists believe they have located the world’s oldest musical instruments, in caves in southwestern Germany. The four primitive flutes, which had been fashioned out of vulture bone and mammoth tusks, were found by researchers scouring through ice age materials that had been dated back 35,000 to 40,000 years, making them the oldest undisputed musical instruments in the world.

* * *

ROTHSCHILDS’ LINKS TO SLAVERY

One of the leading global financial newspapers reported recently that two of the wealthiest families in England were recently exposed as having profited extensively from the slave trade. In the June 26 issue of The Financial Times, Carola Hoyas writes: “Nathan Mayer Rothschild, the banking family’s 19th-century patriarch, and James William Freshfield, founder of Freshfields, the top city law firm, benefited financially from slavery, records from the National Archives show, even though both have often been portrayed as opponents of slavery.”

In the case of the Rothschilds, the newly released documents show that the family profited by using slaves as collateral in bank dealings with a slave owner. It also helped organize the loan that funded the British government’s bailout of slave owners when slavery was abolished in the 1830s. “It was the biggest bailout of an industry as a percentage of annual government expenditure—dwarfing last year’s rescue of the banking sector,” writes Hoyas. Honest historians have long been aware of the ties between Jewish bankers like the Rothschilds and the slave trade.

* * *

CODE CRACKED FOR JEFFERSON LETTER

A Harvard-trained cryptologist believes he has cracked a mysterious code contained in a 200-year-old letter sent on December 19, 1801, by mathematician professor Robert Patterson to his friend and fellow cipher lover, President Thomas Jefferson. The 19th-century professor told the president the code in the now-famous letter was unbreakable. There is no evidence that Jefferson or anyone else ever broke the code until now. The mathematics teacher believes the encrypted letter was a joke between the two friends—the first few lines of the Declaration of Independence, which most historians agree was written by Jefferson.

* * *

COULD DNA SOLVE EARTHART CASE?

For 75 years, researchers and explorers have been trying to figure out what happened to pilot Amelia Earhart and her navigator Fred Noonan after they disappeared while attempting to fly around the world. According to a new report, scholars at the International Group for Historic Aircraft Recovery say they are close to recovering DNA evidence that they contend would show Earhart had crash landed on or near Nikumaroro (Gardner) Island, about 1,800 miles south of Hawaii, and most likely died there. During an expedition in 2007, members of the group found evidence consisting of early 20th-century makeup and two pieces of broken glass that match a 1930s compact mirror. Researchers are planning on returning to the site to gather more evidence and compare it with DNA from one of Earhart’s descendants to get a match.

* * *

THE REAL OLD GLORY

You seldom hear about it anymore, but the first American flag to be named “Old Glory” was made in 1824 for Capt. William Driver, who flew it on his ship twice around the world and displayed it regularly on patriotic occasions and holidays. Originally bearing 24 stars, the worn and tattered flag was remade in 1861 with 34 stars, plus a white anchor to signify Driver’s years at sea. When the War of Abraham Lincoln began and Tennessee, where Driver had moved, seceded from the union, the flag survived, sewn inside a quilt. Some say he was hiding it from the neighbors, while others say it was from his secessionist family members he was hiding it. It was unfurled when Union troops occupied Nashville in 1862 and it then made the news in the North. It never flew again, but passed into legend and bequeathed its name to all American flags.
WANTS MORE ON DEGRÉLLE

I am a proud American Christian of Anglo-Saxon, Italian and Polish descent. I wanted to write a brief letter to express my utmost satisfaction with TBR’s September/October 2008 issue on Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s “The Jews in the Soviet Union.” It was an extraordinary edition, which contained a vast amount of important and suppressed information. This edition struck a chord with me, because of the despicable treatment my Polish grandfather was subjected to as a prisoner in a Siberian forced labor camp.

I also want to mention how much I enjoyed reading the articles of November 1998 and September 2005 on Leon Degrelle. He was certainly an exemplary European, whose story deserves recognition. After reading your articles on him, I had a burning desire to read some of his works, but was dismayed to find how little of his writings are available on the Internet. As far as his writings on Rexism, I found nothing.

ALEX GAJEWSKY
South Carolina

CIVIL WARS

A civil war is one in which different groups wage an armed conflict to seize control of a single government. The conflict of 1861-65 could be considered “civil wars,” with the federal government waging wars against each of the sovereign states for control of those respective states and their governments.

From Maryland to Florida, Yankees brought with them martial law, suspension of civil liberties and barbarism. No, the Confederate States were not fighting for control of Washington.

The similarities between the two armed independence movements in which Virginia has been involved are striking. Many of the same Virginia families fought on the side of independence in both causes, and each time at a terrible expense of life and fortune.

The South was invaded under pretext of having fired upon Fort Sumter, even though the invasion had been planned in advance, and arrangements had been made to ensure that Southern artillery would fire the opening volleys of the war. War was necessary to confiscate the wealth of 5 million Southerners, and exterminate all commercial, civic, religious and social competition. Thus, the folks who know what is best murdered over 600,000 of their brothers in order to claim the right to tell the rest of us what to do.

REX MILLER
Virginia

GAS IS OUT, BULLETS IN

Today there are no more court historians of the “holocaust” who attempt to prove the reality of the “holocaust” and its magical gas chambers. They do as Saul Friedlaender does in his latest work (Nazi Germany and the Jews: The Extermination Years, Seuil, 2008): they simply behave as if it all really existed. For them, history is axiomatic, notwithstanding that their axioms aren’t even spelled out. These new historians proceed with such brazenness that the reader hardly realizes the sleight-of-hand being played on him. These fraudsters comment without end on an ad nauseam.

More Letters to the Editor...

Incarceration of Töben Signals End of Free Speech, Thought in Australia

This is one of those letters I find so difficult to write and remain civil while doing so. Being in the midst of a legal battle myself with these Talmudic Tyrants out to control every aspect of human life and consciousness in their mad attempt to take over the world, I find adhering to the usual protocol of being courteous to these maniacal mind-controllers practically impossible. So if you’re not up to a bit of politically incorrect pronouncements, then best you read no further.

When I see a fellow Truth Warrior like Dr. Töben trapped by their perfidious web of “legal” lies and deceit and knowing only too well their mendacious motives for silencing men and women who have the courage of their own knowledge and convictions to stand up to these savage, pseudo-savants of sophistry and deception, a primal sense of outrage, so deep and so strong, wells up from within me.

True to form, the Zionist media dogs lap up all the usual Zionese/Legalese language of their masters and vomit it forth via their newspapers and out from their Ziovision screens around the world as if it is going to reinforce the obvious, blatant lies they are so desperately attempting to sustain: “Dr. Töben is a ‘holocaust denier,’ ‘guilty’ of ‘criminal contempt,’ and ‘defying orders’ to stop publishing ‘racist material’ on his website,” ad nauseam.

The Zionist-owned-and-controlled “Jewdi-ciary” of Australia have held that Fredrick doesn’t accept the Zionist version of what the Talmudists have mandated as “freedom of speech” and “history,” so they have found him “guilty” of “28 counts of contempt.” Thus Jeremy Jones, former president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, the Orwellian weasel who first launched the complaint against Dr. Töben back in 1996, is now smirking to his brethren and telling them how Australia is now firmly in the grasp of the infamous Noahide “Laws” of the Talmudic Lubavichers once and for all.

Desperate to establish as historic fact, and thus reinforce their crumbling foundation of lies and deception foisted upon the world’s media watchers for the past 60 years and more, that the so-called “Jewish holocaust” did in fact happen, that 6 million Jews were shoved into “gas chambers” and “ovens,” they continue to go on and on in their enervating chorus of “virulent anti-Semitic” pronouncements. They are vainly hoping that by endlessly in-your-face lying, the world is going to swallow all the hogwash they’ve created in order to mask the reality of their true agenda for global hegemony, world slavery and death and destruction as per the dictates of their Talmudic, psychopathic rabbis.

So much for Australia as an outpost of true freedom and democracy in a world tainted to the core with tinctures of Talmudic lies and half-truths.

ARTHUR TOPHAM
Publisher, RadicalPress.com

Send your letters to TBR Editor, P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003 or email editor@barnesreview.org.
event whose reality they haven’t even established. Thus does the buyer, thinking he’s buying genuine merchandise, really buy snake oil concocted by the one giving him the sales pitch.

Today’s world-champion “holocaust” hustler is shabbas goy Father Patrick Dubois—an outright charlatan whose various productions dedicated to “the shoah by bullets,” notably in the Ukraine, appear to scale the summits of Judeo-Christian publicity hype.

ALEX JAMES
Alaska

PAWNS IN THE GAME

The “Civil” War was the result of a planned conspiracy by the mother lodge of the London Masonic orders. When President Andrew Jackson killed the Second Central Bank in 1836, the Masonic central banking interests of Great Britain and the Masonic Jews (Pharisee-Sadducees-Herodian and their scribes) plotted to split apart the union of the United States. The Northern jurisdiction of Freemasonry in Boston agitated for the abolition of slavery. The Southern jurisdiction agitated for secession and the Masonic Jews (Herodian and their scribes) plotted to bring on the war. Both North and South were wrong; they did not planed agitation on both sides was instigated by the mother lodge. It brought on the war. Both North and South were wrong; they did not understand that they were both pawns in the chess game of re-establishing a central bank.

HENRY LINK
South Carolina

OY VAY!

As a longtime subscriber, I do appreciate your politically incorrect articles. But please do not be factually incorrect. You stated in a recent issue of TBR that Winston Churchill’s mother, Jeanette Jerome, had three Jewish grandparents. This is altogether false. She had a solid New England British ancestry with the exception of her paternal line, the Jeromes, who came from France, probably as Huguenot refugees.

We know Winston was an ambitious alcholic monster, responsible for the Lusitania disaster, the unjust hanging of Dr. Hawley Crippen in 1910 for the alleged murder of his wife, and the British declaration of war on the Third Reich. But he was not a Jew himself. Nor was Roosevelt.

JOHN BEARDSLEY
Via E-mail

A BIG ANNIVERSARY

The year 2009 marks the 2,000th anniversary of the epic Battle of Teutoburger Wald, the consequences of which can still be seen in the face of Europe today. In A.D. 9, as the Romans were implementing plans to conquer Germany for their expanding empire, they suffered such a crushing defeat at the hands of a Germanic patriot named Arminius (Armin or Hermann to his countrymen) that they permanently abandoned further serious efforts to expand east of the Rhine River.

WERNER BROSOCHINSKI
Via E-mail

[Please take a look at our two lead articles focusing on Arminius, his life and the victory over the Romans at Teutoburg Forest.—Ed.]

UNIQUE

I am a new reader and, I must say, I am very pleased. There is, as you advertised, “no other publication in America” like THE BARNES REVIEW. That’s for sure. You address points others completely ignore including: the holocaust; the influence bankers exercise over history; the crimes of Israel and Zionism; the Jewish aspect of the Russian Revolution and the crimes of communism; etc. One criticism. I am from Boston and we had some brave soldiers who fought in the Civil War. How about something on one of us Northerners—Joshua Chamberlain perhaps?

THEO KENNEDY
Massachusetts

EUROPEAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE

I really enjoy your “European-American Heritage Project” articles. They are upbeat and truthful—great for our young people. We European people must stick together—whether you be Pole or Portuguese! Keep publishing—please.

MARIA VALSCHENKO
Maryland

ACROPOLIS MUSEUM OPENS

The most significant cultural event of 2009 in Europe was the opening in June of the much-awaited Acropolis Museum in Athens. In the works for 30 years and costing $180 million, the five-story building, 400 yards from the Parthenon, opened up this summer displaying all the available statues and antiquities that were part of the Parthenon complex on the Acropolis.

Absent are the famous “Elgin marbles.” These were stolen from Greece by British Lord Elgin in 1802 while Greece was still under Ottoman rule. Thomas Bruce, the seventh earl of Elgin, was the British ambassador to Greece at the time, and bribed the Turks to allow him to “rape” the Parthenon and the rest of the Acropolis buildings.

We are not talking about a statue or two here. He literally hacked off half the frieze of the Parthenon (247 feet), stole 17 statues off their pediments and 15 metope panels with bas-relief statuary. That is like stealing the dome off the U.S. Capitol. Furthermore, the larcenous lord plundered many statues and architectural elements from the other buildings, including one of the six caryatids from the Erechtheum. The caryatids are the famous statues of women that serve as columns holding up the entablature of the building.

Most of the “booty” from the rape of the Parthenon has been on display at the British Museum in London. Typically, the Brits have refused to return them to their rightful owners for years, under the pretense that Greece did not have a museum worth of displaying such precious artwork. Now that Greece has a first-class museum, they still refuse. They did, however, offer to “lend” the statues to Greece for display at the new museum for three months. The offer required the Greeks to sign a disclaimer that the statues belong to them, and Britain would be their owner forever. The Greeks naturally refused to sign, and the hope is that international pressure can come to bear on the British to do the right thing.

ALEXANDER ACACIA
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