

The Marked

Facts about the culprits of the Second, Great World War

From
Helmut Sündermann

Central publishing house of the NSDAP
Berlin

1945

Content

Page

The First World War and the "International Moral Law" 3

Wilson - the first war criminal of the second world war 6

War as a Principle of Kremlin Policy 10

Roosevelt - the murderer of peace 15

Churchill - "this man means war" 18

Men Behind the Scenes 20

Vansittart - Eden - Duff Cooper - Mandel - Benesch - Sikorski / Rydz-

Smigly - Morgenthau - Kaganovich

From the list of major war crimes 26

The breaches of international law - The air war guilt - The murder of the
Volga Germans - Katyn - Monte-Cassino - Wallendorf and Nemmersdorf

The Jewish Background and the Court of Nations 34

Source directory

The quotations and factual information used in this paper are taken from
the following publications, among others.

Dokumente zur Vorgeschichte des Krieges, published by the German Foreign
Office, Berlin 1939;

British Government Blue Book on German-Polish relations and the outbreak
of hostilities between Britain and Germany on 3.9.1939. authorized
translation Basel 1959;

Yellow Book of the French Government. Diplomatic Documents 1938-39,
Authorized Translation
Basel 1940.

Polish Documents on the Prehistory of the War, First Series, Berlin 1940

The Secret Files of the French General Staff, Berlin 1941;

European Politics 1933-1938 in the Mirror of the Prague Secret Files.
Essen 1942;

Roosevelt's Road to War. Secret Documents on the War Policy of the
President of the United

States, published by the Archive Commission of the Foreign Office, Berlin
1943;

J.F.C. Fuller: The First of the League of Nations Wars. German
translation Berlin 1937;

Prof. Friedrich Berber: Das Diktat von Versailles, Essen 1943;

Prof. Friedrich Berber: American Neutrality in the war 1939-41

Just: The Soviet Union. Berlin 1940

Kohl The Broken Promise of Versailles. Berlin 1935;

Official material on the Katyn mass murder, Berlin 1943

All rights reserved

Printed by August Scherl Nachf. Berlin SW68

1. The First World War and the "International Moral Law".

When World War I had ended because Germany had believed the declarations of U.S. President Wilson and voluntarily surrendered to the enemy, British Prime Minister -Lloyd George paraded through the assembly halls of his constituency -shouting "Hang the Kaiser." The dictation that followed at Versailles called for a trial of the former German Emperor "for most serious violation of the international moral law." A note addressed by the Versailles Allies to the German delegation for explanation declared that World War I was to be judged "a crime deliberately conceived against the lives of the peoples of Europe" by Germany.

Among the innumerable lies from which the poisonous fabric of the Versailles Dictate was pieced together, the assertions about the war guilt have proved to be the most scurrilous and untenable. Unsustainable in the face of all historical research, which has since completely exposed the war threads spun by the Entente against Germany, but basely above all because this whole charge served only one purpose: -to cover up its own historical -guilt, to -divert the -world's gaze from the true war criminals of the -1914/18 war.

It is a natural process that the peoples, who are under the hardest test of war, reflect on the cause of the struggle and raise the question whether the warlike confrontation could have been avoided and who are the men to be blamed if out of spiritual, political or economic difficulties and -tensions a -clash of arms, a millionfold deployment of soldiers with all its hardships and consequences arose.

If we examine this question with regard to the present great world war, we are aware that today, too, from the side of our enemies, a loud clamor is being performed, with which the German people are accused of the intention to conquer the world and thus, just as in the First World War, the blame for the great struggle is being laid at their door.

The slogans of the enemy propaganda machine can be summarized in the sentences: "The German people aspire to dominate the world", the "Prussian military caste" wants to invade the peaceful peoples, a "Teutonic worship of violence extinguishes the concept of law" - and what is more such homicidal nonsense, with which millions of peoples -were dragged into the first as well as into the present -world war!

For the German reader, who does -not need to say anything about these foolish hostile -slogans, they are nevertheless -remarkable and revealing. Whoever directs such insane suspicions against a people that for centuries -was -only the scene of -foreign power struggles, while others conquered half the world, does -not only want to whitewash the latter, but also has another thing to hide.

At Versailles, an attempt was made to destroy Germany by invoking the war guilt lie. French Marshal Foch proudly proclaimed at the time, "There are still Germans, but no more Germany." If not for the 1933 resurgence, he would certainly have been right. Today the Morgenthau and -consorts are screaming -that "Versailles was too lenient," that Germany -could only -be hit if the German people were wiped out. This is a "strangler" among the peaceful peoples (according to Vansittart); as long as it exists, there can be no peace.

The role of Morgenthau and Vansittart, of Roosevelt and Churchill, of Stalin and all the others who are really responsible for this war is today already revealed before all the world so beyond any doubt that the volume of their shouting with which they proclaim their "Stop the thief!" and blame the German national character for what they have most personally on their conscience is no less comprehensible than the "Hang the Kaiser" of those who have the First World War on their conscience.

In the October 1944 issue of the monthly magazine Contemporary Review, a British journalist, George Glasgow, in a review of British politics in the pre-1914 period, made remarks that shed light on the history of the anti-German wars in a very different way than the Vansittart and Churchill would have it true. He writes:

"When the young German nation wisely, skillfully, industriously and enterprisingly founded its empire, England saw only a rival in the rising Germany. For the anti-German encirclement policy which then set in, Great Britain bears the chief responsibility. The war of 1914 was the terrible and inevitable consequence of this policy."

Let us translate these British words into a clearer language: When the German people six centuries after the British, four -centuries after the French and one hundred years after the foundation of the USA finally created its political unity, it entered as a new power into the circle of those who had previously divided the world among themselves. With the criminal instinct of people possessing foreign property, these then together fell upon the have-nots who -surprisingly placed themselves at their side!

Nothing makes this background of World War I clearer than the repetition of the same spectacle we witnessed in the British-American policy of our time toward Italy and Japan. When Fascist Italy claimed a great power position and began to compete with the British in the Mediterranean, when Japan threatened to endanger their possessions in East Asia, where certainly no Englishman or American is at home the keyword "war" was proclaimed with the same vehemence as at the beginning of our century against Germany alone. But England and the U.S.A., of course, by no means -admit that they are fighting in East Asia for their rule in Singapore, Hong Kong and the Philippines, for opium trade and oil business, no, they are fighting "against the Japanese military caste, which threatens the freedom of the peoples". For almost fifteen years the Duce was considered a highly respected European statesman in London; but when he recalled that Italians lived in Malta and that the British Isles were not in the Mediterranean but in the Atlantic, he became "the robber" to be exterminated in the interest of threatened humanity. And towards Franco's Spain, London's language only became moderate since the reference to the Spanish Gibraltar was again put on file there.

These highlights suffice to shed light on that strange "international moral law" which Germany was accused of having violated at Versailles. It was certainly not a law that the Germany of 1914 had broken, it was at best a custom with which it came into conflict: the custom of the propertied classes to regard themselves as just and godly, but the less well-off and nevertheless proud as suspicious and dangerous to be put down,

before he begins to think about the distribution of goods.

The robbers, who do not want to tolerate any honest man, the hereditary creeps, who do not want to tolerate any creative man in their circle, even secretly fear him because he did not do it exactly the same way as they did and nevertheless became great - this is the atmosphere in which the First World War was born.

With this knowledge, which has long since found its historical confirmation, let us now turn to the great clash of world powers which began barely twenty years after Versailles and which has reached its climax today. We want to examine what are the reasons that led to the new struggle and who are the men who bear the historical responsibility. We want to see whether the new great world war was inevitable or whether it was avoidable, and what charge we as Germans have to bring before the judgment seat of history.

2. Wilson - the first war criminal of the Second World War

"If Germany - as many claim - is preparing some 'ghastly surprise,' who is the aggressor? Is it Germany who has been beaten, humiliated and ostracized, or is it those nations who have beaten, humiliated and ostracized her? "

It is again a Briton, the well-known organizer of the English armored forces in the First World War, Major General J.F.C. Fuller, who wrote down this remarkable sentence in 1937 in his book "The First of the League of Nations Wars".

This sentence can also be expressed more clearly and, after the development that has occurred in the meantime, more correctly: The new world war is such a direct consequence of the first world war that later historiography will always treat the two together. Germany laid down her arms in 1918, although, as the British supreme-commanding Marshal Haigh openly told the American Supreme House, was "not defeated in a military sense." It had ended the war, had agreed to make a heavy sacrifice by surrendering Alsace Lorraine in order to make possible a true peace in which it believed at the time, believing in Wilson. A breach of word of historic proportions was the answer it received; military emasculation, political disenfranchisement, and economic enslavement were the consequences of the confidence the German people had placed in the solemn declarations of an American President.

At some point and somehow, every fraud leads to conflict. In the private sphere, it comes to light and is punished; in the international, its perpetrators are historically branded; but its consequences must be erased and a new beginning must be made.

Why this inevitable reparation could not be made peacefully, but led once again to a war-like clash - this will be discussed when we come to the names of Roosevelt and Churchill and to the Moscow problem. Now we shall speak of the initial crime, of those who lured Germany to Compiègne with seductive words in order to deprive her of her defensive power there, so that she then faced the Versailles Dictate defenseless.

Even before the fraud became visible in its full magnitude, still in the armistice treaty, a decision had been made which in the following period proved to be no less important for Europe than all the other dictates in

the West: By the Allies' disorderly evacuation of the eastern territories, especially southern Russia, and their transfer to the Bolsheviks, the Soviet government became in November 1918 from a putschist clique a power factor which has since intervened in European destinies in a much more far-reaching form than Tsarist Russia had done before. Thus, at the very hour when the guns fell silent in November 1918, a new threat of war began to take shape in the East.

But at the moment when the "Allied and Associated Powers" handed over the book of the so-called peace conditions to the German plenipotentiary in Versailles, it became clear that the war was not over at all, even in the West. For it was not peace that Germany had accepted when she laid down her arms, but it was a dictate the fulfillment of which meant suicide, and the tearing apart of which must become a matter of national self-preservation.

Here is the first point we come across in the course of our investigation from the thing to the person:

It is the U.S. President Wilson whom we must establish as the first war criminal of the present new world war.

He announced fourteen points on January 8, 1918, which he expressly called a "program of world peace" and at the time of their announcement he still made the following statements about Germany:

"We are not jealous of Germany's greatness, and there is nothing in our program that diminishes it. We do not wish to do her an injustice and somehow limit her rightful influence or power. We wish only to give it an equal place - not a ruler's place, to be sure -- among the peoples of the world, the new world in which we now live."

There is no need to repeat here the entire lengthy history of the American-British-French preliminary armistice negotiations of October/November 1918; of historical probative value is only the concluding note which the United States addressed to Germany on November 5, 1918. It states literally that the Allied Governments "declare their readiness to conclude peace with the German Government on the basis of the terms of peace set forth in the President's address to Congress of January 8, 1918, and the principles laid down in his subsequent addresses." A qualification, referring to the term "freedom of the seas," and a statement that the occupied territories must not only be vacated but that damages must be paid to the civilian population, are made explicit. Otherwise, the 14 points are clearly and unambiguously regarded as peace conditions. On the basis of this note, Germany laid down her arms in 1918.

Between the 14 points on the one hand, which provided for an open peace treaty, general disarmament and national self-determination of the peoples, and the Versailles dictate on the other hand, there is a truly monstrous disproportion, both in the basic ideas and in every detail. Whoever - like Wilson - proclaimed the 14 points before the whole world and then nevertheless put his name to the Versailles dictate can only stand in the judgment of all peoples as a deceiver of unique magnitude. So much has been reported since then about the dodges that lay between January 8, 1918, the day the Fourteen Points were announced, and June 28, 1919, the day they were signed in Versailles, that an almost complete

picture of lies, deceit and intrigue presents itself before the historian. That the consequences of the dictate had to be confusing for all concerned, but devastating for Europe, was recognized even then by some who experienced the evil Parisian stage play of the "Allies" at close quarters. Historical truth dictates that, for example, the South African Prime Minister Smuts sent almost imploring letters to Wilson on May 22 and 30, 1919, in which he implored him to return to his 14 points, because otherwise there could be no peace. He did not shrink from the remark that the Versailles Dictate "probably -meant even greater disaster for the world - than the war had been." One of the "big four," Lloyd George, also had a lucid moment when, on March 25, 1919, in view of the creation of the Polish "corridor," he wrote down the prophecy that had become famous, that this senseless solution by force "must sooner or later lead to a new war in the East." And nevertheless, in the original copy of the Versailles Dictate the name is written in the 6th place: D. Lloyd George and in 16th place: J. Chr. Smuts!

Anyone who studies the history of the Versailles Dictate will be in doubt as to which instincts took precedence among its authors: hatred of Germany, irresponsibility for the future, or the reckless arrogance, the "hubris" - to use the word of the ancient Greeks - that deluded Wilson, Clemenceau, the Italian Jew Sonnino and their comrades into thinking they could determine the fate of nations at the green table. Countless are the vouched anecdotes of those secret negotiations in which decisions were made about provinces whose exact geographical data were unknown to the deliberators, in which Wilson confused Silesia with Cilicia, Clemenceau invented "150,000 Saar Frenchmen" and the pianist Paderewski was able to bring two million Germans under Polish rule under the impression of his skillful piano playing on the Wilson family. It was under such auspices that the Versailles state came into being, characterized by the ostracism, maltreatment and exploitation of Germany, by a disarmament of the Reich and rearmament of all others, by the oppression of millions of Germans, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Slovaks, Croats, Ukrainians, etc., who were pressed into states hostile to them and saw themselves raped in all their national sentiments. In inversion of Clausewitz's word, this "-peace" could -not be spoken of otherwise than as a continuation of the war "with the interference of other means".

All those, however, who offered their hand to the momentous deception, who were not ashamed to speak the word of a "new world", although they knew that it was not and could not become one, are to be indicted, because they put violence before justice, hatred before reason, acquisitive -desire before the thought of the future. They are all marked before the judgment seat of -history!

3. War as a principle of Kremlin policy

Colonel House, the close confidant of U.S. President Wilson, made the following -remark to British Foreign Secretary Balfour when the latter visited him in New York in 1917 and discussed peace problems:

"We must reckon with the future Russia. This could in fifty years or so - be the threat to Europe, -not Germany."

It remains a side note, for Balfour thought that the -creation of Poland would probably eliminate this danger!

In any case, when it came to the armistice terms for Germany a little over a year later, the concerns of the Supreme House were completely -forgotten: With a stroke of the pen, the -independent Ukrainian state -created at Brest-Litovsk was -eliminated, and the Soviet Empire was finally lifted into the saddle.

Once this decision had been made, the Russian or, more accurately, the Bolshevik problem came repeatedly into the focus of the Versailles powers, because its importance simply could not be overlooked. Thus it is reported of Marshal Foch that he had already worked out a campaign plan against Soviet Russia a few months after Compiègne in the spring of 1919. Churchill's opinion on Bolshevism, the British Minister of War at the time, left nothing to be desired in terms of clarity; he, too, demanded that the Russian peoples be freed from Lenin's dictatorship through rapid military intervention.

But the intoxication of the Parisian festivities drowned out every voice of warning. Russia was far away, Germany was near. It was easier to spit on the Germans than to fight the Bolsheviks.

Meanwhile, Lenin and Trotsky began to make themselves at home in the Kremlin, where they -had felt uncomfortable before. -After all, anyone who usurped power in a state of 150 million people with no more than 25,000 followers had reason to be cautious. As is well known, the masters of the Kremlin never completely got rid of this feeling. Even today, the Bolshevik rulers live no differently than Lenin and Trotsky: as imperious rulers foreign to the people behind the walls of a fortress.

For Lenin, who had so much reason to be grateful for Compiègne, the news of the Versailles rape was also welcome -news. The unnatural state of violence decreed there for Europe was favorable to the plan of a Bolshevik world overthrow; continental chaos could -only be conducive to the realization of Moscow's hopes.

At that time Lenin formulated the following principle for the political standpoint of the Soviet Union:

"We live not only in one state, but in a whole system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Union alongside other states is unthinkable in the long run."

Lenin -expressed the same thing even more succinctly on another occasion:

"We are in Moscow only temporarily; we all wish that this time may be as short as possible."

For twenty-five years this slogan has been the guideline of the political, economic and military development of the Soviet Union, which in its very name, "Union of Soviet Republics," knows no national limitation. In 1944/45 it need no longer be proved that nothing has changed in the intentions of the Moscow rulers since Lenin's time. The genocidal Bolshevik procedure has -again been -so forcefully demonstrated today throughout -occupied Europe that any word of enlightenment -about

the world danger which Bolshevism poses- to all freedom-loving and creative peoples is superfluous. The language of facts has become clearly enough audible in the East as well as in the West of Europe."

For our investigation, however, the fact that a full quarter of a century of planned war preparation in Eastern Europe, based on Lenin's ideology, lies behind us is of importance.

The war guilt of the West, characterized by Versailles, military pacts, war-mongering and secret diplomacy, contrasts with a no less war responsibility of the East, which finds its expression in the ideological commitment to war against the "other" world as well as in a very obvious military preparation.

The internal turmoil in the Soviet Union had barely been -overcome when the -14th Party Congress in 1925 officially announced the planned creation and development of a war industry. Stalin declared at the time: "We must be able to produce all our armaments from our own resources," and the official history of the Party Congress notes of the decision that it was taken "because this was demanded by the thesis of the Soviet Union, the struggle for world revolution.

From this point in December 1925, a monstrous process of rearmament took place in the Soviet Union, which as early as 1931 prompted Churchill to state in an article entitled "The Russian Threat" that

"Russia, which already has by far the largest army in the world, continues to arm. In a year or two, Russia will be armed for war as never before in the past."

This was written down in 1931. For that year Soviet statistics give as military state expenditures the sum of 2 billion rubles, while according to the same official source in 1939 they rose to 40 billion, in 1940 to 77 billion! The manpower of -the standing Soviet army was brought from 600,000 men (1930) to 2,000,000 men (1938) in the same period. Above all, however, it was the technical armaments that drove the Soviets up.

In August 1939 Voroshilov boasted that the army's armored car fleet had increased 43-fold since 1930!

Through all the years of Soviet rearmament, the basic theses put forward by Lenin remained unchanged. In always new form, but with always the same content, they were and still are talked up to the Russian people.

Almost in the same words as Lenin twenty years earlier, the Bolshevik head of state Kalinin declared on June 18, 1938: "The victory of Bolshevism must be considered incomplete as long as the other states of the world still have a form of government different from our regime."

As late as May 1941, a book entitled "Total War Economy and the Red Army" appeared with a preface by Molotov, in which the same principle was enunciated even more comprehensively:

"A simultaneous parallel coexistence of our Soviet state with the rest of the world is impossible in the long run. This opposition can find a solution only by force of arms. There is no other solution and there can be no other. Only the one who feels in himself the determination to attack will win. The country which is only set on defense is inevitably doomed to defeat."

"There is no other solution and there cannot be" - in this sentence the monstrous share of the Soviet Union in the present world war is revealed in its full size and meaning: The war as a doctrine, the rape of foreign

nations as an ideological demand - this has been the state idea of the Soviet Union since Lenin and has remained until today. The Bolshevik ideologies do not stand up to the national arguments, the Soviet practice finds the abhorrence of all creators; neither with the slogans of Soviet literature nor with the picture of Soviet facts there is a spreading of what the Lenin and comrades call "world revolution"; tanks and airplanes are their only arguments, and to them they therefore profess on principle. As there are said to have once been prophets who hoped to spread their theses over the whole world by fire and sword, so the Soviets today have proclaimed war as a principle!

An orderly people living in peace and deciding their fate with deliberation is an impregnable fortress for the Bolshevik doctrine. Nowhere has a Soviet regime -been established by popular decision. -A chaotic ideology, a doctrine of annihilation and enslavement can gain ground only where distress and horror confuse the minds. Potemkin, the former Soviet ambassador in Paris, was thinking of this when he declared to Fabry, then French Minister of War, in July 1935 "Out of the world war arose the Russia of -the Soviets, out of the next one will arise the Europe of the Soviets."

The sequence: first the war, then sovietization, is the decisive point in the calculation that Lenin once called "the scientific predetermination of final victory." Stalin expressed it as follows (10.5. 938): "The direct resumption of revolutionary action will be possible only when we succeed in exploiting the (antagonisms between the other countries in such a way that they plunge into a world war. Then the decisive hour will have come for us."

We spoke of a criminal hubris to characterize the state of mind with which the men of Versailles presumed to determine the fates of peoples at the green table without even being able to judge them. Their crime was great and is indelible, and yet it still takes a back seat to the image of the world-threatening delusion, the genocidal -doctrine that seeks -war for -war's sake, that sees in it the prerequisite and the only way of its success, that wants world conflagration because it -can plant its flag only on sites of ruin.

The bloody madness will pass away under the thunder of this war; but all those who cold-bloodedly made it the law of a giant empire will be eternally marked, and as long as there are free peoples, they will speak of them only with a curse on their lips.

4. Roosevelt - the murderer of peace

When serious problems arise between nations, when grave questions come to the forefront of international life, war is not the only way out of the confusion. There has never been a great struggle -which has not been -preceded by -a period of political -conflict and an -attempt at peaceful settlement, and there has never been a war between the great powers without the will of individuals -or groups of individuals ultimately deciding whether to turn from politics to arms.

Certainly, the Versailles Europe was a powder keg, but its explosive substances could be systematically removed and the danger averted; there

was no need for the fire of war to be directed at it. That this happened - although the beginnings of pacification had already become visible in -many forms, is the fault of men who had the power to direct the development and who were nevertheless determined to lead it to a new war. Here, above all others, the U.S. President Roosevelt is to be mentioned. The United States, whose President Wilson had once trusted Germany, only to be so egregiously -betrayed, had later -refused to recognize -Wilson's signature on the -Treaty of Versailles and -concluded -a separate peace treaty -under normal conditions with Germany in -1921. -Since then, -U.S. presidents had often seized the opportunity to exert a calming influence -on French and British European policy-. -Even Roosevelt's predecessor, President Hoover, had acted as a mediator in the reparations questions. What could be more natural than for U.S. policy to offer a hand in the further liquidation of the Versailles crime?

It soon became apparent that President Roosevelt, newly installed in March 1933, was not amenable to such a view. He himself had been undersecretary of state in the Wilson administration as a young man, and he was part of the 1,500-strong U.S. delegation that brewed up the poisonous dish of the Versailles Dictate in Paris. Roosevelt had agitated for America's entry into the war as early as 1917, and he was among those who saw the Versailles Dictate as flawed because it had left a residual Germany.

Roosevelt did not confine himself to -watching the European -difficulties; when his domestic experiments had failed and he was at the point where he would have had to admit -his fiasco, he thought it right to divert the eyes of his people to Europe - with arguments that foretold clash and war. Whoever since then in Europe rejected the idea of a peaceful revision knew that he had the approval and support of the U.S. president.

Just at the moment when the political and legal corrections of Versailles had been completed without more serious friction and the more difficult territorial questions were entering the discussion, Roosevelt raised his voice and in Chicago (November 1937) -imperiously demanded a world rearmament against Germany, Italy, and Japan. Even before that, in May 1937, he had brusquely rejected a suggestion by Mussolini to mediate on the disarmament question and had his representative, Envoy Wilson, declare in Geneva that now was not the time to speak of disarmament. When, despite this provocative attitude on the part of the -American President, the Führer -succeeded in resolving the -Austrian and Sudeten questions peacefully, Roosevelt sent his special ambassador Bullitt to Europe, now to put a stop by diplomatic means to any further rational solution. As is well known, the Polish and French files from that time, which have been published in the meantime, have -characterized the Bullitt case as a warmongering action of astounding unambiguity. It is thanks to this Rooseveltian initiative that as early as 1938 the -warmongering groups in every -European state sensed the morning air, pushed themselves into the political foreground with confidence in U.S. help, -and laid the strings with which the European war was then set in motion a year later.

When it finally came to the warlike confrontation so carefully prepared by Roosevelt over the question of Danzig and the corridor, in which the U.S. State Department had not been stingy with encouragements to Warsaw, it was the same Roosevelt who from the first day clearly took the anti-

German side, although as President of a neutral state he was also obliged to take a neutral position.

In the course of the war, Roosevelt would have had many -opportunities to intervene in the war negotiations. There is a little story that is characteristic for him: When after the Polish campaign the Führer addressed his peace offer to England and France, the German Reich press chief Dr. Dietrich gathered the American correspondents attending the Reichstag session in the Krolloper and drew their attention to the fact that now there was an opportunity for the U.S. president to restore peace by a suitable word to both sides. Roosevelt, of course, had only a snide hand gesture for this. In his press conference, -he briefly declared that he was not interested!

What interested him instead soon became clear:

As early as 1939, the scheduled delivery of war material to -England and France is organized. In June 1940, the "neutral" president urges the French prime minister to continue fighting and announces help. In September 1940, he delivers to Great Britain fifty destroyers. In January 1941, he announces a "lease and loan" agreement to supply arms to Britain without her having to pay for them. At the same time, a special envoy again travels to Europe, this time -inciting Yugoslavia -to war with Germany. In April 1941 Roosevelt has bases in Greenland occupied, on July 7 the island of Iceland. On June 16, he demands the closure of the German consulates in the U.S., on August 2, 1941, he also -assures the Soviet Union of economic support, on August 12, he proclaims the so-called "Atlantic Charter" under chanting with Churchill, which has since long been exposed as a brazen hoax, then follows on September 12 the -infamous firing order, which authorizes the U.S. Navy to attack German submarines. Hardly a day without a new violation of neutrality, without active participation in the war! Finally, on October 13, the U.S. merchant ships are armed, and on October 28, as the crown of the efforts, a speech follows in which Roosevelt declares that Germany 1. intends to occupy South America, and 2. -wants to abolish all religions and -forcibly introduce a National Socialist -cult in its place. Both slogans, as incredibly stupid and simple-minded as they are, do not fail to have an effect in the end:

The U.S. is following Mr. Roosevelt into the war he not only ran after, but passionately -wanted, planned, organized and deliberately brought about - one of the greatest war criminals of all time.

5. Churchill - "this man means war"

Churchill's participation in the preparation of the present war was of a different nature, but of a similar spirit and filled with the same passion as that of President Roosevelt.

Churchill is the only one among the statesmen in the foreground today who already played an important role in the First World War. It was he who became First Lord of the Admiralty in 1911, with the idea and the aim of making the British fleet ready for war with Germany. When July 1914 came, he could not wait for the war to break out. Already on July 29, six days before the British declaration of war, he issued the warning telegram to all squadron commanders to be ready for war. Almost twenty years later, in July 1933, another small world sensation occurred when Churchill, on a visit to Paris, was greeted with official words of thanks by the chairman

of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the French Parliament, MP Berenger. France would never forget that it had been Winston Churchill who had prompted the British government in 1914 to go to war immediately alongside France. This oratorical outpouring may, historically speaking, exaggerate Churchill's importance at the time, but his character is certainly accurately portrayed.

Asquith, the British prime minister at the time, recounts an episode in his October 1914 diary that illuminates why Churchill was such a fanatical warmonger.

"Winston Churchill" - Asquith writes - "literally begged me not to look at his future in a conventional way. Having, as he put it himself, tasted blood at Antwerp, he now begins to cry out like a man-eating tiger for more blood, and asks me to relieve him of his post at the head of the Admiralty and entrust him with a military command. He declared that a political career meant nothing to him compared with military glory."

This strange picture of the soul that Asquith draws of Churchill, this strange picture of an abnormal ambition, is still confirmed and supplemented by some scattered lights in the First World War. As is well known, Churchill's passionate urging caused the Dardanelles fiasco and temporarily cost him his position. Of his front-line journeys thereafter as a colonel, sayings are reported at which the trench soldiers shook their heads, but which characterize Churchill. "Well, don't you like war?" - with this question he greeted the Tommies in Flanders. And to the Scotts Fusiliers he proclaims, "War is a game played with a smiling countenance." The English biographer of Churchill, who otherwise does not spare admiration, remarks with a shudder:

"The more this strange person saw of the war, the more he liked it!"

When the First World War had passed without Winston Churchill having brought home the longed-for "military glory," he passionately looked around for new possibilities of warlike activity. It can be considered proven today that his trumpet blasts against Bolshevism at that time were given less out of serious recognition of the danger threatening from the East, but above all out of the urge to make a noise with weapons. In the nervous hope of getting to his war after all, he even proclaimed at the time to the astonished Versailles politicians the slogan: "Create a Franco-German-English military alliance." Once again, in 1922, he hoped to get to war, this time against Kemal Pasha and the Turks. At the last moment, the British Cabinet restrained its wild-eyed war minister. And Lord Beaverbrook spoke then the word that for a long time spoiled Churchill's political career: "This man means war."

By the 1930s, Churchill had become quiet. He was no longer taken seriously. His political career had not only -become "-conventional, -" it also seemed to have ended.

But ambition burns in such people as long as they breathe. Churchill knew that there -was no more chance for him in a peaceful England, in a -calmed atmosphere. He was marked as a man of war. If his voice was to have any validity again, it could only be in a new world war. In 1934 he turned sixty years old. There was not much time left to lose ...

Churchill is looking for a new way to power; he is convinced that this can only be the way to war. Turkey, of course, has been written off. The

"Russian threat" is also forgotten; now it is again against Germany. Although Churchill called the Paris Conference in 1919 an "impetuous clash of confused demagogues," now, when its work is to be revised, he becomes an ardent defender of the Versailles Dictate. Here he senses a new opportunity for war, and he is determined not to let it out of his hands this time. Already on March 15, 1934, the Czech envoy reports Masaryk from London to Prague:

"It is common knowledge that Winston is going through a period of alarmist mental attitude, constantly -referring to the near possibility of war and the -necessity of armaments."

The "alarmist mindset" - this is the -contribution that -Churchill tirelessly made to -the preparation for war. As early as May 1938, in Manchester, he openly calls for the military encirclement of -Germany as the main task of British policy. And when Chamberlain returned from Munich, he fell drooling over him, proclaiming peaceful unification a national disgrace. In the summer of 1939, he tours France and demonstratively visits the Maginot Line. On September 3, 1939, he reaches his goal: the war is here, and he is back in office. After eight months, on May 10, 1940, he finally gets the long-awaited post of prime minister. Now he has what he wants: the path to military glory. What does it matter that this -leads first to Dunkirk -and Singapore, then to dependence on the USA, finally to stooge service for the Soviets. As a young man, barely out of school, Churchill once exclaimed:

"How nice to imagine being only 19 years old in 1793 and still having more than 20 years of war ahead of you."

May England fall, may mankind curse me, I, Winston Churchill, descendant of the Dukes of Marlborough, have fulfilled the dream of my youth, the longing of my life!

6. Men behind the scenes

Not only the men who act openly on the stage of world politics, but also those who stand in the wings can hold power and means in their hands to intervene in the development of peoples, to The question of war or peace. In the future, the activities of those who, from influential positions, prepared the present great world war and brought it to an outbreak will be added to the historical -examples of unmasked secret and -cabinet politics.

Vansittart

It would certainly give an incomplete picture of British war preparations, for instance, if we did not draw the person of Lord Vansittart into the circle of our investigation, if we did not illuminate the man who today has exposed himself before all the world as a manic-depressive German-hater and who during the whole period of political war preparations -- from 1929 to 1941 - as Secretary of State of the Foreign Office was the decisive figure of -British foreign policy. In November 1943 this man sent to Moscow the following message: "I saw and predicted

the present struggle even before the Nazis came to power, and I knew that England and the Soviet Union would one day face the Germans together." In this admission is contained all that -needs to be said about Vansittart-: the planned organizer of a new world struggle, whereby, as he has since clearly proclaimed in his extermination programs, he -sees the enemy in the German people themselves, of whom he declares that they "sing hymns of hatred even in their sleep" and that they "periodically drift toward bloody expansion." In reality, however, of course, it is not such nonsense that dictated Vansittart's political actions in Downing Street, but cold political calculation. "The new Europe - he wrote in January 1944 - will be built either with us or against us, but if without us, then in the end against us." He believes that Germany is the factor that would bring about a European unification without England, and therefore he pursues the slogan of the destruction of all German life. That he thereby unfurls the flag of a Soviet Europe, he seems not to have noticed, blinded by hatred. For the man who has directed British foreign policy for twelve decisive years, mental blindness is no -excuse; the crime against peace is indefeasible on Vansittart's account!

Eden

One cannot speak of Vansittart without referring to the circle -which is considered his and which played such a sinister role in the period of British preparation for war. Here, first of all, is Eden, the ambitious young Foreign Secretary of the 1930s, who went to the Vansittart school without succeeding at the time, and who then, in a burning urge to return to the Foreign Office, became a tireless advocate of the idea of war. A -witness as unsuspecting -as the British Ambassador in Berlin at the time, Sir Neville Henderson, declared to the Czech envoy Mastny as early as February 23, 1938 (i.e., even before the return of the Ostmark), "If there is another personal change and Eden returns, you will probably have Eden, but you will also have the war." And the Czech envoy in London knows to report to his President Benesch on July 14, 1938, the encouraging message: "-Churchill as well as Eden and Sinclair are in constant -communication, and I think in the autumn, if God gives peace until that time, there will be a measuring of forces."

God gave another year of peace, but Churchill and Eden -therefore strengthened their "permanent connection," and Eden took -part in Churchill's triumph on -September 3, -1939; he too returned to the British Cabinet, and today he is again Foreign Secretary.

Duff Cooper

Duff Cooper belongs to the same circle of failed British politicians who longed for war because they hoped it would give them a new chance in their careers, even if his importance is less. He was even called "His Majesty's most stupid minister" in England. This did not prevent him from clamoring vigorously against the "defeat at Munich" during the time he was out of office, where -England and France had suffered "a common humiliation." -He was also the first to publicly appeal to the Soviets, -as early as 1938, to join England and -France "in defense of freedom" in the struggle against Germany in due course.

Almond

The most fanatical advocate of the idea of alliance with the Soviet Union in those years was, of course, the French minister Mandel, whose Jewish profile should not be missing from any album of war criminals. He was Clemenceau's cabinet chief and confidant from 1916 to 1919, and as such was one of the intellectual fathers of Versailles. Mandel, certainly the sleaziest phenomenon of the not very clean French -parliamentarism, could claim for himself not to have forgotten or denied the Versailles slogans at any time. As late as 1922 he was still demanding the entire Rhineland for France. He was willing to use any means to create a wartime mood, and as late as December 1938 he had to be told by the Paris "Jour" that, having failed to draw France into the war in September, he was now preparing for a new mobilization by involving the -press in his machinations. He was also rewarded for his efforts. In the Reynaud cabinet, he was given the longed-for post of Minister of the Interior. In the spring of 1944, Mandel was -shot dead by French policemen while attempting to escape, before all corners of his criminal political career could be illuminated before the -bars of the court. What has become known is sufficient to characterize him, together with Reynaud, Leon Blum and others, as the most disastrous figure in French wartime politics.

Benesch

Among the men who embodied the world of Versailles in their person was the -former Czechoslovak foreign minister and president, Eduard Benesch. He -imposed the -structure of the Czechoslovak multi-ethnic state in Paris and Versailles -with many a hardship and many a dodge. In the feverish effort to preserve this failed -solution in terms of power politics, he became a political criminal of European proportions. He was the driving force behind the military pact policy that ultimately prevented European pacification. With France he concluded a military pact against Germany, with Romania and Yugoslavia he had formed a "small entente" against Hungary, and finally he crowned this dangerous activity in May 1935 by a military convention with the Soviet Union, for which he received the votes of the Czech Communist Party in the presidential election in December of the same year. Benesch's undisputed intention was to develop Czechoslovakia as a military outpost, as an "aircraft mother ship" of the Soviet Union and thus to carry the war directly to Central Europe. The fact that this terrible -military-political conception could no longer be realized as a result of the events of 1938 does not change the fact that Eduard Benesch is the man in whose person and in whose policy the spirit of Versailles was combined with the plans of Moscow, the man who was unscrupulously prepared to hurl the conflagration into the heart of Europe.

Sikorski - Rydz-Smigly

If we investigate the people who, in a similar attitude, were willing to deliberately put the lives of the European nations at risk just to preserve the Versailles solution of force, we must not forget the men of the Warsaw officer clique who saw their task in thwarting the peace work of their Marshal Pilsudski. Here it is necessary to mention General

Sikorski - who has been murdered in the meantime - and later also the "Marshal" Rydz-Smigly.

In the files of the Prague Foreign Ministry there were interesting reports on this subject by the Czech envoy in Warsaw, Girska. The latter reported as early as May 10, 1933: "In Polish -officer circles, the view prevails that war between Germany and Poland is -inevitable. A considerable number of senior officers suspect that Poland can emerge victorious -from this war only if it comes to war now, when Germany is not yet militarily prepared. The idea of a preventive war has supporters even in the General Staff.-" Later, when Pilsudski's policy of a German-Polish- union had gained acceptance, it was General Sikorski who steadily called on the French government, through its Warsaw ambassador, to make domestic demands in Poland, to demand "Beck's head." (Envoy Slawik to Prague July 2, 1936, and March 13, 1937.) These are the same people who first wanted preventive war against Germany, then sought to torpedo the pacification policy, who finally, in March/April 1939, raping the feeble and witless Rydz-Smiglyda, turned the Polish wheel, accepted the British offers, and went to war for England. They have incurred an irredeemable debt, not -least to their own people, whom they now see -betrayed by the British and raped by the Soviets. Some of them, of course, -atoned for their guilt as early as the spring of 1940 by dying a horrible -death in the mass graves of Katyn....

When we speak of the people in the wings, we must not overlook two men who, admittedly, are more important in terms of their influence than those we have mentioned, but who nevertheless remain in the background.

Morgenthau

When Roosevelt entered New York in the fall of 1944 in the course of his election campaign, the only person sitting at his side was Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury. When the U.S. president traveled to Quebec to meet Churchill, he had in his briefcase a plan by the Jew Morgenthau on the future treatment of Germany. Even when Roosevelt was still governor of New York State, he called Morgenthau to his side. Since then he has been his closest advisor, the -No. 1 collaborator of the "brain trust" Roosevelt has gathered around him. Morgenthau also took a -direct part in -Roosevelt's war policy. As early as July 1938, he traveled to Europe and, during a visit lasting several months, had -detailed discussions with the British Minister of War, his Jewish racial comrade Hore Belisha, and with the -French military authorities on the supply of war materials. In January 1939, Morgenthau had to answer to the U.S. Senate Military Affairs Committee for revealing secret -aircraft types to France. He justified himself by saying that he had acted on the instructions of President Roosevelt! Morgenthau has since become the whip of Roosevelt's war policy, the organizer of the lease-loan system and the promulgator of the monstrous plan of hatred and extermination against the German people, a plan by which he has entered his name in special letters in the list of war criminals.

Kaganovich

Finally, it should be mentioned that there is also in the Soviet Union a man of similar influence as Morgenthau has in the USA. It is Laser

Moissejevich Kaganovich, known in the Soviet Union as "the red crown prince". In 1918, this ghetto Jew from Gomel was brought to Moscow by Stalin himself and has since been -Stalin's right-hand man as the party's personnel chief, as a member of the Politburo, later -as People-'s Commissar for -Transportation and for Heavy Industry, and finally as Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. Kaganovich -is the organizer of Soviet armaments, he is the driving force behind the plans of attack on Europe and the whip of their armament realization. The scope of his activity and influence makes him the most important figure in the Kremlin. He is Stalin's Jewish backer, the Soviet outpost of international Jewry -and - with his racial comrade Ilya Ehrenburg -- the Bolshevik prophet of Talmudic hatred -against the German people.

He and all of them, who were at work on side paths and in the background to plunge mankind into a new world war, will be met by the curse of the nations and the judgment of history, wherever they will crawl away to.

7. From the list of major war crimes

The reference to the criminal background of the preparation of the present world war would give an incomplete picture if the great criminal acts which took place in the course of the war were not also called to our remembrance. -In the course of the five years since 1939, the maxim of international law of waging war with humanitarian considerations has been more and more invalidated, on -the -one hand, by Anglo-Americans, who in many points -respect the -Geneva Convention only -theoretically, and, on the other hand, by the Soviets, who, as is well known, do not recognize principles of -international law at all. As a result of the ongoing Anglo- American violations of international law agreements, the High Command of the Wehrmacht has established its own "Wehrmacht Investigation Office for -Violations of International Law," by which thousands of sworn affidavits of Wehrmacht members with exact time, place, and factual details have already been -collected and legally evaluated since the beginning of the war. Killing, maltreatment -and shackling of prisoners, violations of the Red Cross, abuse of German national emblems and use of forbidden means of warfare, shelling of German Wehrmacht members in distress at sea, acts of violence by Anglo-American -troops against the civilian population of occupied territories (beginning with the brutal assaults committed by British troops in Belgium in May 1940) - these are only a few of the subjects on which numerous documents are on file at the Wehrmacht Investigation Office. At present, this authority is busy sifting through, examining, and corroborating through witness interviews the extremely extensive material that was accumulated during the combat events of the summer of 1944. In addition to these individual cases, numbering in the thousands, from the field of immediate combat practice, a series of major war crimes committed by our enemies has already come to light openly before all the world's public. Whoever seeks to gain an overall picture of the present war must also mention these shameful events, for they have become an indelible fact of human history.

Far at the top of this list of major crimes is British culpability in the start and -development of the -bombing war against civilians-.

The terrible indictment against British murder-burning does not only rise from the smoke of burning cities and from the ruins of proud monuments, it emerges no less clearly from the prehistory of the war. As early as the disarmament conference in Geneva, it was England that emerged at that time as the champion of the bombing war against the civilian population. The powers participating in the conference had agreed at the time to -declare a general outlawing of air warfare against the civilian population. The German side had also requested the inclusion of a ban on "any preparation for the dropping of bombs.-" On March 16, 1933, however, the British delegation declared that it could not agree to such a ban on bombing. In any case, an exception "for police requirements in certain remote areas" had to be established; the British government claimed that it could not dispense with the use of bombing planes against natives and thus brought down the planned international ban on bombing. The then Secretary of State for Aeronautics, Lord Londonderry, -looking back on the worries he had had about the Conference on Disarmament, stated with cynical candor in the House of Lords on May 22, 1935:

"I had the -greatest difficulty at that time, with the general cry of indignation, in -retaining the use of the bomber -even for the frontiers in the Middle East and India, where it was only due to the presence of the Royal Air Force that we could keep those areas in check."

That the British position against the outlawing of the bombing war was not only an opinion about the requirements of the colonial war, but also about fundamental views on modern war in general, was clearly stated by the then British Prime Minister Baldwin in the House of Commons already on November 10, 1932, when, starting from the statement that in his opinion "disarmament will not stop war", he briefly and succinctly explained the question of the air war:

"The only defense is offense, which means you have to kill more women and children than the enemy if you want to protect yourself."

This attitude was reflected in the actions of the British military before, during and after the outbreak of war. As early as the Franco-British general staff meetings of April 3, 1939 (i.e., five months before the outbreak of war), the protocol of which fell into German hands in 1940, the "use of Allied bombers, wherever possible, against economic and industrial targets in Germany" was envisaged "with the aim of contributing to the eventual collapse of German resistance." After the outbreak of war, the first bombing missions followed immediately, but they were unsuccessful. On September 5, 1939, the RAF dropped bombs on the Danish town of Esbjerg. The first air war dead of this war becomes thereby a Danish woman! Then, on January 12, 1940, comes the first British air raid on German territory, on Sylt, while the German Air Force is under strict orders not to attack any British or French ground target. Meanwhile, on November 17, 1939, British -Prime Minister Chamberlain had already -discussed with French Prime Minister Daladier (this protocol is also in German hands) the project of a planned -bombing of the cities of the Ruhr. For the time being, of course, their own forces were too weak, but as soon as they -were strengthened, the plan was to be realized. The -attack on Sylt was followed at intervals by

bombing raids on Heiligenhafen, Heide, Weningstädt, and after May 10, 1940, by intensified attacks on Freiburg i. B., Hamburg, Bremen; almost every night the RAF then flew into the Reich territory and dropped its bombs indiscriminately. From January 12 to June 20, 1940, Germany accepted these attacks -without taking any counteraction. The recently -published book by the British air war expert Spaight: "Bombing vindicated" not only recognizes this fact, but still praisingly emphasizes that England nevertheless did not allow itself to be disturbed in its bombing plans. Even in further developments, Germany is known to have always let the British make the first move; thus, in the summer of 1940, the British attacked Berlin no less than seven times before the first German raid on London was flown. The German Luftwaffe never participated in the further brutalization of the -war of terror against the civilian population, the carpet-throwing on small towns and villages, the strafing of civilian passenger trains and plowing farmers in the fields. On the contrary, the German Wehrmacht proved that military successes can be achieved without haphazard bombing of civilians. Prior to June 20, 1940, it did not carry out any air warfare action at all that was not directly connected with an operation of the ground forces. It did not make any attack on unfortified cities of the enemy's rear in connection with such fighting, even when, as national capitals, they played an important role in enemy operational command. The capitals of Copenhagen, Oslo, The Hague, Brussels, and Paris were taken without air attack. Even the fortress of Warsaw was not attacked until it was surrounded by German troops, unsuccessfully demanded to surrender and, moreover, a 24-hour deadline for the civilian population to vacate the city had passed!

The beginning and the development of the air war against the civilian population -is a war crime of monstrous proportions, which -comes exclusively on the British account. The USA joined in the crime without a word about the fact that at the beginning of the war President Roosevelt had made a hypocritical appeal to all belligerents to prevent precisely this method of war.

Dozens of the most venerable European cities, hundreds of thousands of non-combatants, of women and children have fallen victim to the crime. These terrible facts are combined with the documents of a twisted imagination, the hate-blinded slogans with which the British accompanied their bombs when they set out to fight Europe as much as they bid to preserve India.

If the sentence is to be valid that all guilt is avenged on earth - our imagination cannot conceive a punishment that would ever be able to erase these British-American deeds. Centuries from now, the most distant generations will stand by the ruins and curse those who have them on their consciences.

A crime of similar magnitude, which also cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of civilians, is now almost completely erased from the memory of the world public, but it loses none of its horror: the deportation and probably complete extermination of -several hundred thousand Volga Germans-. In September 1941 the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union -issued the order that all German inhabitants of the -so-called "Volga German Republic" were to be resettled in Siberia. Before the First World War, more than 900,000 Germans had lived on the Volga. The last Soviet

statistics gave the number of German inhabitants as 402,000. This half million people were driven by the GPU on foot to the Urals in the autumn and winter months of 1941. Some of them were to reach the Novo Sibirsk district in the Altai Mountains, others the deserted deserts of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Since the news of the departure of the death trains, there has been no trace of these hundreds of thousands of people whose only crime was to -be German!

An equal silence reigns over the fate of numerous Caucasian peoples on whom the GPU pounced after the withdrawal of the German troops. The last reports of refugees who managed to make their way to our troops date back to January 1943 and state that the Soviet authorities used the opportunity to completely exterminate the tribes that were inconvenient to them, especially the so-called Turkic peoples. Here are also recorded the renewed -deportation measures of the Soviets in Estonia and Latvia, which, in continuation of their violent acts of 1940/41, aim at breaking the back of these peoples by exterminating all nationally conscious men and women.

The way in which the Soviets proceed in this "denationalization policy-", as they call it, the world experienced with a shudder when in April 1943 the graves of Katyn were found, in which by July 1943 4143 former Polish officers, all murdered by shot in the neck, had been unearthed, while a total of some 10 to 12,000 bodies lay at the site. With these finds, -numerous futile inquiries made by the Polish side to the Soviet authorities -up to that time as to the whereabouts of 8300 officers and 7000 other Poles -received a sensational answer. -The Soviets first declared, on April 16, 1943, that everything was a "hideous invention of the German fascist canons" and that it was "the archaeological excavations of the historical grave of Gnesdovaya". When this impudent excuse could no longer be maintained, the Soviets broke off -relations with the Polish Emigrants Committee in London. As -is known, this rupture has not been repaired to -this day, although the British government never tired of covering the bloody fact of Katyn with a cloak of oblivion. Finally it occurred to the Moscow rulers to accuse the Germans of the murder! With all these dodges, however, they could not cover their trail of murder, which is openly exposed to the whole world.

Katyn has -become an international concept and an immutable -symbol of Bolshevik executionerism. Wherever war crimes are spoken of, the ten thousand Polish officers of Katyn who were butchered will always intervene as silent accusers!

War crimes can be committed not only against living people-, there are also spiritual and historical treasures whose wanton destruction is an outrage that has an effect beyond our time. We do not want to speak here again of the works and values that were and still are destroyed by haphazard bombing. The Anglo-American warfare has not only brought this ignominy upon itself, the history of the present war also records cases in which -certain historical monuments were deliberately and plannedly destroyed without any seriously compelling reason for doing so. The destruction of the venerable Abbey of Monte Cassino, one of the most beautiful and valuable ecclesiastical buildings of the Middle Ages-, stands out as a particularly drastic case. -The German Wehrmacht, when the fighting had moved into the area of Monte Cassino, had expressly

refrained from occupying the monastery and had made this known to the enemy. Nevertheless, on February 15, 1944, American artillery fire was directed at the building; a bombing raid completed the senseless work of destruction. It was later admitted by the Anglo-American side that no German soldier had been in the Cassino monastery. It was also stated that Roosevelt himself, as Supreme Commander of the USA forces, had given the fateful order.

The war crime of Cassino did not hit a human or material value, but an irreplaceable cultural one. It will go down in history as the mark of a barbaric attitude. In addition, however, the fact will be recorded that on the part of the German Wehrmacht, which had fought so many battles on historic ground in this war, military disadvantages were accepted rather than endangering a building that was important for human culture.

Athens, Rome, Florence and hundreds of other individual sites dear to humanity have been preserved only because there is no commander, no officer and no common soldier in the German Wehrmacht who respected such sites as little as the American president did when he had the Cassino monastery destroyed.

These highlights of the most prominent enemy war crimes must be supplemented by reference to events of the autumn of 1944. It is the crime of Wallendorf, the allegedly "punitive" burning of an entire German village before the eyes of its inhabitants by American-Jewish stage ruffians, and it is the terrible Bolshevik murderous deeds uncovered in the again liberated East Prussian villages of Nemmersdorf, Tuteln and Brauersdorf. We need not repeat the gruesome details of these American and Bolshevik crimes. They are indelibly imprinted in the memory of every German.

These atrocities, which unfortunately continue daily, complete the picture of the threat which Germany faces in her struggle for life. All the terrible events, which the few references to the main war crimes of our enemies illuminate, are today an exhortation to fight, a portent of steadfastness for every German. Hardened by the terror of bombing, he confronts the bloodthirsty front of verified enemies with a passionate will to defend himself. He knows that he saves more than himself by passing the great struggle.

Never before has human dignity been trampled to the ground as it is today. It will only rise from the dust again on the day when the crimes of the terror bombing, the extermination of peoples of Volga and Caucasus, the bloodbath of Katyn, the barbarism of Cassino, the murder-burning of Wallendorf and Nemmersdorf and all the other nameless atrocities of Bolshevik cruelty and Anglo-American gangsterism will find their historical balance in the victory of German steadfastness.

8. The Jewish Background and the Judgment of Nations

When we survey the numerous observations we have had to make on the prehistory and history of the present Great World War, without even attempting to illuminate all that the historian will one day have to say on the subject, the question arises as to the inner system which united the British, the American, and the Soviet ideas of war, the question as to the common motive force which enmeshed peoples with such diverse

national interests in the blind allegiance of Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill.

Not only the picture of the political past and the warlike present, but also the outlook on the future slogans of our enemies intensifies the question about the background of all that we saw seemingly incoherent in effect.

If we want to find the answer here as well, we have to make a remark beforehand:

The demand for a world Soviet state proclaimed by Moscow and the plan for a world capitalist system proclaimed from Washington -are by no means as contradictory as they may seem at first sight. The paths may be different, the aims coincide, and the consequences of a Wall Street victory and of a Moscow triumph would be equally devastating to creative peoples. If here the economic, there the political execution may be the means, here usury and bailiffs, there the shot in the back of the neck of the -GPU at work, theoretically and practically both systems meet in the proletarianization of all creators, in the concentration of the national economic -labor profit at a top, in the hands of economic rulers, who thereby at the same time secure for themselves the unrestricted rule over the political destinies. Political dictatorship through economic exploitation - that is the common denominator to which plutocracy and Bolshevism can be united!

There is no need to discuss it - because it is an indisputable historical fact that this whole world of thought, that both modern capitalism and Marxism - the spiritual breeding ground of Bolshevism - are of Jewish origin. As the Jew Marx is the spiritual progenitor of Moscow, so the name of the Jew Ricardo is on the first page of the program which today forms the basis of the U.S. war aims proclamation.

In contrast to all other peoples whose national ambition is exhausted in leading a free, secure, culturally rich and economically sufficient existence, the Jewish people is -filled with a passionate -objective which is of religious origin and aims at nothing more and nothing less than the establishment of a world dominion of the "chosen -people". Truly possessed by -the thought of such a goal, the Jewish people, for two millennia, despite being scattered all over the earth, has never lost its inner cohesion and has always preserved its racial unity. It has certainly never been the thought of Jewry to go out on a battlefield itself and fight for its national goal with weapon in hand. The search for other ways of seizing international power has -become, in the course of the -centuries, the -special characteristic of the Jewish instinct. What were once merchants and court Jews have become in modern times the prophets and theorists of an international world state. It is thereby the Jewish conviction that

"the governing power of the nations that make up the world republic will pass smoothly into the hands of the Israelites. The Jewish people, collectively, will be -their own Messiah. "

Thus Baruch Levy wrote to Karl Marx already a hundred years ago. (Quoted in the already mentioned book of the British General Fuller: The First of the League of Nations Wars).

The Jewish instinct, which impetuously pushes for systems that shall give Judaism power over the peoples, believes to have found in Bolshevism -as

well as in the capitalist principle the modern starting points to unhinge above all the world of -nationalism; for only on the ruins of the peoples, on the ruins of the -nation-states would the Jewish goal be attainable.

In the present great world war, when the capitalist as well as the Bolshevik power factor are jointly set in motion against Germany, which has become dangerous to Jewish plans as a bastion of self-conscious nationalism and, moreover, as a model of socialist order, international Jewry hopes to -achieve the outlawing of nations, a final disempowerment of the people's states and the enthronement of international systems of states, such as we have before us in the "United States" as well as in the "Union of Soviet Republics".

That it was Jewry which put Roosevelt and Churchill in the saddle and incited them to war with passionate hatred is a fact which need not be proved because it is not -disputed. The -Jew Emil Ludwig Cohn, who had previously become rich in Germany, -summarized the thousands of Jewish inflammatory slogans that were hurled against Germany without ceasing in those years in 1938 (in his writing "The New Holy Alliance") in the formula-:

"Hitler does not want war, but he will be forced to it, not this year, but soon!"

And on August 1, 1938, the US Jewish -magazine "The American Hebrew" wrote:

"It is clearly evident that the union of Great Britain, France and Russia will sooner or later declare war on Germany. By accident or design, a Jew has come to occupy a position of great importance in each of these states. In the hands of non-Aryans -lies the fate, indeed the lives, of millions."

When on September 3, 1939, Great Britain and France declared war on Germany, the states which declared war on Germany according to the rules of international law were joined in an unequivocal manner by the supranational and interstate power of Judaism, and it left neither us nor the world in any doubt about the fact that it considers itself a belligerent. There is even a kind of state paper on this subject, which -was officially -published in London at the time. This is -the official letter of the Zionist leader Dr. Chaim Weizmann, which he addressed to Prime Minister Chamberlain on the day of the British declaration of war on -Germany, and in which he expressly made the following statement on behalf of all Jewry:

"I wish to -confirm in the strongest terms the declaration -which both my colleagues have made during the past months and especially during the past weeks, namely, that we Jews will stand by Britain and fight by the side of democracy. For this reason we place ourselves under the summary leadership of the British Government in the smallest as well as in the greatest matters. The Jewish representation is ready to enter into immediate agreements in order to use usefully all human-Jewish strength, its -technique, its aids and all its abilities. "

"All human-Jewish power" - Chaim Weizmann pronounced here a declaration of war which -embraced not only the Jews of the British Empire, -but all Jews in the whole world, including those living in Germany and Europe! (As a special feature of genuine Jewish mendacity it -should be noted that this international Jewry, despite the legal fact officially created by Weizmann, does not tire of suspecting and slandering Germany for having -taken a series of measures in the -course of the war to exclude Jews living in the Reich from German economic life, to place them under supervision and to put them to work, similar to members of enemy states).

The Jewish background, and only this, is what completes and makes comprehensible the picture of criminal -war preparation -and barbaric warfare that we saw before us.

What sense is there for the U.S. soldier in his struggle on European soil; what national aim is pursued by the Briton who bleeds to death at Antwerp for a Soviet Europe; indeed, what has the Russian mushik to gain at the gates of Budapest? There is no other answer to these questions than one: it is not national interests which have set the armies of our enemies in motion, but it is -international objectives, it is Jewish instincts, Hebrew -hopes, which drove the march of the Soviets into Europe, which threw the fiery fuse into the powder keg of Versailles Europe, which gave the U.S. President Roosevelt the chance to drag America into the war and to -be elected four times-!

The "hubris" we spoke of when Versailles was mentioned, when Lenin was mentioned - it grows into the monstrous when we think of the forces at work, believing and intending to make the Jewish race the master of mankind!

It is a terrible delusion for which millions of people have been rushed into war, and it must be a terrible -awakening when they realize one day what they have -fought for, for what they have brought so much suffering, caused so much disaster, done so many abominable things, destroyed so many irreplaceable things.

It may be indifferent for mankind and its future whether -Roosevelt once drags himself before an international judge's table or whether Churchill sits on a British dock, whether Stalin is shot or hanged, whether the Kaganowitsch, the Morgenthau, the Vansittart or as they are all called die in bed or on the scaffold - what is all their small human fate compared to the violence of the -historical judgment, compared to the fact that as marked and outcasts the curse of their nations will hit them until the most distant generations!

The more important task of the Court of Nations, which will follow this great struggle, must and will be to prevent the repetition of such a crime, which our century -has witnessed. -If the first thing to be done is to create an order in which the free development of all creative peoples is -guaranteed, and at the same time the continental security of the -European continent, -which is the home of the most important nations, is established, it will be no less important to -expel those dogged saboteurs of all national life, the insidious -dogmatists of social disenfranchisement, the homicidally selfish -advocates of international plans of domination, from among the peoples whose lives they threaten and whose future they wish to destroy.

Only a world solution of the Jewish question can restore to mankind the inner peace which it needs so much and which alone can eliminate the factor of war from its existence in the long run.

May they gather after two thousand years of dispersion, may they start a new, different life in reservations, wherever there is room for them away from other peoples:

Banish the Jews from the circle of nations and there will be peace.

Remove them from the capitalist system, from the Bolshevik world organization - and empty schemes will remain, over which the peoples will pass to the order of the day.

Certainly, there may continue to be fools like Vansittart, and there may be criminal ambitionists like Roosevelt and Churchill trying to plot and intrigue - but they will never again have to decide the question of war or peace, for there will no longer be any subterranean power to drive and support them, they will lack that Jewish echo that responds to every call that conjures up chaos.

If the world-historical crime of the second, the great world war leads to such an inner purification and liberation of all peoples, if it lets the new world of creative nations come together under better conditions of existence - then the mighty thunderstorm will be followed by that clear atmosphere in which new life can blossom out of the ruins, only then, finally, the mighty sacrifice made by all mankind, and in it especially by the German people, will not have been in vain!

We conclude the circle of indications with which we illuminated and indicted the criminals and the crimes of the present great world war. Certainly, the picture that stands before us today - in the midst of the great struggle - is still fragmentary and incomplete, but the broad lines, the contours of the monstrous process of which we have been and are witnesses, are emerging immovably.

We know who the men were who wanted, prepared and brought about this war, the motives of their actions have become known to us just as we know the aims for the sake of which they sent their peoples to the battlefields of war.

Open-eyed, we face the certainty that this struggle is not only greater, but more decisive than any other before.

It is a world struggle in which everything is at stake that has made the world great and beautiful, the nations proud and capable.

The slogan "Victory or destruction" is not only over the fate of the German people, to whom a bloody Talmudic orgy is announced. It is no different for all the capable nations of this earth; even if the hour of awakening has not yet struck some of -them - it will come nevertheless, and all the sooner, the more clearly the -picture of the origin of the war, of the indelible guilt of the war criminals clearly appears before their eyes.

But let this knowledge burn in our hearts, let it accompany us every hour in the struggle we are waging for our own and all proud peoples' future.