



**ABOUT THE AUTHOR:** Dr. Revilo Pendleton Oliver, Professor of the Classics at the University of Illinois for 32 years, is a scholar of international distinction who has written articles in four languages for the most prestigious academic publications in the United States and Europe.

During World War II, Dr. Oliver was Director of Research in a highly secret agency of the War Department, and was cited for outstanding service to his country.

One of the very few academicians who has been outspoken in his opposition to the progressive defacement of our civilization, Dr. Oliver has long insisted that the fate of his countrymen hangs on their willingness to subordinate their doctrinal differences to the tough but idealistic solidarity which is the prerequisite of a Majority resurgence.

### SOME QUOTABLE QUOTES FROM *AMERICA'S DECLINE:*

**On the 18th Amendment (Prohibition):** "Very few Americans were sufficiently sane to perceive that they had repudiated the American conception of government and had replaced it with the legal principle of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' which was the theoretical justification of the Jews' revolution in Russia."

**On Race:** "We must further understand that all races naturally regard themselves as superior to all others. We think Congoids unintelligent, but they feel only contempt for a race so stupid or craven that it fawns on them, gives them votes, lavishly subsidizes them with its own earnings, and even oppresses its own people to curry their favor. We are a race as are the others. If we attribute to Ourselves a superiority, intellectual, moral, or other, in terms of our own standards, we are simply indulging in a tautology. The only objective criterion of superiority, among human races as among all other species, is biological: the strong survive, the weak perish. The superior race of mankind today is the one that will emerge victorious—whether by its technology or its fecundity—from the proximate struggle for life on an overcrowded planet."

### *AMERICA'S DECLINE*

Order No. 1007-\$8.50  
plus \$1.50 for postage and handling.

376 pp., pb.  
ORDER FROM:

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS, Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA

# Liberty Bell

ISSN: 0145 - 7667

SINGLE COPY \$4.00

## MUST WE FOR EVER BE INFERIOR?

by *John Tyndall*  
page 7

### ALSO IN THIS ISSUE:

*Dr. Charles E. Weber:*

GERMANY 1945-1948, Recollections  
and Reflections of an American Veteran,  
Part III, page 1.

*Colin Jordan:*

HITLER WAS RIGHT!, page 23;  
THE ENEMY WITHIN, page 31;  
WAR CRIMES WITCH-HUNT UNDER WAY  
WORLDWIDE, page 39;  
MURDER AT SPANDAU, page 40.

*Professor Revilo P. Oliver:*

POSTSCRIPTS,  
MORE ON AN ENGIMA, page 54

VOL. 17 - NO. 8

APRIL 1990

## Voice Of Thinking Americans

## LIBERTY BELL

The magazine for *Thinking Americans*, has been published monthly since September 1973 by Liberty Bell Publications, George P. Dietz, Editor. Editorial office: P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA—Phone: 304-927-4486.

Manuscripts conforming to our editorial policy are always welcome, however, they cannot be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope. Manuscripts accepted for publication become the property of Liberty Bell Publications.

©Copyright 1988

by Liberty Bell Publications.

Permission granted to quote in whole or part any article except those subject to author's Copyright. Proper source credit and address should be given.

### ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

SAMPLE COPY	\$ 4.00
THIRD CLASS-BULK RATE USA only	\$35.00
FIRST CLASS-USA	\$45.00
FIRST CLASS-all other countries	\$50.00
AIR MAIL - Europe, South America	\$60.00
Middle East, Far East, So. Africa	\$65.00

### BULK COPIES FOR DISTRIBUTION:

10 COPIES	\$ 22.00
50 COPIES	\$ 90.00
100 COPIES	\$150.00
500 COPIES	\$600.00
1000 COPIES	\$900.00

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH—FREEDOM OF THOUGHT FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

The editor/publisher of *Liberty Bell* does not necessarily agree with each and every article in this magazine, nor does he subscribe to all conclusions arrived at by various writers; however, he does endeavour to permit the exposure of ideas suppressed by the controlled news media of this country.

It is, therefore, in the best tradition of America and of free men everywhere that *Liberty Bell* strives to give free reign to ideas, for ultimately it is ideas which rule the world and determine both the content and structure of our Western culture.

We believe that we can and will change our society for the better. We declare our long-held view that no institution or government created by men, for men, is inviolable, incorruptible, and not subject to evolution, change, or replacement by the will of the people.

To this we dedicate our lives and our work. No effort will be spared and no idea will be allowed to go unexpressed if we think it will benefit the *Thinking People*, not only of America, but the entire world.

George P. Dietz, Editor & Publisher

## PART III

In what happened to Germany and Japan after they laid down their arms there lies a striking anomaly. Germany was a nation with Christian traditions and a European intellectual development. It was

racially similar to its adversaries, at least its western adversaries. Japan was not only different in these respects but had attacked the United States in a manner which could hardly have been better calculated to provoke a desire for revenge. Japan, however, received far more lenient treatment after it laid down its arms. It was not divided into four zones of occupation nor its territory (as of 1930) greatly reduced, nor a large number of its people killed during massive expulsions of its populations. Even its soldiers who surrendered probably received better treatment than disarmed German soldiers on the whole. The Japanese head of state, Emperor Hirohito, was allowed to continue his reign.

How did this anomaly come about? Were these differences a result of different attitudes on the part of Generals Eisenhower and McArthur toward their defeated enemies or were directives for Germany and Japan from Washington of a different nature? If so, was Germany considered at that time a greater economic threat, so that German productive capacities had to be severely limited? The status of Austria was still another matter. Austria was considered to have been a victim of "aggression" and received milder treatment, even though it was also divided into four zones of occupation, like Germany. The Germans had a bitter joke about this situation: The Austrians had only one Nazi and they sent him to us. (On attitudes of Austrians toward National Socialism, see John M. Ries' review of the book by E.B. Buckley, *Hitler's Hometown: Linz, Austria, 1908-1945* in the *Journal of Historical Review*, Fall, 1989, pages 380-383.)

After the end of hostilities General Eisenhower continued to command American occupation forces in Germany for several months. Eisenhower showed little compassion for the defeated German nation and was no doubt responsible for at least some of the decisions on handing over German soldiers and others who had fought against Communism to the Russians, the infamous "Operation Keelhaul," one of the most stupid acts (if not one actually disdainful of American interests) done by American authorities in Germany. Eisenhower's attitudes toward Germans were in spite of his German name with an Anglicized spelling, or perhaps even a result of it. As is well known, General Patton, the great American com-

## GERMANY 1945 - 1948

Recollections and Reflections  
of an American Veteran

By  
Charles E. Weber

mander of armed forces, became much more sympathetic with the German population, but he was killed in the American Zone in an automobile "accident" on 21 December 1945. There is evidence that General Eisenhower had a personal hatred of Germans, but I do not rule out the possibility that this hatred was feigned for the purpose of furthering his career and to have earned the amazingly rapid promotions which he had been given. These rapid promotions were pointed out by Robert Welsh in his bitterly critical book on Eisenhower published in 1963, *The Politician*. After all, much of Eisenhower's career had extended through the years of the Roosevelt administration. (As to the question of Eisenhower's merits as a military officer, see *U.S. News & World Report* of 1 September 1986, pp. 28-41, "Ike: Overrated Warrior?" (Reviewed in our *Bulletin* No. 6.)

For some time after the war American soldiers were forbidden to "fraternize" with the German population, although there could hardly have been any real military danger from their doing so, since there was virtually no underground resistance to the Allied occupation after the organized German armed forces had laid down their arms. The real reason for the prohibition was more likely the fear that "fraternization" would have given Germans the opportunity to neutralize some of the anti-German indoctrination and propaganda to which American military personnel had been subjected. A few weeks after the war in Europe, American forces evacuated Saxony and Thuringia, of which Saxony had particularly important mining and industrial resources. These areas were served on a silver platter to the Communists, with whom Eisenhower had been so sweetly fraternizing. Approximately one half of the area of Germany (as of 1937) came under Soviet control.

On the whole, the behavior of the American soldiers toward the German civilian population was pretty decent and in some cases even chivalrous, and that in spite of the fact that American military personnel had been subjected to rather energetic anti-German indoctrination and propaganda in various forms, including indoctrination and training films. In addition, the American media—especially the film industry—gave very effective support to the war effort against Germany, quite in contrast to the rôle of the American media during the American participation in the war in Vietnam.

There were, however, distressing exceptions to the general behavior of American soldiers in Germany during the months following the surrender of the German armed forces. I recall that during the time when I was stationed in Kornwestheim I encountered a crude, stupid truck driver who boasted that he had killed Germans with his truck. In fact, the incidence of automobile accidents was very high on the part of American military personnel and I was myself almost killed by poorly disciplined

American drivers. After the war (!) some 90% of the sculptures by the famous artist, Arno Breker, were destroyed by American soldiers.\* On 13 September 1945 the distinguished composer, Anton Webern, was shot by an American soldier near Salzburg.

I had the impression that attitudes of American soldiers toward the German population varied considerably with educational and social levels of their family backgrounds. In well educated families there was usually an awareness of German cultural and scientific achievements, a factor which no doubt moderated the attitudes of soldiers from such families toward the defeated Germans. Many American soldiers from humbler backgrounds felt that Germany was, at least in a material sense, closer to the United States than any other country in which they had been previously on duty, most notably England and France. It has been observed, probably correctly, that American soldiers from the southern states were the most sympathetic with the plight of the Germans and it has been suggested that this was a result of historical circumstances, namely the fact that areas from which they had come had been subjected to a harsh occupation ("Reconstruction") after the surrender of the Confederacy in 1865.

The harsh conditions imposed on the German civilian population (not to mention the German prisoners of war who were detained for long periods in camps), especially during 1945-1948, were essentially the result of directives from Washington and the resultant continuation of the very harsh policies toward Germany that developed under the Roosevelt administration. These policies included the demand for unconditional surrender of Germany which Roosevelt made as early as January 1943, an irresponsible act which was bound to strengthen the German will to resist and thus to increase the danger to lives of American soldiers like myself. Roosevelt's readiness to sacrifice American soldiers for political aims was not only manifested in the demand for unconditional surrender. It has been claimed, I believe correctly, that Roosevelt could have saved lives of many soldiers and sailors by providing them promptly with information available to him on the coming attack on Pearl Harbor, but that he deliberately allowed an even greater toll of American military personnel

\*Letter dated 23 January 1990 from B. John Zavrel, President of the Arno Breker Society International, Inc. During recent years Mr. Zavrel has made repeated attempts to learn about the circumstances of this incomprehensible destruction of important works of art. In extensive correspondence with the Central Intelligence Agency Mr. Zavrel appealed for the release of a report dated 8 April 1947 concerning the matter. He cited the Freedom of Information Act but thus far the CIA has withheld the information sought by Mr. Zavrel, as if great secrets vital to the defense of the United States could be contained in the report.

in order to set the stage for a vigorous war effort and to justify his previous policies toward Japan, as well as to open a "back door" to war in Europe. I am strongly inclined to agree with Prof. Revilo Oliver's assessment of Roosevelt and his designating Roosevelt as the "Great War Criminal." During 1943-1946 I served in the armed forces of the United States and followed orders, but I had no enthusiasm for the war and distrusted the conduct and objectives of the war, so much so that I was interrogated on this matter when I was in intelligence training camp in Camp Ritchie. My doubts about the conduct and objectives of the war did not distinguish me from many American soldiers, however. Even Roosevelt's chief military lackey, Eisenhower, complained that many of the American soldiers to whom he talked had no real conception of the aims of the American involvement in Europe.

Attitudes of Germans toward National Socialism, even during its most successful years, when it was undoubtedly very popular, had never been especially simple and unvaried. (See my comments in *Bulletin No. 33* on Phillip Jenninger's famous speech before the Bundestag in November 1988.) Attitudes on the part of various components of the population also varied, on average. (See my review of O.E. Remer's *Verschwörung und Verrat um Hitler* in *Bulletin No. 11*, page 4.) The central factor in the attitudes of Germans toward National Socialism after the war was undoubtedly the fact that Germany had suffered a terrible, indeed catastrophic, defeat under the National Socialist government after desperate and costly defense measures which demanded great sacrifices.

The western Allies undertook a vigorous program of "Denazification" in the form of trials for "war crimes," compelling all adult Germans to fill out lengthy questionnaires under the penalty of perjury, automatic arrest categories, dismissal of former members of the NSDAP from their employment and having German authorities examine former NSDAP members for the purpose of putting them into specific categories of "guilt" by special courts ("Spruchkammern"). "Denazification," after all, was based on a cynical disregard of an important legal principle going back to ancient times and embodied in our own Constitution, Article I, Section 9, where ex post facto laws are prohibited.

This process of political reeducation caused bitter divisiveness amongst Germans. Defeat is an orphan. The terrible horrors of the final months of the war caused many a German to remark with resignation, "Lieber ein Ende mit Schrecken als ein Schrecken ohne Ende." (Rather an end with terror than a terror without end.) I recall a sort of joke which was making the rounds and which went something like this: Who is hardest on former National Socialists? The Russians? No. The British? No.

4 *Liberty Bell* / April 1990

The French? No. The Americans? No. Well, who then? The Germans themselves!

An ironic poem also made the rounds amongst those who had disliked National Socialism or who claimed that they had. It went something like this:

Wir waren alle in der Partei,  
Wir waren überall dabei,  
Wir schrien stets und laut "Heil Hitler!"  
Wir waren alle große Profitter,  
Wir nannten den Führer ein höheres Wesen,  
Doch Nazis sind wir nie gewesen.

(We were all in the Party, we were with it everywhere, we cried steadily and loudly, "Heil Hitler!", we were all great profiteers, we called the Führer a higher being, but Nazis we never were.)

When former members of the NSDAP were tried by the Spruchkammern they frequently presented what became known as "Persilscheine." Persil is the brand name of a widely sold laundry detergent, so "Persil coupons" were attestations that the defendants in question had not been such bad people in spite of their membership in the NSDAP and that they were "clean." Obviously, too, the "Denazification" process also presented opportunities for personal vindictiveness and other abuses.

Although I was myself involved in the "Denazification" process during my military service, notably when I worked in Internierungslager 75 in Kornwestheim during 1945-1946, I found myself tormented by the question of whether or not I would have joined the NSDAP if I had been a German man born in the early years of the century. If I had been, I would have witnessed the defeat of my homeland, the humiliating loss of German territory and overseas colonies, the partial Allied occupation (mostly west of the Rhine), the severe limitation of German defense forces and the economic chaos during the time of the Weimar Republic, namely the hyperinflation of 1922-1923, and the massive unemployment during 1930 ff. Many Germans saw in National Socialism the only possible path to a restoration of decent economic conditions and a restoration of national dignity by overcoming the conditions created by the Versailles Treaty. Then, too, many foreigners were favorably impressed with Germany when they came to see the Olympic Games in 1936. No less a person than the Prince of Wales, the future King Edward VIII, manifested admiration for developments in Germany. The Munich agreement on the Sudetenland in 1938 even gave foreign recognition to a need to revise the terms of the Versailles Treaty.

The war which England and a somewhat hesitant France declared

*Liberty Bell* / April 1990 5

against Germany on 3 September 1939 left Europe physically deeply scarred, psychologically demoralized, economically depressed and politically largely enslaved to brutal Communist governments. During the course of the following years England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium lost their overseas empires except for remnants. Militarily, National Socialist Germany had been entirely crushed by overwhelming numbers and resources in spite of its determined defense. Today it seems that the most significant heritage that could be derived from National Socialism would be the will of the Aryan nations to survive culturally and racially. It is reasonable to assume that the besieged Aryan component of the population of the United States will become ever more aware of the National Socialist heritage as it struggles against ever greater forces aligned against it, forces which will severely test its capacity to survive in any sort of meaningful way. Furthermore, it is also reasonable to assume that National Socialist Germany will be reevaluated by future generations of Aryan Americans in spite of all the shrewd, well financed efforts to denigrate it.

\* \* \*

I have in my reference library a rather large book (247 pages, 23 1/2 x 17 cm), *So lebten wir... Ein Querschnitt durch 1947* (That is the way we lived... a cross section through 1947). The book was published with the permission of the Military Government in December 1947 by the Scherer-Verlag in Württemberg in a printing of only 5000 copies. This book was written by a number of German authors on such topics as the status of the Saar area, the Soviet Zone, Berlin, the black market, student life, the attitudes toward the National Socialist past, prisoners of war still in Allied camps, refugees, the status of German medicine, and the currency question. The chapter on the status of German prisoners of war, of whom there were still many in captivity as late as December 1947 (pages 144-152) [my elder brother, captured in April of 1945, was not released from a Soviet prisoner of war/slave camp until November 1949! —Editor], is of renewed interest in view of the revelations by the Canadian author James Bacque in his recent book, *Other Losses* [available from Liberty Bell Publications, \$30 postpaid], which has caused a sensation in Canada. Thus far we have encountered reviews of *Other Losses* in *Christian News* (4 December 1989), *GANPAC Brief* of November-December, *Instauration* of January 1990, *Liberty Bell* of November 1989, and *Unabhängige Nachrichten* of November 1989, where it is stated that a German edition has already appeared under the title, *Der geplante Tod*. □

Your support is needed — Your subscription, book orders and contributions are our life blood: subscribe, order and contribute today!

## MUST WE BE FOR EVER INFERIOR?

We will never recover from the British disease,  
says John Tyndall, until we learn  
to tell causes from symptoms

NEW YEAR'S EVE 37 years ago was a day that I shall always remember because it was my first day ever on foreign soil. An eighteen-year-old national serviceman, I had just finished basic training in the Royal Artillery and had been posted to my service regiment in Hohne, West Germany.

Wearing one's country's uniform abroad was an experience which, for me at any rate, served to concentrate the mind on the larger issues and priorities. Up till that time I had never had any doubt that Britain was a great nation, perhaps the greatest of nations. It was still then possible to talk of the British Empire in the present tense. Casting one's thoughts over the whole panorama of human endeavour back across the ages, it was difficult to think of any race whose achievements had excelled our own. Finally, had we not, just a short time ago, emerged victorious from a war, as we usually did? I was now in the land that had been defeated in that war, and the army to which I had belonged was one of its conquerors and occupiers.

Rather naive and over-simplistic thoughts, the reader will probably observe. Indeed they were, but they were the thoughts of a youngster still in his teens, not as yet very well informed as to the realities of the modern world, but of ordinary healthy patriotic instincts. Such thoughts, I hasten to add, did not seem at the time any reason to strut and swagger, least of all to act in an overbearing manner towards the locals. But they did, I believed, provide ground for a quiet pride and self-confidence, for an inner feeling that we were the inferior of no nation and needed to bow to none.

How spectacularly the world picture has changed since that time!

Germany, the vanquished and conquered nation of those days of my youth, has risen from the ashes and surpassed us in almost every field you care to name. Britain, one of the 'victorious' powers of World War II, has experienced 37 years of defeat and degeneracy on nearly every front. The verdict of the war has been entirely reversed. Germany and Japan are the victors in today's world. And their wartime adversaries and post-war overlords? Apart from our own sick-

ening decline, we have seen the steady erosion of American power, as that country has lapsed into economic insolvency, the total collapse of internal order and irreconcilable racial division. More recently we have seen the Soviet Union beginning to come apart in a wave of nationalist unrest coming in the wake of decades of economic incompetence and political corruption.

But it is the condition of Britain that should occupy our minds the most because we are British. Our record, beside that of the nation over whose defeat our leaders and opinion-moulders gloated in 1945, has been pathetic, and it was amply exposed by Graham Turner in the *Daily Mail* of the 8th January. In an article headed 'Why do the Germans live better than us?' the writer put the spotlight on the spectacular differences in economic performance between our two nations over the past 30-odd years, pointing to West Germany's £50 billion trade surplus last year by comparison with Britain's £20 billion trade deficit, with £8 billion of this with West Germany itself.

According to Turner, it is expected that this year the latter deficit will rise to £11 billion. What is more, he said:—

...it is in areas where the performance of our own manufacturing industry has sagged most alarmingly—engineering and motor vehicles—that the Germans are advancing. Last year, for example, the German motoring industry earned a surplus of £25 billion abroad, while our own made a trading loss of £6 billion.

A fact which, of course, is well demonstrated when we drive along our roads, littered as they are with Mercedes, Volkswagen and BMW cars and Mercedes and MAN lorries—with no corresponding presence of Austins, Rovers, Jaguars, Leylands or ERFs on the roads of Germany.

As to the causes of this superior German performance, Turner went on to list a number of factors. The first was hard work. "The devotion to work as the central cause of human fulfillment," he said, "is certainly still deep in the German psyche. He then quoted a production manager of a chainsaw factory as saying:—

"Our workers do have a very high commitment. If one of our machines breaks down, they will stay till eight or nine at night to mend it—and they do that without us even having to ask them."

"Doing a perfect job," said Turner, "requires intensive training, and:—

...the Germans have a passion for training unequaled in the western world. The latter stages of their educational system are a massive

machine expressly designed to churn out the skills which are essential for companies who want to sell highly-priced goods overseas.

And he continued:—

Seventy per-cent of all German youngsters spend three years [in on-the-job training in an office, bank, or trade shop of their choice, to acquire the *practical* knowledge and experience necessary for their chosen trade, which is supplemented by two days of *theoretical* training at vocational schools or Schools of Commerce —Editor, *Liberty Bell*] to learn a trade or skill. Nor are these schools the lowly-regarded institutions of last resort they so often are in Britain 'with teachers who feel themselves to be second-rate and students who regard themselves as inferior,' as Hartmut Mattees, a teacher in a Stuttgart school, found when he visited Britain.

In addition to having an education system miles ahead of our own when it comes to training young people for aptitude and success in the modern world, the Germans (like the Japanese) also channel far more investment into new technology and industrial modernisation than does Britain. These facts Mr. Turner amply demonstrated in his article, and then mentioned a further one, perhaps less widely known. The Germans, he said:—

...also have a secret weapon which we signally lack: an entire population which is fiercely critical of the goods and services it buys, will accept nothing less than the best and is vociferously angry when it does not get that perfection.

The article concluded with a quote from a Daimler [Daimler Benz—maker of the unsurpassed Mercedes Benz motor cars. —Editor, *Liberty Bell*] shop steward, who said:—

'We are now the best. That is in the workers' hearts here, and we are proud of it.'

To which the writer added his own postscript:—

Justly proud too, and until we are prepared to apply ourselves as the West Germans have we shall remain one of their industrial colonies.

## SO WHAT'S NEW?

All of the foregoing will, of course, be greeted by the nodding of many heads, but just where does that lead us? Thousands of articles along just the same lines as Mr. Turner's must have appeared in hundreds of newspapers, magazines and trade journals in Britain over the past 20 or 30 years in which Germany's superior economic performance has become increasingly evident. All the factors in this superior performance have been extensively discussed in our country, so that there really is no longer an excuse for any moderate-

ly well informed person here being ignorant of them. One or two additional factors are not so extensively discussed or known, and we highlighted one of these in December when we reprinted a chapter from the book *The Money Bomb*, by James Gibb Stuart, [see *Liberty Bell*, January 1990, page 15] in which the author pointed out that the German economy started in 1945 from a position of being debt-free by contrast with our own, which was in pawn to the international bankers. The importance of such a factor should not be underestimated, but it provides nowhere near a full explanation of German superiority, which is primarily due to the factors mentioned by Mr. Turner and listed in much the same way by countless other British writers and analysts over the years.

And the fact is that, notwithstanding all this evidence, nothing has changed. No British remedy has been adopted. We have not, in this country, applied our abundant knowledge of the reasons for the Germans' and Japs' success and our own failure to any effective scheme of action to put things right.

And this is the reality despite all the plentiful Thatcherite rhetoric on the subject. At the beginning of the Thatcher decade we were promised so much in the way of enterprise, energy and initiative to improve things in Britain. We were promised a veritable revolution that was going to rejuvenate our industry by getting rid of old habits of sloth, inefficiency and outdated practices. We were even told—and for several years many believed—that this was actually happening, that British industry was making a dramatic recovery in performance, that we were closing the gap between ourselves and our rivals.

Now, ten years later, all this can be seen as pure illusion. We are still stuck back at the starting blocks while our rivals remain miles ahead of us. The grand economic recovery was just a figment of Mrs. T's imagination—made plausible by the propaganda skills of Saatchi & Saatchi. It has been like the much-heralded campaign to clean up the country's filth and untidy town centres—always something that was **about** to happen but never actually did happen, the object of grandiose plans and projections but never a visible reality.

These things—along with immigration controls, a tightening up of law and order and the preservation of the British sovereignty in the face of the bureaucrats and regulators of the EEC—have been part of the Santa Claus world in which dwell the publicists of the Tory Government—hallucinatory drugs to keep the brute masses happy and prevent them asking too many awkward questions.

To summarise, despite plenty of knowledge as to what has to be

done to get Britain moving, there has been absolute paralysis when it comes actually to doing it. Seen against the background of this reality, what many have thought to be the **causes** of our decline may be recognised as nothing more than **symptoms**. To penetrate through to the underlying origins of the British disease, we must dig much deeper.

### MASTER RACE?

Hitler believed the Germans to be superior to other peoples and, not entirely surprisingly, such a belief was bitterly resented outside Germany. In the East, the Japanese, at the same time, developed their own theory of racial supremacy along similar lines. This, too, was understandably resented—and, of course, equally hotly repudiated.

But the snag of all this resentment and repudiation is that in the years subsequent to World War II the rest of the world has so far done nothing to prove such theories wrong. Quite the contrary, despite overwhelming military defeat and destruction (the result, it might be added, solely of greater weight of numbers and firepower and not of any superior fighting prowess), the Germans and Japanese have turned the tables on their conquerors and succeeded in the post-war years while the latter have failed. And the more dogmatically asserted the post-war 'democratic' doctrine of universal race-equality the more thoroughly that doctrine has been contradicted by the peerless achievements of the Germans and Japanese in rebuilding their countries and attaining world economic and technological hegemony, while their wartime adversaries have become steadily weaker and less competent.

The big question arising out of all this is: is such obvious superiority a genetic one, or does it have other causes?

These days, to venture into discussion on the question of whether one race is genetically superior to another is to tread, in Britain at least, on dangerous ground—something I myself know a little about as I have served a term in jail for just such a crime. I can, however, at least say this much without fear of further imprisonment: I know Germany well and am convinced that such genetic differences as exist between its people and ours are very minor ones. Both Germans and Anglo-Saxons are sub-divisions of the same basic Northern European racial family. Both contain Nordic majorities and both harbour a substantial Celtic element—though in the case of the Germans this is less generally known than in ours. The majority of Germans, if they were to walk down a street in this country,

would not be identifiable as foreigners, and the same would be true of Britons in Germany. I was struck by the physical similarity of Britons and Germans when a young soldier in Germany at the time earlier mentioned, and if physical similarity does not automatically indicate mental similarity it does at least indicate the strong possibility of a similar genetic mental make-up, particularly when it is known that the parties concerned have similar ethnic origins. This is not to say that a different environment and upbringing may not result in a differing form of mental development.

When the environment and upbringing have been the same, Anglo-Saxons and Germans have not shown any marked variations in aptitude or performance. This can be seen by the comparisons between people of British and German stock mainly born and brought up in the United States. In intelligence tests conducted among American servicemen in World War I those of British descent did not score less than those of German descent. Among the ranks of great American achievers, Anglo-Americans and German-Americans are represented about equally in proportion to their total numbers. Interestingly enough, although the United States has over 50 million people of German descent, this section of the population has not produced one single great composer—although Germany, together with Austria, has produced at least fifteen.

Donald Day, North European correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune* before and during World War II, said in his fascinating book *Onward Christian Soldiers*:—

Many Germans cannot understand how it was possible for the extremely large German element among our (America's) immigrants to become assimilated into American life so thoroughly and so quickly. As a boy I recall how in Chicago the city was proud it had almost half a million Germans among its inhabitants. They were certainly by far the most cultured element among our foreign-born population... They had pleasant homes and lived in clean surroundings... But this German element, like the Scandinavian element, did not organise its own schools. As in other American cities with similar settlements such as Milwaukee, St. Louis and Indianapolis, the Germans and Scandinavians sent their children to American schools. And within two generations the German newspapers, *turnvereins* and other social organisations disappeared completely.

### THE IMPRINT OF HISTORY

Here what Day seems to be hinting at is the fact that the Germans, while genetically similar to Anglo-Saxons, have developed a culture and way of life that are profoundly different in many

respects, the difference stemming from diverse intellectual and political development which, in their turn, are perhaps the consequences of very dissimilar geography and history. The Germans, a land people of continental Europe, have always lived close to external danger and been subjected frequently to external conquest. In the Thirty Years War, in the Napoleonic Wars and in the two World Wars of the present century, they have known catastrophe, death and suffering on a scale that is quite outside the British experience and comprehension, and such adversity, as Nietzsche said, when it does not destroy, makes one stronger. The British, by contrast, a maritime people on the European periphery, have obtained relative protection from the same upheavals, largely by reason of their peripheral position but also by reason of the Channel—a much more formidable strategic obstacle in past times than it is now. Also, during the past three centuries, we British have had access to a whole vast new world across the oceans in which our racial energies could be absorbed and in which, for most of the time, such conflict as we experienced has been with primitive peoples with whom we could easily deal.

Not for many centuries has Britain had disputed borders with any continental European power, whereas over the same centuries Germany, and her constituent states, have had them constantly.

Graham Turner, in his *Daily Mail* article, gave an example of the stimulus given by suffering in German history when he said:—

The reasons for Germany's staggering industrial success are clear enough. The first, quite simply, is terror: the terror of millions of men and women who lost everything in 1945, who had neither beds to sleep in nor food to eat and who yearned to regain their former status. Eleven million came from the East in two years, and the trickle in the decades which followed has become a flood again.

He went on to quote a German sociologist, who said:—

'Every one of these refugees has given a very dynamic impulse to our economy, and all of them have passed on to their children the importance of being diligent because of a fear that they might lose everything again.'

But, of course, all this only amounts to an affirmation of what has become a constant throughout so much of German history: familiarity with hardship, with life in the raw. By such experience people 'grow' mentally and spiritually. Mr. Turner might have expanded his theme a good deal further: rather than dwell merely upon the impetus this experience gives to individual drive and ambition, he could also have stressed its effect on the collective consciousness, giving rise to institutions and social convention much

more urgently geared to the needs of group survival. Here we can see a marked difference between the German and Anglo-Saxon concept of individualism. To the German mind, individual qualities are resources to be used in the service of the community, while individual is seen to be valuable just to the extent that it provides the individual with time, opportunity and latitude to give full flower to his talents in pursuit of communal objectives and interests. In the Anglo-Saxon concept, on the other hand, individual freedom is seen as a self-justifying end, while society, state, law and government are visualised merely as necessary evils, accepted to the extent that they are required to serve the individual, and no more.

Likewise, with the German and Anglo-Saxon concepts of nationhood. In the first, the nation is seen as a community linked by blood and by a mystical force of common destiny. In the second, it is an institution of convenience, established for the mutual self-interest of so many millions of individuals who happen at any time to inhabit a geographically defined area. This Anglo-Saxon concept of nationhood, derived as it is largely from the now discredited 18th Century 'Enlightenment', has been taken to the four ends of the earth by British migrants who have opened up new continents, and is today the bedrock on which such states as the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are founded. In South Africa it governs the thinking of the English-speaking population—which provides one of the reasons for the vast psychological divide between this people and the genetically similar Afrikaners, whose history is founded on struggle and whose concept of nationhood owes much more to German than to British sources of inspiration.

This very basic cultural and intellectual divide accounts in no small part for the different responses of our two peoples, British and German, to the seductions of 'democracy'. While Anglo-Saxons have fallen for this swindle with the infatuation and wonderment of children grabbing at presents from the Christmas tree, to Germans the democratic form of government and society constitutes just one among numerous theories of politics, to be evaluated, along with each other, on grounds of utility. For a large part of their history, Germans have not embraced democratic institutions—for the practical reason that they did not see them as providing the kind of leadership and organisation required for survival. And at those times when they have embraced them, as today, they have done so against the background of a cultural tradition very different to that of the Anglo-Saxon. Generally speaking, this culture has been a strong and

disciplined one, shaped by adult perspectives gained from experience of the storms and stresses of history—by contrast with the Anglo-Saxon culture, which, with all its virtues and attractions, is a relatively 'laid-back' one, and possessed of considerably less maturity.

Thus does the person of German stock born and raised in an Anglo-Saxon cultural environment become an Anglo-Saxon in almost all but name. By contrast, such people as Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Winifred Wagner (*nee* Williams), transplanting themselves into a German cultural environment, become almost "more German than the Germans."

### SUBSTANCE AND FORM

The racket which operates under the name of 'democracy' has in the case of modern West Germany been imposed by the Allied occupation forces as a consequence of the German defeat in World War II, just as its predecessor of Weimar was imposed through defeat in World War I. Anglo-Saxon 'democracy', on the other hand, is the product of much deeper cultural forces stemming from national history and development. In the second instance, democratic institutions represent something of **substance**, no matter how shallow and flimsy the substance may be. In the first, they represent merely **form**. An infantile 'democracy' functioning against the background of an adult culture will be largely a procedure of 'going through the motions', whereas the thinking applied to vital public questions will still bear the marks of the adult culture underlying the process. It is for this reason that contemporary German 'democracy', with all its undoubted faults and abuses, never descends to quite the same silliness as British or American 'democracy', under which debate is at the level of the kindergarten and political behaviour assumes the quality of vaudeville.

Though the **forms** of 'democracy' and 'liberalism' are currently prevalent in West Germany, the underlying culture of the older Germany still survives strongly, with its impassioned will to excellence and its intolerance of the sloppy, the lazy and the second-rate. Not only is this seen in the German attitude to economic activity, to care of public and private places and to education of the young, it is even seen in the field of sport, where today the combined achievements of East (Central) and West German athletes and gameplayers put the rest of the world in the shade. Why does this happen? Even if there is some genetic cause, this would not account for the wide gulf in standards between German sportsmen and others of Northern European

type. The difference is, of course, that the Germans simply try **harder** and have a stronger desire to win!

We see a particularly stark example of the immense divide between the British and the German mind when we look at the question of **organisation**. We are accustomed to looking on the Germans as very able organisers, but is it not really a case of different attitudes towards the whole principle of organisation as such? A mature and disciplined culture is going to be one that recognises the necessity for organisation and planning as essential factors in getting things done properly, and this, *ipso facto*, is going to produce plenty of people who are capable organisers. Before aptitude in the arts and skills of organisation must come acceptance of the **organisational ethos**. Some strange inhibition in the Anglo-Saxon psyche (no doubt conditioned by the drivel we read which passes for political philosophy) seems to recoil from the idea of organisation except for the most trivial of purposes—or the idea of intensity of effort except in pursuits of the same kind. Is this difference genetic? I think I have already given evidence that it is not. It can only, therefore, be seen as a difference of response to differing national circumstances. If we accept the dictum that necessity is the mother of invention, we may conclude that the necessities of Germany's history have given birth to the ethos of national organisation for national survival—together with that of effort and struggle towards excellence. By contrast, we in Britain, and today in other Anglo-Saxon countries as well, seem to be governed by the view that "few things matter and nothing matters very much."

Returning to the question of the work-ethic, it could be that Graham Turner has got this matter a little out of focus as a factor determining differences in German and British economic performance—at least in recent times. Certainly the Germans worked much harder than we did in the couple of decades following World War II. It is doubtful that they do today, at least in their places of employment. They most assuredly are worked harder at school and at university, and for better purpose, with the result that they join the nation's workforce much better qualified in economic skills. That, rather than hours registered on factory clocks, is the probable reason for the far superior German record. On the other hand, German managers most certainly do work harder—but could that not be because German managers in industry are of a generally superior type? In Britain we have a habit of sending our brightest and most ambitious young people into the occupations that are of the least impor-

tance in making for national prosperity and success. We probably have the best lawyers, the best stockbrokers, bankers and financial consultants, the best classical students and the best actors and actresses in the world today. But that does not get us very far in making the products that give a country strength and power!

## THE CULTURAL CLASH

But it is not only in the fields mentioned that the vast differences in German and British standards manifest themselves to the discredit and shame of our own country. I have touched on cultural factors in as much as they determine attitudes to work and to organisation for work. But when we are speaking of culture we are speaking, of course, of a sphere which includes the arts—indeed in which the arts are central. The Germans have long been acknowledged as the most highly cultured people in the world, even by those who dislike them, but is there any special reason why they should enjoy a culture so much superior to our own?

And superior it most certainly is! This was highlighted in an article by Denis Vaughan titled 'Music to make us all lager louts', which appeared in the *Daily Mail* on January 9th. The writer compared Germany's 102 opera houses with Britain's six, and referred also to the ten opera houses and 21 symphony orchestras in Munich alone, a city barely a sixth the size of London.

The chief theme of Mr. Vaughan's article was the effect of music on a nation's social and moral behaviour, and his lament—which I thoroughly share—was that our country was almost totally under the spell of the most barbaric and moronic forms of 'pop' music, a fact which he thought was not unconnected with our being at the top of the European league for the portion of the population in jail. He said:—

The power of musical therapy has long been known. In ancient Greece it was used to still belligerent people in their tracks; today it is in constant supply, but its effect on general behaviour is rarely considered.

And he went on to say:—

At a recent run-of-the-mill concert in London, a friend was making his vocal debut at the Marquee. It was impossible not to be struck by the behaviour of the listeners. The huge volume of the music, the mechanical hammering of its rhythm, its sheer physical impact and total lack of nuance left an audience to trail out at the end in a state of complete mental stupor—drugged, numbed and impervious to feeling.

And later on, in contrast:—

Germanic appreciation of the arts is not just a popular pastime but a national habit and tradition. And German society suffers much less from the hooliganism and 'lager-loutism' it sensitively refers to as the 'British disease.'

The use of the term 'British disease' here is interesting, for have we not for twenty years or more heard the same words employed to describe our poor performance at the workplace? But the common phraseology linking social behaviour with attitudes to work should not be regarded as coincidental, for here are just two manifestations of a national sickness that are closely interwoven, as they are interwoven with others. Putting it in the most basic of terms, we have been allowed to become a nation of slobs, a rabble whose tastes in music reflect its general standards in nearly everything. We have suffered a decline in international strength and power and we have lost an empire, not through some natural stroke of misfortune decreed by the gods, nor because of any inexorable law which must then wane, but because we have become no longer fit to be a great people. And this is not—at least up till the present—the result of any significant genetic decline in the race; it is because we have no leadership, and no institutions able to produce leadership.

Mr. Vaughan has drawn attention to the high status of the arts in Germany, and by this he means contemporary 'democratic' Germany and not just the former 'autocratic' Germany. Here is a classic example of what I have said earlier about the imposition of a traditional culture upon modern political norms. For centuries, German and British governmental attitudes to cultural questions have been fundamentally different. The German approach, rooted in the authoritarian societies of the older Germany, has always been that it is the duty of the state to promote high cultural standards and to act as the guardian of cultural values, with the aim of raising the cultural level of the population by its leadership and example. The British approach, rooted in much longer-standing 'democratic' and 'liberal' institutions, has been essentially a *laissez-faire* one: culture and the arts, like everything else, should be left to 'market forces'. If there is a demand for high culture, commerce will respond to it and undertake supply. If there is a demand for drivel, commerce will respond to that too, and supply accordingly. And the supply will be in exact proportion to the demand. The latter, of course, according to British thinking, is something that government should not dare to do anything to influence—for that would be a violation of the individual 'freedom of choice' which is part of the national religion, even in the event of such

freedom of choice amounting to choice of banality, trash and dirt.

As a result, while being the racial cousins of the Germans, and therefore probably with similar genetic cultural potential, we are a nation with an infant culture whereas they are a nation with an adult culture. This, much more than contemporary forms of government, shapes the enormous divide between the quality of their life and the quality of ours. And it is generally true that the same infant culture prevails in other predominantly Anglo-Saxon countries to which we have exported our way of life, norms and values. Finally, it must be reiterated, people living in those countries who are of German descent are no less vulnerable to the effects of this infant culture than others.

One could almost say that this was what World War II was all about. It was Beethoven versus Boogie Woogie. And Boogie Woogie won, as every such culture will when the contest depends on who can mobilise the larger mobs and tell the bigger lies.

#### NEMESIS AND HOPE

But that *status-quo* brought about by the temporary triumph of mob force and mob values could not endure. That which was rotten at first base was bound to crumble. Now, as the Berlin Wall comes symbolically down, we see the falling apart of that whole world which mobsters set up in 1945 and the years following. And in the meantime, those cultures founded on adult perceptions and aristocratic ideals are having the last laugh over their former conquerors, as they rise resurgent, in the West as in the East, to nullify the result of the war fought "to make the world safe for democracy."

It is perhaps appropriate to end this article by returning to the point at which it began: my thoughts as a young British soldier posted abroad for the first time and wanting to believe I belonged to a country of which one could be proud. In middle life I still harbour the same sentiments, hopes and dreams. But the experiences of the intervening years have convinced me that this can only become possible by means of revolutionary upheaval, a revolutionary upheaval that makes Mrs. Thatcher's 'revolution' seem like the bourgeois garden party it has always been. The real revolution that we need must come from the Right—let there be no mistake about that. But it must be the authoritarian Right and not the 'free market' Right of current prevalence. It must not be a revolution that, in Mrs. Thatcher's words, will "roll back the frontiers of the state," it must be a revolution which, for the first time within long memory, establishes a state that will really govern. It must be a revolution which, instead of chanting asinine

slogans about 'people's power', gives power to an *elite* with the courage and the wisdom to lead the people towards higher ideals and better standards, to transform the British race from a rabble into a nation, animated by **discipline, duty and patriotism**, dedicated to hard work and high culture, and characterised by **energy** instead of sloth. It must be a revolution of the mind as much as of the political system, for it must be one whereby the British learn to be serious. To use terminology that has been used before, what we need is a nation with an adult perspective towards the world in which it lives—a nation that rejects, in absolute totality, everything that is meant by liberalism.

To this there will be those who will reply: "What about freedom?" To them I would say that at times when a nation is heading for ruin and collapse and is being beaten by its rivals at every turn it is not the appropriate moment to be yapping about 'freedom'; what has to be done must be done to turn that nation around and point it in the direction of recovery and resurgence, so that it has the chance to survive and prosper again and to walk the world in honour. Then, and only then, when the Augean stables have been swept clean and a climate has been established in which people, by natural self-discipline and self-restraint, conduct their lives in accordance with a code conducive to national strength and advancement, can we talk about 'freedom'. Ultimately, there is only one freedom worth having, and that is the freedom to do what is right for one's people.

Of course, there will be many who will reject such radical proposals, being as they are so enamoured of the slack old ways, the muddle, the disorganisation, the paralysis, the second-rateness, the undemanding ideals—in a word, everything they have been taught to identify as 'England'—that they will refuse to travel with us along the road that we have signposted. It is all too, too extreme!

Well, if that be their wish one can only say that they must be prepared, in consequence, to be citizens of a nation well along the way to joining the despised serfs of this world, fit only to be kicked and insulted, possessing nothing of their own, the inhabitants of a social jungle and an economic museum, given up to the morality of the curs and the culture of the ape.

I think those many who died on foreign fields wanted something better. □

From *Spearhead*, No. 252, February 1990  
P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW, England

Our educational work deserves your support! — Do your part!  
Subscribe, order books and send your contribution today!

**FOR MY LEGIONARIES.** The Legionary Movement in Romania, commonly known as the Iron Guard, —perhaps the oldest anti-Communist movement in the world, still alive—was founded by Corneliu Z. Codreanu in 1927. *For My Legionaries* (353 pp., pb, \$8.00 + \$1.50 for postage & handling), Codreanu's stirring work, is a complete and authoritative account of the ideals and principles of the Legionary Movement which shaped the character of young Romanians before WWII. Control over the communications media and the normal channels of book distribution by our international enemies makes it impossible to reach the broad market this unique book deserves. We are certain that *For My Legionaries* will soon become a collector's item. This book also provides the 'missing pieces' of the drastically censored *The Suicide of Europe* by Prince D. Sturdza; the identity of those who masterminded Romania's takeover and who are now engaged in carrying out the same program in the U.S. will no longer be unknown to you. ("Solzhenitsyn would appear to have not the slightest inkling of who conquered HIS country!"—B.C.) **FOR MY LEGIONARIES**, Order #06003, single copy \$8.00, 3 copies \$21.00, 5 copies \$35.00

**THE ANTI-HUMANS**, by D. Bacu (307 pp., hb. \$7.00 + \$1.50 for postage & handling) describes what was done to the young men whom Corneliu Z. Codreanu, the founder of the Legionary Movement in Romania, inspired, when seven years after his brutal murder, Romania was delivered to the Bolsheviks. They were subjected to what is the most fully documented 'Pavlovian experiment' on a large number of human beings. It is likely that the same techniques were used on many American prisoners in Korea and Vietnam. *The Anti-Humans* is a well-written document of great historical and psychological importance. Reading it will be an emotional experience you will not forget. "A sequel to Orwell's 1984" —R.S.H. "A searing exposé of Red bestiality!" —Dr. A.J. App) **THE ANTI-HUMANS**, Order #01013. Single copy \$7.00, 3 for \$15.00, 5 for \$20.00.

**For postage and handling add:** On domestic orders, \$1.50 for orders under \$10.00, 15% of order total for orders over \$10.00. On orders from abroad, \$2.00 or 20% respectively. Sample copy of our monthly magazine *Liberty Bell* and copy of our huge book list containing hundreds of "Eye-Openers," \$4.00. Subscription for 12 hard-hitting, fact-packed issues \$35.00 (U.S. only). Order from:

**LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS**  
Postoffice Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA



## HITLER WAS RIGHT!

by  
Colin Jordan

[Editor's note: The following essay was written by Colin Jordan in 1989 in connection with Adolf Hitler's 100th birthday. Unfortunately, we were unable to accommodate it in our special 20 April 1989 issue of *Liberty Bell*.]

Never in all history has a man been so vilified as he whose centenary of birth occurred on the 20th of April 1989. According to the mass media of today's democracy, he was an absolute monster, an insane incarnation of evil. However, the very fact that he is presented as so totally black, with nothing at all to his credit, should excite suspicion in anyone other than an utter idiot or some partisan blinded by prejudice.

The vilification was not always total as now. Lloyd George, British premier during World War I, after a visit to Germany in 1936, was quoted in the *Daily Telegraph* of 22nd September of that year as stating: "I have never seen a happier people than the Germans. Hitler is one of the greatest men I have ever met." In a letter to a friend in December of that year he said: "I only wish we had a man of his supreme quality at the head of affairs in our country today."

Viscount Rothermere, in his pre-war book, *Warnings and Predictions*, said of Hitler: "He has a supreme intellect.....He has thoroughly cleansed the moral, ethical life of Germany.....No words can describe his politeness.....He is a man of rare culture. His knowledge of music, the arts and architecture is profound." The iron curtain of lies completely descended when the elements intent on destroying Hitler became virtually omnipotent, knowing that they had to do this or they would be shown to be wrong and Hitler to be right: for he stood for Aryan renaissance, and they for an old order spelling decline and death.

The real Hitler, contrary to the mad monster of the media, was a most talented and very widely read man with a phenomenal memory, an exceedingly quick grasp of essentials, a colossal will-power, along with, of course, being the most effective orator the world has ever known: all this in the service of a cause to which he gave himself completely. He was also a charming host, a considerate

and loyal friend and colleague, kind to animals, highly appreciative of the beauties of Nature, simple in his style of personal life.

Becoming imbued in his teens with a consuming sense of mission as the liberating leader of his people in the future, he knew poverty as a young man amid the unemployed of Vienna, and danger and hardship in the frontline trenches as a soldier before joining the tiny political body which under his direction was to become the power-winning NSDAP. Night after night his captivating words brought applauding audiences from a defeated and demoralized nation to their feet in new-born hope and determination. His vocal and visual inspiration, plus the plentiful perspiration of his ardent and industrious followers, constituted the means of National Socialist success, not the mythical money-bags of big business as opponents try to make out to explain away their own inferiority in charisma, ardour and effort. As the saying had it in those days, respecting the last of these three factors, the lights always burned later in the night in the offices of Hitler's party than in those of any other.

Exhibiting the burning enthusiasm and sheer hard work: "During one month prior to national elections in 1930, for example, the Nazi Party sponsored 34,000 meetings in Germany, which averaged out to be three meetings in every village, town and urban neighbourhood." (*Mothers in the Fatherland*, Claudia Koonz, p. 69) Typical of the receptive spirit of the people during the 1932 elections, NSDAP Press Chief Otto Dietrich described a meeting at Stralsund, scheduled for 8 p.m. but for which Hitler was long delayed, finally reaching the place at 2:30 a.m.: "In the open air, and in the pouring rain, we met the crowd drenched to the skin, weary and hungry, just as they had gathered over the night and patiently waited.... Hitler spoke to the audience as day slowly dawned...." There they were, 40,000 people eagerly listening at 4 o'clock in the morning—after all that time and all that discomfort—to the man they rightly regarded as their political saviour! Can you imagine such a turnout for such a trumpery figure of the twilight as our present premier, Margaret Thatcher?

Just try to picture the tremendous scene of rejoicing when the long hard years of struggle were rewarded, and at the end of January 1933 Hitler became Chancellor! For hours that night a river of fire flowed past his window as thousands upon thousands of his torchbearing party comrades paraded through the streets of a reborn Berlin. The above mentioned Claudia Koonz quotes a longstanding NSDAP member regarding that occasion: "We wept with happiness and joy and could scarcely believe that our beloved Führer stood at

the helm of the Reich.... A magnetic power radiated everywhere and eliminated the last traces of internal resistance.... We were gripped by an inexpressible joy when we saw our banners, once scorned and belittled, flying high on all public buildings." (p. 132)

Our thesis is not and does not have to be that Adolf Hitler was absolutely perfect and never made a single mistake, for perfection, absolute perfection, is an irrelevant abstraction which belongs not to this world, and accordingly never has and never will be seen here. What precisely we do say here is that, taking everything into account, the man and his movement in championship of our race, was the closest to perfection that this world has ever seen so far, and that is enough for us. We proclaim him right because where he is said to have gone wrong is, in our estimation, so massively dwarfed by where the opposite is true. Given but six short years of peace, he, his party and his people in unison wrought a virtual miracle in that brief span. Never elsewhere in history has so much been done for Aryan survival and revival so quickly!

*Hitler was right* in the supreme importance he attached to the factor of race, and, consequently, his basic conception of the nation as a racial community to be protected in its ownership of its homeland, and from interbreeding with alien stock; and, furthermore, to be improved by eugenical measures. Beyond any other statesmen in any land at any time, he gave practical recognition to the superior qualities of the Aryan peoples and the need to maximize the higher holders of those superior qualities as the golden means for human upliftment. In this unique dedication, and, consequently in the bitter opposition of all those with a vested interest against the elevation of the Aryans lies the greatest single explanation of the drive to destroy and defame him.

*Hitler was right* in his opposition to the disruptive party game of democracy which exists to delude and to exploit the people it pretends to represent, and in his belief instead in personality and leadership and unity. In such a fusion of the folk as he achieved, where stood the need for parties other than his? Only a minute minority remained against him after 1933, although the hostile foreign media concentrated on this fragment of discontent, and not on the almost total support he received.

*Hitler was right* in holding and ensuring that every man in the folk community should have productive employment for the benefit both of himself and that community. When he came to power, no less than 6,014,000 were unemployed, yet by 1938 only 338,000

remained out of work; the vast bulk of this reduction being achieved before any significant rearmament, contrary to hostile propaganda.

*Hitler was right* in believing in extensive social welfare for all members of the folk community. The NSDAP's "Strength through Joy" organisation had by 1938 enabled over 22 million to visit theatres, over 18 million to attend film performances, over 5 million to attend concerts, over 3 million to attend factory exhibitions, and no less than 50 million to take part in cultural events. The organisation had 230 establishments for popular education, and through it 62,000 educational events were arranged, being attended by 10 million people. By 1938 490,000 had been given sea cruises, and 19 million had been given land excursions. 21 million had taken part in sporting events. All this at a time when the democracies left millions of unemployed to rot, and those who were employed received nothing remotely comparable to such welfare. The best-selling car in history—more than 15 million of the Volkswagen "Beetle" in over 30 countries—resulted from Hitler's project of a people's car, a small inexpensive car for the ordinary man. Connected with this, his Autobahn construction-programme preceded Britain's by decades. (This and other detailed information on the stupendous achievements of Hitler's Germany is contained in the book *Hitler Germany* by Cesare Santoro (Berlin, 1938).

*Hitler was right* in the importance he attached to the protection of the peasantry as vital to a thriving folk community, his measures to this end including the legislation for hereditary holdings. Indeed, *Hitler was right* in so many major ways we would need far more than the whole of this Hitler centenary double issue of *Gothic Rip-ples* to catalogue them.

Hitler's revolution accomplishing all this radical reform was a bloodless one compared with either the French Revolution (whose 200th anniversary occurs this year) or the Russian Revolution of 1917. Camps for the concentration of detainees—including women and children—were introduced by the British during the Boer War, and conditions in them were so bad that a great number died. Britain's wartime ally, Russia, still has concentration camps galore in which, according to even Soviet statistics, a million people are currently held. Yet it is only the German ones we endlessly hear about with every conceivable invention and exaggeration. Colin Cross in *Adolf Hitler* (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1973) puts the peacetime peak at 26,789 in July 1933, many being held for only a matter of weeks, and most being subsequently released, and says:

*26 Liberty Bell | April 1990*

"Conditions in the camps were spartan but, by prison standards, there was an adequate diet and reasonable accommodation in dormitories." Inmates were not, as so often insinuated, all poor persecuted Jews or other heroes of democracy, but included the very dregs of society: habitual criminals, pimps, perverts, despicable drunkards, perpetual beggars and work-shy parasites.

Jewish leaders in the outside world proclaimed economic and political warfare against Hitler as soon as he came to power, and set themselves to bring about a war to destroy him. Not unnaturally, therefore, when that war came about, Hitler considered Jews in general in his territories to be enemies and a threat to security, and so he had them rounded up and placed in ghettos or camps. During the final stages of the war—when Germans were enduring the most terrible conditions themselves, including hundreds of thousand of civilian men, women and children slaughtered in air raids such as that on defenceless Dresden—adequate supplies were either unavailable or failed to get through to camps overcrowded by evacuation from the east, and typhus raged, this accounting for the undeniably terrible conditions found in some of them at the end of hostilities, which were, however, certainly not the result of any deliberate policy of extermination, which allegation is an atrocity of falsehood.

After the war the campaign to denigrate Hitler focused on the allegation that 6 million Jews were deliberately exterminated at some of the camps during the war, mostly by gassing with the standard delousing fumigator, Zyklon B, which was certainly in general use in the camps and other places as well for its proper purpose of preventing death (by disease), not causing it. The super-sob-story of mass extermination of Jews in gas chambers has been decisively shown to be a colossal lie by the *Leuchter Report*, a report by America's leading consultant on the gas chambers in American prisons who, at the arrangement of Ernst Zündel, for the purpose of his recent retrial in Canada, visited Auschwitz and took samples from the structure of the buildings alleged to have been gas chambers which, after submission to independent analysis in the U.S.A., showed conclusively that they were not so used. Incidentally, the recent admission by the Russians themselves that over 30 million were exterminated by Stalin, Britain's and Jewry's ally against Hitler, makes the Jewish allegation against Hitler small in comparison to this very real Red Holocaust.

Returning to the Germany of the 1930s, we can estimate Hitler's greatest conquest as that of the hearts of his people, for his

*Liberty Bell | April 1990 27*

was the most popular regime the world has ever known. His Germany was a land electrified and transmuted. Never, anywhere at any time has a whole nation been so radiant, so disposed to service as was his under his leadership. In their millions the German people daily acclaimed *Hitler as right*.

*Hitler was right* in seeking to rectify the iniquities of the Treaty of Versailles, and to unite German territories. His actions received the overwhelming support of the populations concerned. When he entered Vienna 200,000 Viennese packed the city's Heroes' Square in an ecstasy of rejoicing at what the anti-Hitler propaganda machine in Britain called an "aggression." He was similarly welcomed in the stolen territory of the Sudetenland in the synthetic state of Czechoslovakia. Hitler tried hard and long right up to and including the very last days of peace to reach a thoroughly fair settlement with Poland regarding the latter's German areas and inhabitants, the port of Danzig (90% German), and the detached territory of East Prussia; but this has been deliberately obscured by the deceitful Western warmongers, Britain giving a thoroughly reprehensible general guarantee to the backward state of Poland to make its reactionary regime unreasonable and bellicose, and so to bring about the desired war.

*Hitler was right* in the importance he set on an Anglo-German alliance which he long strove for. With it, the combination of the British Navy and the German Army could have kept the peace of the world, preserved the British Empire which Hitler greatly valued, and served as the core for a world order of the white man safeguarding that white man by world supremacy. The British Ambassador in Berlin recorded on the 26th July 1939: "From the very beginning Hitler has always sought above all an understanding with Britain." (*Vansittart in Office*, I. Colvin, P. 346) Indeed, a point where Hitler went wrong was when, in persistent pursuit of an Anglo-German agreement even then, he waited after the defeat of France and the debacle of Dunkirk for Britain to come to her senses, whereas, if he had invaded in July 1940, he would almost certainly have succeeded.

*Hitler was right* in his conception of a New Order for Europe, conforming to ethnic realities in preference to geographical and other demarcations conflicting with those realities, and his encouragement of co-operation to common benefit, and of unity corresponding to common aims.

*Hitler was right* in forestalling the intended Russian attack, planned to take advantage of the European war, by launching his

own attack first in June 1941, accompanied by the European crusade against communism which he sponsored; and, had it not been for the immense material aid given to Stalin by Britain and the U.S.A., he would have undoubtedly crushed Stalin and eliminated the Soviet menace which today is only masked by the sly tactics of Gorbachev, designed to soften up the West. As it was, we today owe it to the gigantic effort made by Germany and her allies (including all the foreign volunteers of the wonderful Waffen-SS), and encompassing the desperate defensive fighting right up to May 1945, that the Red Army did not break through to Calais, and today with the KGB stationed at Dover, Durham and Dundee.

Let it be remembered with high pride that never has a cause been fought more valiantly to the utmost than the National Socialist cause of Adolf Hitler. In the battle for Nuremberg, scene of the greatest rallies the world has ever seen: "German civilians, men, women and youths, armed themselves to stand alongside the SS in bitter street fighting in which the veteran American 45th 'Thunderbird' Division suffered heavy casualties. The fanatical SS detachments defending the infamous Nazi Congress Hall, which Adolf Hitler called the heart of Nazism, flung back nine bloody US assaults before dying to a man." (*The Spear of Destiny*, Trevor Ravenscroft, P. 335; Neville Spearman, 1972.) These were *our* people! In *Destination Berchtesgaden* (Ian Allan Ltd, London, 1975), J.f. Turner & R. Jackson describe the rigours of the advance thusly:- Aschaffenburg: German reinforcements arrived, "many of them fanatical youths of 16 and 17 who refused to surrender and had to be annihilated." Schweinfurt: "Every small town and village on the road to Schweinfurt was fortified, every hill and wood occupied by the enemy for as long as possible, often by fanatical Nazi youths." Würzburg: "Once again, civilians joined German troops in defending their home town, retreating into the sewers and often appearing in the Americans' rear."

In flaming Berlin heroic remnants of the foreign volunteers of the Waffen-SS, Europe's elite, fought to the last and died defending the neighbourhood of the Reich Chancellery and the bunker where Adolf Hitler gave up his life; and while other heroes of the Hitler Youth, some only 14, succeeded in holding the bridges over the River Spree till the very last. With blood sacrifices like this as the nutrient, National Socialism's potency to survive and revive was assured.

If there is any certainty at all in this world, it is that, if ever a real champion of our folk emerges, he will be denigrated to the ut-

most by the forces of ruin. So it is that it is precisely those in Britain today who are most responsible for her present ghastly condition who are most responsible for the denigration of Hitler. Those who are damaging us the most are precisely those who denigrate him the most: that is the great equation.

*Hitler was right* in his denunciation of democracy; this we indeed ought to know now by our own experience in Britain today. Bruce Anderson in the *Sunday Telegraph* (29th March 1987) said of Britain's Afro-Asian invasion: "The voters were never consulted: if they had been we would have had no large-scale coloured immigration." So whereas Hitler's dictatorship gave the people what they wanted, and preserved Germany for the German people, Britain's democracy gives the British people what they do not want and calls it "freedom".

*Hitler was right* in his prophecy of the darkness which would follow his defeat. As we take stock of the whole range of evils from which we currently suffer, from recurrent strikes to the mugging of elderly ladies, from drug peddling to the promotion of perversion, from subsidies to the coloured world to the degeneracy known as "rock", we take note of the fact that Hitler would not have allowed us these blessed refinements of democracy. We also take note of the fact that projections of the present coloured birthrate in Britain show that within a hundred years we will be a minority in our own country. Not even the most maniacal opponent of Hitler has ever accused him of wanting to make Britain black. It has been left to those opponents to bring about just that.

National Socialist resistance did not cease in 1945. One epic figure from the war who refused to renounce his belief in National Socialism, and maintained close contact with National Socialists world wide until his death in 1982, was Hans-Ulrich Rudel. This German flying ace held a world record for 2,530 combat flights, and another for 519 enemy tanks destroyed. Single-handedly he sank the Soviet battleship *Marat* and 2 cruisers, as well as 70 supply boats. His motto was "Verloren ist nur wer sich selbst aufgibt" (Only he who gives up loses").

Another stalwart from the old days was Winifred Wagner, English-born daughter-in-law of the great composer, Richard Wagner. After the war a de-Nazification court convicted her of the crime of actively supporting Hitler's regime by having been his personal friend. For this terrible offence she was sentenced to 450 days special labour service, her personal wealth was confiscated, she was for-

bidden to hold any public office or become a member of any political party for five years, and she was even banned from owning a motor car. Nevertheless, when interviewed in a film in 1975 by those who tried in vain to get her to express some rejection of Hitler, this magnificent lady rounded on them with the consummate remark: "If Hitler walked through the door today, I would be just as glad and happy to see him and have him here as ever."

And so the fight has gone on, as exhibited in such recent news items regarding Germany as the gaoling of Peter Naumann for 4 1/2 years for master-minding the bombing in 1979 of a television mast near Koblenz which interrupted the transmission of the programme "Holocaust", and for plotting to storm Spandau Prison when Hess was still alive and imprisoned there. Likewise the banning of the organisation Nationale Sammlung to prevent it taking part in local elections: thus demonstrating the utter falsity of democracy in that country, where National Socialism, the wish of a German majority, has been banned since 1945. Likewise the headline in the *Daily Telegraph* recently: "Neo-Nazism 'on the rise' in West Germany."

As long as man survives on this planet, the name Adolf Hitler will be remembered — with truth or with lies. It is for us in present dismal days to derive the satisfaction of bearing witness to the truth concerning him in the face of the torrent of lies. Make it your obligation to observe and mark the 101st anniversary of his birth on April 20th, 1990! Whatever else you do on and around that date to honour his name, make sure that at 6:18 in the evening, the time of his birth, you stop in silent meditation, lighting a candle in your heart in memory of the greatest champion of the Aryan peoples — your peoples — this world has ever seen!

"What though the field be lost?

All is not lost — the unconquerable will,  
And study of revenge, immortal hate,  
And courage never to submit or yield:  
And what is else not to be overcome?"

(from *Paradise Lost* by John Milton, 1608-1674)

\* \* \* \* \*

## THE ENEMY WITHIN

Strasserites  
Hollywood Nazis  
"Rock" Rowdies

On the centenary of his birth it needs to be noted that the cause of Adolf Hitler is confronted and conflicted not merely by the hostility of all the regular forces of the old order, but also and no less to its detriment by others who constitute one variety or another of an auxiliary enemy within. These comprise, firstly the Strasserites: persons claiming to be nationalists or even National Socialists, but denigrating Hitler in tune with the champions of the old order, and upholding in his place the Strasser brothers, Otto and Gregor, and Ernst Rhöm, whom Hitler had to eliminate from his party because of their treacherous disruption.

Secondly, there are those who, while plentifully making use of Hitler's name, are as plentifully harmful to his cause by their misunderstanding and misuse of it, and the consequent exploitation by the outer enemy of their association with it. In this category we include the Hollywood Nazis: all those, in other words, who make use of National Socialism as nothing more than a political playtime devoted to its superficial trappings, thereby seeking to compensate for the deficiencies of their arrested development by dressing up, giving themselves titles, and performing sterile and egocentric antics.

Also to be included are all those who, in their virtually total ignorance of what National Socialism really is, have not the slightest perception of, or respect for, the discipline, order and authority central to it, and who are simply excited to associate with it because of the enemy's distorted image of it as something violently notorious, and who accordingly supply the enemy with living proof of validity of their distortion. These latter are the dismal morons whose real cause is no more than crude hooliganism plentifully embellished with swastikas and Iron Crosses and a flourish of Hitler salutes at football matches. At this centenary let it be confirmed that there is no room in our ranks for such human rubbish.

Likewise, let it be declared that National Socialism, so uniquely responsive to harmony and beauty, health and strength, has absolutely no room for "rock", that degenerate din of the African jungle to which the above hooligans, and also others pretending to be National Socialists, are addicted, and which, we would have them know, Hitler would most certainly have prohibited. This is something that skinheads—if they are to elevate themselves from this category, have got to learn.

Returning to the Strasser brothers, they showed themselves to be more of the nature of national communists than true National Socialists, attacking private ownership of property (although upheld

in the NSDAP's manifesto) in favour of mere possession on trust for the state (usufruct)—propounded by Otto Strasser in *The Structure of German Socialism* (1931)—and acclaiming class warfare in the name of the proletariat. As early as 1925 Gregor Strasser in a speech in the Reichstag called for an "economic revolution involving the nationalisation of the economy." On the 21st May, 1930, Otto Strasser met Hitler and demanded what he called "real socialism" and no attacks on Soviet Russia. Hitler replied: "What you understand by socialism is nothing but marxism." The next day in continued discussion Otto Strasser demanded the nationalization of industry, to which Hitler answered: "Democracy has laid the world in ruins, and nevertheless you want to extend it to the economic sphere. It would be the end of the German economy." (*Who Financed Hitler*, James & Suzanne Pool, Dial Press, New York, 1978; pages 241 & 242) If the Strassers had had their way, National Socialism would have never got to power, for they would have disrupted its appeal, frightening off essential support. No sensible person can really credit these men with the ability to succeed in Hitler's place in winning and holding the hearts of a nation.

Both the Strassers were confined in their concern to the economic side of the cause to the disregard of other aspects such as the racial. This deficiency, aggravated by their distortion of the party's economic policy, meant that they were always a couple of cuckoos in the nest. National Socialism, properly understood, has never been a mere combination of conventional socialism spiced with nationalism, and thus yet another merely materialist doctrine. It most certainly derives from its conception of the Folk a strong belief, and thus the belief—increased by its belief in the Leadership Principle, again derived from its racial belief—that private ownership and private enterprise must be subject to national regulation and supervision to ensure that its productive efficacy is fairly distributed and in accordance with national requirements; but it has never accepted the idea that nationalisation of property is the only and necessary means to adequate social justice, any more than it has been prepared to tolerate the anarchic inequity of liberal capitalism as the only answer and necessary means of preserving private property and enterprise. It has always stood for reconciliation, not a conflict of private and corporate interests. However, along with this economic outlook, National Socialism has always been far more than this, being first and foremost a racial outlook from which its economic outlook has followed.

Otto Strasser left the NSDAP in 1930, setting himself up in opposition to Hitler. In 1931 he was behind the SA mutiny in Berlin—where many SA men were former communists—led by the Berlin SA chief, Captain Walter Stennes, who was advised and encouraged in the revolt by Otto Strasser. The authors James & Suzanne Pool, in their book earlier referred to, reach the conclusion (p. 378) that “the evidence indicates that Stennes was financed by several important industrialists who were intent on destroying the Nazis.” Otto Strasser himself admits in his book *Flight from Terror* that the foremost financial backer of Stennes was the Jewish multi-millionaire, steel and coal industrialist Otto Wolff. Money also came from the major industrialist Hermann Bücher. Hitler, by personal intervention on the spot, quickly swung the great bulk of the SA men away from Stennes and Strasser.

On Hitler's attainment of power in 1933, Otto Strasser went first to Austria to continue his anti-Hitler campaign, then to Czechoslovakia. The Jew, Fritz Max Cahen, head of the German Resistance Movement against Hitler, describes in his book *Men Against Hitler* (Jarrolds, London, pages 140-142), how, when he was in Prague in 1935, he had a conference with Otto Strasser and others leading to a plan for united opposition to Hitler, and how thereafter he met Strasser at least once a week. The periodical *World Jewry* (28th August, 1936) carried the following report from its Prague correspondent: “The well-known rival of Herr Hitler, Otto Strasser..... has published an appeal to the German Jewish emigrants to join the newly-formed organisation of German Jews headed by Herr Rossheim.” ..... “In his opinion, the solution of the problem of the Jews in Germany lies in the direction of assimilation.....”

In 1938 Otto Strasser moved to Switzerland, and afterwards to France. The British Ambassador in Berlin, in a letter to the British Foreign Secretary on the 18th July 1939, said, “So many people, such as Otto Strasser and others of this world are seeking with intense pertinacity to drive us to war with Germany.”

According to W.J. West in *The Truth Betrayed* (Duckworth, London, 1987), at the time of the Bürgerbräukeller bomb plot, November 1939, which failed to kill Hitler as intended—and which the German authorities held to have been masterminded by the British Secret Service working through Otto Strasser—there were in fact very strong links between Strasser and the British authorities through Sir Robert Vansittart (Permanent Head of the Foreign Office and later Chief Diplomatic Advisor to the Government) who in

October 1939 recommended to the Foreign Secretary Otto Strasser and Hermann Rauschning (another defector responsible for a volume of lies entitled *Hitler Speaks*, exposed by Swiss historian Wolfgang Haenel). After the failure of the bomb plot it is significant that Vansittart turned against Strasser, clearly implying that his reputation was bound up with it (W.J. West, p. 155).

Otto Strasser's friend and supporter, the author Douglas Reed, describes the *The Prisoner of Ottawa*, (Jonathan Cope, London, 1953, pages 712-175) how the former, while in France during the earlier part of the war, plotted against Germany with the Jew Georges Mandel, then Minister of the Interior in the Reynoud Government. With the fall of France, the roving traitor moved to Portugal from whence in 1940 the British helped him to reach Canada to continue his dirty work there.

Material from Otto Strasser went to make up the book *Der Führer* which was issued in the name of “Konrad Heiden”, which, along with Rauschning's above-mentioned collection of lies, was used in formulating the indictment of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg whereby leading Germans were put to death and barbarously so by slow strangulation. Strasser material was also made much use of by Dr. William C. Langer as acknowledged in his book *The Mind of Adolf Hitler* (Secker & Warburg, London, 1972), a piece of wartime propaganda he was assigned to concoct by the American dirty tricks department known as the OSS. The kind of help muck-spreader Strasser gave to Langer can be distinguished from Strasser's own offering of ordure entitled *The Gangsters around Hitler* (W.H. Allen, London, undated but on British bookstalls in the middle of the war). Typical of its filth is his tale of a film made, he claims, of two titled ladies from the War Office executed for espionage: “.....when Hitler is unable to sleep he orders this film to be shown again and again, as he sits alone in the cellar which houses his private cinema” (p. 43). Otto Strasser died in obscurity in Munich in 1974.

His brother Gregor stayed on in Hitler's party till 1932 when his disruptive intrigues came to a head. Authors James & Suzanne Pool, in *Who Financed Hitler* (p. 382), reveal that during the autumn of that year the Jew Paul Silverberg, a very wealthy industrialist, secretly gave money to Gregor Strasser who, like his brother, while presenting himself as such a strict opponent of big business, was quite prepared to be on its payroll. The Jewish industrialist Otto Wolff, whom we have come across as paymaster for the Otto

Strasser-Walter Stennes plot in 1931, also extended his purse to Gregor in this following year. "Like Silverberg, Wolff had contributed heavily to Strasser....." (p. 454). When in December 1937 General Kurt von Schleicher became Chancellor, he immediately offered the position of Vice-Chancellor to Gregor Strasser with whom he was conspiring as a move to disrupt Hitler's party. Thereupon Hitler denounced him as a traitor, and he had to resign from the party. This was not, however, the end of his subversion. He was involved in the Röhm plot two years later, and executed for this.

Ernst Röhm, head of the SA in 1934, was akin to the Strassers in political outlook, wanting to pursue a further revolution in the military sphere by elevating the SA in place of the Army, just as the Strassers wanted to regiment industry through public ownership. If Röhm had had his way, the consequent upset to the country, when Hitler had only newly taken hold of it, would very likely have meant the downfall of National Socialism. At that time the SA, two million strong, was—under Röhm behaving with increasing grandeur—running out of Hitler's control. A loyal SA commander, Victor Lutze, brought to Rudolf Hess eye-witness accounts of Röhm's plans to overthrow Hitler and bring about a second revolution (*Hess: The Missing Years*, David Irving, Macmillan, London, 1987, p. 22). Also, Hitler's personal pilot, Hans Baur, in his book *Hitler at my Side* (Eichler Publishing Corp., U.S.A., 1986, p. 79 [available from Liberty Bell Publications]) records that Hitler told the author that the Italian Ambassador in Paris had learned that Röhm was planning an uprising, and had entered into negotiations with the French who had assured him they would not interfere, and that Röhm had already drawn up his entire lists for a new government. The Italian Ambassador had notified the German Ambassador in France who had informed Hitler, who, after agonizing deliberation, had to order the arrest and execution of Röhm and his leading conspirators, thereby by his prompt and necessarily radical action very rightly preventing the vastly greater bloodshed and turmoil of civil war.

The Strasserites of today, devotees of the treacherous Gregor and Otto and fellow traveler Ernst Röhm, accuse Hitler of becoming a tool of big business, and betraying his cause and his followers thereby. The crucial point in this connection is not whether Hitler accepted vitally needed money from big business or any other quarter, but whether in so doing he allowed any money from any source to pervert him from the cause he believed in and stood for, and the answer to this must on any sensible survey be an emphatic

"no!" Hitler, whatever the hopes of contributors, was never for purchase, and always remained the master whatever the money.

A major authority on the subject of NSDAP funds is the book here repeatedly referred to: *Who financed Hitler*, by James & Suzanne Pool [available from Liberty Bell Publications, Ord. #22020, \$12. + \$1.80 postage]. In 1923 industrialist Fritz Thyssen apparently gave 100,000 gold marks to General Ludendorff who acted as a conduit for various organizations, and part of this may have been intended for and may have reached the NSDAP. Industrialist Ernst von Borsig apparently contributed to the NSDAP in its early years, but not much more than to conservative parties as well. Not till 1927 did Hitler win a further supporter among industrialists, Emil Kirdorf, who thereafter mustered some financial help from others. "Throughout the period of prosperity Hitler received relatively few donations from important businessmen" (p. 155). In 1928 Hess met Thyssen who arranged a loan. In the summer of 1931 the Ruhrlade (group of industrialists) gave the NSDAP on Thyssen's recommendation a small sum (p. 278). In 1931 it was reported that Deterding of Royal Dutch-Shell both gave and loaned large sums to Hitler. In that same year Hitler spoke at The Industry Club of Düsseldorf and Thyssen is later supposed to have written that as a result of this contact a number of larger contributions were made to the NSDAP; "supposed", we here say, because as will be seen Thyssen's writings are distinctly suspect. The Pools say there may have been enough inflow to finance the current election campaign, but no great flow (p. 355). They estimate contributions from industry to the NSDAP 1930-32 as totaling not more than 600,000 marks. They mention help from Cologne banker, Baron Kurt von Schröder, but only in the form of arranging for NSDAP bills to be underwritten, not actually paid, and their overall conclusion is that "the primary source of Party revenue was not big business" (p. 385).

Otto Dietrich, NSDAP Press Chief, in his revised 1955 memoirs, says of the 1931 Industry Club of Düsseldorf meeting that insignificant sums were collected at the door, and nothing great followed. Henry Ashby Turner in *German Big Business and the Rise of Hitler* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1985), another major authority, debunks the notion of Hitler's dependency on big business sustained by such as the writings attributed to Thyssen, showing in fact how little big business had to do with Hitler's success, its contributions never being critical, and most NSDAP money coming from membership dues, interest-free loans, and the admission char-

ges at meetings. Peter Drucker, the economist, in *The End of Economic Man* (London, 1939), endorses this conclusion on page 105: "As far as the Nazi Party is concerned, there is good reason to believe that at least three-quarters of its funds, even after 1930, came from the weekly dues ..... and from the entrance fees to the mass meetings....."

A markedly inferior source, although much favoured by and advertised by Britain's contemporary Strasserites, is *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* by Antony C. Sutton (Bloomfield Books, Sudbury, U.K., 1976). Behind the gusto of its blatant partisanship, it shows itself distinctly thin even as simply a survey of big business contributions to Hitler's rise to power, and totally lacking in any proof that in accepting such contributions Hitler was in any way whatsoever corrupted and deflected from his course, without which there can be no culpability on his part, only good sense in gaining necessary finance without compromise.

The book *I Paid Hitler*, attributed to Fritz Thyssen, has been made much of by the anti-Hitler front, but in 1948 Thyssen denied authorship of the book, saying that it was the work of Emery Reves who published it without permission or payment. Reves—a Jew whose father was formerly Rabbitz—was a New York publisher running an anti-Hitler propaganda machine, who acted as literary agent for Winston Churchill, and was responsible for the fictitious book by Hermann Rauschning, *Hitler Speaks*, wherein Rauschning claims to have had more than a hundred private talks with Hitler in which the latter revealed the entirety of his views and plans including a world empire, whereas this liar in fact only met Hitler four or five times, never alone, and never at length.

Strasserites, along with their idiotic depiction of Hitler as the paid lackey of big business, also try to reinforce their smears with the equally idiotic tale that Hitler had Jewish ancestry. In the case of author Douglas Reed, the addled supporter of the sordid Otto Strasser, the nonsense even stretched to the extent of suggesting that Hitler was some satanic agent with the role from the start of misleader and destroyer of patriotic forces. The "Hitler was Jewish" canard comes in two main variations, so take your pick! One of them makes out that Hitler's father's mother was once a domestic servant in the household of Baron Rothschild of Vienna, and there seduced by him. The prime source for this is none other than the book *I Paid Hitler* which, as we have just seen, the Jew Reves wrote while falsely attributing it to Fritz Thyssen. The other version is that the seduc-

ing was done by a Jew named Frankenberger in his household at Graz. This whopper is said to have come to us from high NS official, Hans Frank, in memoirs said to have been written while in the custody of the Allies shortly before they hanged him at Nuremberg at the end of the war, when they may well have (as in other cases) done a bit of hand-guiding before neck-stretching.

Colin Cross, in *Adolf Hitler* (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1973), says that the Graz Hebrew congregation had no Frankenberger among its members at the relevant time (p. 18); and Joachim C. Fest, in *Hitler* (Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London, 1974), says, "Recent researches have further shaken the credibility of his statement, so that the whole notion can scarcely stand serious investigation" (p. 15). Yet the self-styled "political soldiers" of the Nutty Farce which the present National Front has become, who have never faced and are never likely to face and endure what vast legions of men and women in Germany in peace and in war did in support of Adolf Hitler as epitome of their ideals, continue to defecate their denigration of his as a fake inferior to themselves, whereby these midgets most of all succeed in exhibiting their own childish and odious charlatanry.

\* \* \* \* \*

## WAR CRIMES WITCH-HUNT UNDER WAY WORLDWIDE

With the Hebrew "Holocaust" facing increasing doubt, a new drive to refurbish it had to be arranged. Hence the present hunt for "Nazi war criminals" to be put on show-trial. The British Government having responded by setting up a War Crimes Inquiry, *Gothic Ripples* contacted it and obtained its terms of references, which are: "For the purpose of this inquiry, the term 'war crimes' extends only to crimes of murder, manslaughter or genocide committed in Germany and in territories occupied by German forces during the Second World War."

In April 1988 we sent it details of war crimes conforming to those terms of reference committed by British citizens, requesting explicit recognition that the Inquiry's obligation included consideration of such. It took three further letters and five months before the Secretary wrote in September to say: "I can confirm that the Inquiry's terms of reference include the investigation of alleged war crimes committed by people who were then British in Germany or

German occupied territory during the Second World War. However the Offences Against the Person Act of 1861 allows the prosecution in this country for murder or manslaughter of people who were British at the time of the alleged offences wheresoever in the world they took place." Accordingly, he concluded, "it seems more appropriate" that our allegations be investigated by the Director of Public Prosecutions to whom our material would be passed. Having been shunted off the main line in this way, it took two letters and further four months before the D.P.P.—who just happens to be the Jew Allen Green—favoured us with the following few words: "These matters are still under consideration." This January 1989 message was the last we have had to date.

\* \* \* \* \*

### MURDER AT SPANDAU

Rudolf Hess, the Prisoner of Peace, was finally laid to rest in the family grave at Wunsiedel on the 17th March 1988. At a time then and now when a War Crimes Inquiry is being conducted in Britain, we specify as a war crime the retention of this peace envoy in custody in Britain from 1941-1945, and, derivatively so, his wrongful conviction by a tribunal of victors' vengeance at Nuremberg in 1945-1946, and his consequent imprisonment in Spandau Prison in West Berlin from then till 1987; and, finally, his ultimate murder there in that year. For all this war criminality we principally accuse the deceitful and dishonourable government of the United Kingdom in its various composition throughout this time.

Prior to his flight to Britain, Rudolf Hess had been energetically engaged with Hitler's knowledge and approval in seeking to end the conflict between Britain and Germany which both of them heartily deplored. Peter Allen, in *The Crown and the Swastika* (Robert Hale, London, 1983), claims that Rudolf Hess secretly met the Duke of Windsor in Portugal on the 28th July 1940, immediately after the fall of France, and that the latter approved German peace proposals presented by Hess as Hitler's official representative. The Duke was then tricked by the British government of warmonger Winston Churchill whose Minister of Information, Walter Monckton, flew to Lisbon, pretended that the British government was going to give serious consideration to the proposals, and on the strength of this persuaded the Duke to depart for a post in the Bahamas. Manoeuvred out of the way in this manner, the Duke had been

manoeuvred off the British throne several years earlier, not really because of Mrs. Simpson, but because he was pro-Hitler and wanted Anglo-German unity.

Hess's son, Wolf Rüdiger Hess, in *My Father Rudolf Hess* (W.H. Allen, London, 1986; p. 158), records that Albrecht Haushofer, assigned to do so by Hitler and Hess, met representatives of influential British circles in Geneva in August 1940, who indicated that Britain was willing to make peace, if Germany canceled the 1939 pact with Russia. Hitler was in principle prepared to do this, but wished to wait until the complicated situation in the Balkans was clearer. However, the Churchill government was merely concerned to isolate Germany and bring her into conflict with Russia so that Churchill could achieve his long-standing aim of an alliance with Stalin against Hitler, something he had proposed to the Russian Ambassador in London back in July 1934 (I.M. Maisky, *Who Helped Hitler?*; p. 55); and, according to J.F.C. Fuller in *The Second World War*, put forward on 4 occasions: March 1938, September 1938, May 4th and May 19th 1939.

Hess's son relates that in the winter 1940/1941 Albrecht Haushofer had discussions in Madrid with the British Ambassador there, Sir Samuel Hoare, through the medium of the Swedish Legation in Madrid (p. 80). In January 1941 the Vice-President of the International Red Cross, Carl Jacob Burckhardt, received unofficial information from London that Britain was prepared to make peace, and on the 28th April 1941 Albrecht Haushofer went to Geneva to see Burckhardt on the orders of Hitler and Hess (p. 70).

It was during this period that Rudolf Hess, having conceived the desperate measure of a personal flight to Britain, had twice—on the 10th January and the 30th April 1941—prepared to fly, but been prevented from setting off, before finally doing so on the 10th May 1941. Also, Albrecht Haushofer had in September 1940 written to the Duke of Hamilton (with whom he had been in touch since 1936), at the suggestion of Rudolf Hess, to explore the way for negotiations. This letter fell into the hands of Britain's Secret Intelligence Service. Says David Irving in *Churchill's War* (Veritas, Australia, 1987; p. 650) [available from Liberty Bell Publications, \$30.00 + \$4.50 postage & handling], according to Dr. Eduard Benes, ex-President of Czechoslovakia, the SIS saw the Haushofer approach as "an excellent opportunity", sent a reply purporting to be from Hamilton, and further letters arranged for Hess to fly to the Duke's estate.

As to Hitler's prior knowledge of Hess's flight on the 10th May

1941, according to Wulf Schwarzwälder (*Rudolf Hess*, Quartet, London, 1988; p. 156), Hess's former adjutant, Alfred Leitgen, remembers overhearing snatches of a conversation between Hitler and Hess in which there was mention of Albrecht Haushofer and Hamilton, no problems with the aeroplane, and (from Hess) of declaring him insane. The first German radio communique concerning Hess's flight was not until the evening (20:00 hrs.) of the 12th May, suggesting that Hitler held his hand to see if Britain responded favourably to Hess's mission. Thereafter, as could be the pre-arranged protection, when it was seen that the mission was unsuccessful, the German authorities stated that Hess had become unbalanced.

Hess's flight significantly occurred at a time when—contrary to the Allied picture of an unprovoked attack on Russia by Germany in late June of 1941—Russia was preparing to make a surprise attack on Germany. Ernst Topitsch, in *Stalin's War* (St. Martin's Press, New York, 1987), assembles evidence that by late summer, 1941, preparations for a mass offensive against Germany would have been concluded. On page 106 Major General Grigorenko is quoted as saying, "More than half the troops of our Western Military Region were in the area round Bialystock to the West of that, that is in an area which projected into enemy territory. There could only be one reason for such a distribution, namely that these troops were intended for a surprise offensive."

In *Truth for Germany* (Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho, West Germany; p. 411) Udo Walendy quotes H.A. Jacobsen & H. Dollinger, *The Second World War in Pictures and Documents* (Vol. 1, p. 372) as stating that Russia concentrated in her western territories up to June 1941 13 armies with more than 131 infantry divisions, 23 cavalry divisions, 36 motorized brigades and about 40 tank divisions with almost 4.7 million soldiers. Walendy (p. 416) also cites H.G. Seraphim *The German-Russian Relations 1939 - 1941* (p. 85) that Russian General Vlassov stated in 1942 in Berlin after his capture, "The attack was intended for August/September 1941."

Victor Suvorov, a former member of the Soviet General Staff, in an article in *The Journal of the Royal United Services Institute for Defence Studies* (London; June 1985), assembled very detailed information to show that beginning in March 1941, and assuming a huge scale in May and June, Soviet troops were being moved to and concentrated on the German border in preparation for a Soviet attack on Germany. "If Hitler had not attacked first, Stalin would have had

23 armies and more than 20 independent corps facing him. This took place before general mobilisation." Suvorov shows that the measures were clearly offensive, not defensive. "It seems certain that the Soviet concentration on the frontier was due to be completed by 10 July. Thus the German blow which fell just 19 days earlier found the Red Army in a most unfavourable situation—in railway wagons."

German intelligence certainly learned what was going on, this causing Hitler to consider a pre-emptive strike a necessity, and he set in motion preparations for this at the end of April 1941, just before Hess's flight. However, he only confirmed the final forward movement a month in advance, that is to say, after it had become clear that Hess's mission had been unsuccessful; and both events shortly followed a Kremlin banquet on the 5th May at which Stalin announced in a supposedly secret speech—which German agents are said to have reported to Hitler almost at once—"Our war plan is ready .... It follows that over the next two months we can begin the fight with Germany." (*Hitler's War*, David Irving, Viking Press, U.S.A.; 1977; pp. 238 & 239.)

Attempting to put together and interpret the items of information here presented so as to form a full picture of Hess's flight, it seems evident that the flight was no self-contained impulse of purely personal initiative as is the common conception. It came after a long period of attempted negotiation to which Hitler was fully a party, and was most likely made with his approval. It came, furthermore, almost certainly in response to encouraging intimations from the British authorities, in part at least making use of the Duke of Hamilton, and amounting to giving the go-ahead green light; but all this on their part as merely a ruse to lure Hess to Britain, and this as part of Churchill's design to bring Stalin into the war in alliance with Britain against Germany. In this design Hess was conceived as the catalyst. Stalin for his part had made a pact with Hitler to encourage Hitler to confront the West. Now, in the ensuing war, hopes by Germany of an arrangement with Britain could both encourage Hitler to feel it opportune to fight Russia and, in turn, encourage Russia to feel it had to forestall such an attack, even though it would be far more to her advantage to attack a Germany still at war with the West. This assuredly is the key to the mystery.

Hess is likely to have brought over extensive peace proposals which have been hidden from the British public along with other aspects of his flight just discussed. His proposals were of course ig-

nored, and he was kept in close custody ever afterwards in order to prevent his disclosure of the full background to his flight, his peace proposals, and his treatment in custody. This happened despite the fact that Hess appears to have been in a position of a bearer of a Flag of Truce under Article 32 of the Hague Convention. This piece of international law protects such a person from being held as a prisoner of war, or put under any other form of confinement after negotiations: Churchill, it is to be noted in this connection, put Hess under the responsibility of the War Ministry as if in the category of a prisoner of war, instead of the Home Office, as would befit the bearer of a Flag of Truce.

Repeated reference has been made to the part played by Albrecht Haushofer. David Irving, in *Rudolf Hess - The Missing Years 1941-45* (Macmillan, London, 1987; p. 57), states that he had pre-war contact in London with the Special Intelligence Service. Early in 1940 he was introduced into the Wednesday Society, a centre of German resistance to Hitler, says Hess's son on p. 72 of his book. He was arrested in 1944 on suspicion of being involved in the July plot to murder Hitler and seize power; and he was shot just before the end of the war.

Much has been made of Hess's alleged "abnormality" and "instability" during his imprisonment in Britain from the time of his arrival till, four years later, his transfer to Germany for trial. This portrayal was undoubtedly deceitfully done by the British authorities in order to discredit Hess and thereby his peace flight at a time when Churchill was fearful of the potential response in the country menacing his position. It stopped just short of declaring him positively insane, since this condition would have entitled him as a prisoner of war to repatriation under the Geneva Convention.

The "abnormality" and "instability", where they were not a matter of a mere loss of memory which Hess feigned in order to protect his knowledge of confidential German matters under intensive questioning, was due to the wrongful and oppressive conditions to which he was subjected. Although the Geneva Convention prohibited electronic eavesdropping on prisoners of war, apparatus was installed at Mytchett Place at Aldershot before he arrived (D. Irving, *Rudolf Hess*; p. 101). Military Intelligence 6 provided "companions" for Hess, including Zionist sympathiser, Major Frank E. Foley (p. 103), with the job of penetrating Hess's mind, and seemingly drugs were used to this end (p. 107). Hence Hess's repeated protests and recurrent fear that he was being "poisoned" which his

captors paraded as proof of his unsoundness of mind.

Hess was put in the hands of a Jewish psychiatrist, RAMC Major R.V. Dicks who worked with MI6 (SIS), and who posed as a regular doctor, and who progressed to portraying Hess as of unsound mind. Dicks was by then the author of a new textbook, *Analysis under Hypnotics*, and he is known to have eventually injected Hess with the narcotic Evipan. (For these preceding facts, see Irving on Hess.) It has elsewhere been reported that documents in the U.S.A. indicated that behavioural peculiarities in Hess were caused by the administration of "truth drugs". The British Foreign Office significantly refused a request by Hess's wife that the International Red Cross be allowed to examine her husband.

Moved to Nuremberg in 1945, one of the panel appointed to pronounce on his fitness to stand trial there was a Prof. Ewen Cameron. This worthy was sponsored by the American Central Intelligence Agency to research brainwashing when he ran the Allan Memorial Institute in Montreal from 1943 to 1967. While doing so it was alleged that, for one example, one patient was injected with LSD, put to sleep for up to 50 days at a time, given repeated electric shocks, made to wear a helmet with speakers through which instructions were endlessly conveyed to him; and ended up a physical and mental wreck. (*Daily Telegraph*, London, 12th September 1988.) Just imagine this had been a German in Hitler's days, and what the Simon Wiesenthal Center would have made of it now—and all the British media!

Hess's continued incarceration from then till his death in 1987—41 years of his total caging for a monstrous 46 years—was arranged in order to exact the utmost in victors' vengeance while, fully as importantly, gagging him from making known the truth about his flight which would have been most damaging to the British government. The means to this end was the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, a creation of, by and for the victors regardless of real justice which it most flagrantly disregarded. For instance, Article 3 of its Charter disallowed objections that the judges, being nominated by the victors, were prejudiced. Article 6 allowed accusations only against representatives of the Axis Powers. Article 19 laid down that the Tribunal should not be bound by the technical rules of evidence. Article 21 provided that proof was not required for what the prosecutors regarded as facts generally known, Britain's Judge G. Lawrence refused to allow Hess's counsel to discuss the Treaty of Versailles, even though the Prosecution had introduced the subject

by arguing that the struggle for its revision had been a long-planned conspiracy against peace. One of the American judges at Nuremberg, Francis Biddle, later revealed in the *American Heritage* journal, Vol. XIII, No. 5, August 1962, that the U.S. judges knowingly permitted the Soviet prosecutor to admit false evidence against the defendants.

Hess was convicted—with the rich irony of a Russian judge reading out the findings against him—of “Crimes Against Peace” encompassing the following:— He had urged the importance of armaments, given support to military preparations, and signed the decree introducing conscription. He had been in Vienna when the German troops entered the city, and had signed the law for the union of Germany and Austria, having earlier made speeches in favour of this. He had co-operated with the Sudeten National Socialists and after the incorporation of the Sudetenland in the Reich he had carried out the fusion of their party with the NSDAP. In June 1939 he had been authorized to participate in the administration of both Austria and the Sudetenland, and in August 1939 he had given public approval to Hitler’s policy concerning Poland, and was a party to taking over Danzig and certain areas in Poland. As Hitler’s close confidant he must have known of and thus be responsible for Hitler’s “plans of aggression”. (See Irving on *Hess*.) For this—comparable to what Western politicians have regularly done, and never been charged or punished for—the man who tried to make peace was convicted of violating peace, and sentenced to life imprisonment.

Sent to Spandau Prison in West Berlin, conditions there were so bad that Pastor Casalis, a chaplain at the prison, said in November 1948 that the prisoners were dying slowly of starvation. “Spandau,” he said, “has become a place of mental torture.....” He spoke of “an atmosphere of refined sadism.....” Even when conditions later improved, Hess continued to be subjected to such harshly punitive restrictions as never to be allowed to touch his wife or son or grandchildren, and for over half of his total of 46 years behind bars he suffered the additional hardship of solitary confinement.

Nevertheless, despite nearly half a century of such veritable torture, and despite the unsuccessful efforts of French chaplain to get him to sign a declaration of remorse this Pastor Gabel had himself composed, he remained steadfast in his National Socialist beliefs and in his loyalty to and esteem for his friend and leader, Adolf Hitler. His martyred life ended on the afternoon of August 17th, 1987.

Stünde ich wieder am Anfang  
würde ich wieder handeln  
wie ich handelte.

Auch wenn ich wüßte,  
daß am Ende  
ein Scheiterhaufen für  
meinen Flammentod brennt.

Gleichgültig was Menschen tun  
dereinst stehe ich vor dem  
Richterstuhl des Ewigen  
ihm werde ich  
mich verantworten  
und ich weiß:

Er spricht mich frei!

Schlussworte von Rudolf Hess  
Stellvertreter des Führers  
vor dem Nürnberger Tribunal 1946

A succession of conflicting announcements as to where and how he died followed from the Allied authorities, exciting profound suspicion. Although the Americans were at the time in rotational charge of Spandau, the British insisted that the death be investigated solely by the Special Investigation Branch of the British Military Police, and that the post mortem be conducted by a British Army pathologist. This autopsy, performed two years later by Prof. James Cameron, indicated that death was due to suicide by hanging, but the Russians refused to countersign the verdict. At it, and not before and during the investigations by the Military Police, an alleged suicide note was discovered in the clothing of the corpse which, when he eventually obtained it, Hess's son saw to be highly suspect, being scrawled on the back of an old letter from the son's wife which lacked the usual prison stamp, and being without signs of having been in the pocket of a body very roughly handled in ostensible efforts at resuscitation which caused 9 ribs and the breastbone to be broken, and the stomach to be blown up like a balloon because a tube for oxygen was wrongly inserted in the oesophagus instead of the windpipe. The piece of electric flex with which he was supposed to have hanged himself had been wiped clean with acetone by the time the Military Police investigating team arrived, and the British Military Governor of Spandau, Lt.-Col. A.H. Le Tissier later told the son's wife that he had destroyed it.

A second autopsy, arranged by Hess's family and conducted by Prof. W. Spann of Munich University found marks around Hess's neck and throat which indicated he was throttled not hanged, while his hands showed he had not wound the flex round a hand to exert the necessary pressure on his neck for self-strangulation; the inescapable implication being that he had been murdered. In support of this conclusion this second autopsy showed that the victim suffered from disabilities which virtually rendered him incapable of hanging himself—or, for that matter, strangling himself.

According to various sources, including this second autopsy, Rudolf Hess so suffered from advanced arthritis and curvature of the spine—his left arm being of little use because of a frozen shoulder which prevented it being lifted above the horizontal in front and not even as high as that out to the side, his head being incapable of raising backwards to enable him to look up or of turning more than a few degrees to the left and halfway to the right—that he could never have reached above his head to tie a noose. Furthermore, the muscles of the hands of this 93-year-old man were so weak

that he had trouble gripping anything, and thus it was impossible for him to tie a knot to hang himself, or to apply the pressure necessary for self-strangulation (when in any event unconsciousness and consequent relaxation of the grip precedes and prevents death). Some other person or persons therefore killed him: that must be our verdict.

Whom could they be acting for? Was it the Russians whom Britain has always blamed for Hess's continued imprisonment? The Russians, despite their fulminations against Hess on occasions, were on other occasions prepared to make use of him. The German historian, Dr. Werner Maser, has asserted that back in 1952, on the night of March 17th, when the Russians were in charge of the prison, they took Hess to East Germany to a meeting with Kremlin officials at which Otto Grotewohl, the East German Prime Minister and Maser's source of information, was present. There Hess was offered immediate freedom, if he would head a new party to reconcile former National Socialists to communist rule. Hess refused, and was returned to prison for 35 more years.

In April 1987, four months before his father's murder, Wolf Rüdiger Hess was amazed to find that his approaches to the Russians suddenly had a favourable response. He was summoned to the Soviet Consulate in West Berlin where officials hinted that his father's imprisonment might soon end. Also, on June 21st, 1987, in a reply to a listener in Germany, Radio Moscow (Department of German language broadcasts) wrote: "Recent remarks by the head of our government, Mikhail Gorbachev, permit the expression of hope that your longtime efforts in behalf of the release of war criminal Rudolf Hess may soon be crowned by success." It seems that Gorbachev did intend to release Hess unilaterally during a Soviet turn of administration at Spandau as a powerful propaganda stroke to exhibit to a nicety the kind tendencies of a reformed Soviet regime, even towards a notorious old enemy it had formerly fiercely denounced. The Russians let the West German President know of their intention. He tipped of the British who expressed through him a resolute refusal to accept this.

The possibility of Hess's release now put the British in a panic. Hitherto they had been able to rely on the Russian refusal to agree to Hess's release as the means of keeping him and his secrets locked up for ever, while they, in characteristically hypocritical style, posed as the forgiving ones favouring his release. What then is said to have happened according to information from American personnel at Spandau reaching German friends of theirs is as follows. In an

operation carried out in great haste to proceed even any advance announcement of Gorbachev's intention, let alone its implementation, and thus accounting for flaws, two British Special Air Service men were put into the prison to kill Hess, and the American, French and Israeli secret services were acquainted beforehand, but not the Russian and West German. These two assassins were spotted beforehand on the afternoon in question in the vicinity of the garden shed where Hess met his death. In the region of 3:15 to 3:30, the American warder on duty to accompany Hess on his daily visit to the garden and there to the garden shed, was by a curious coincidence called away to answer a telephone call in the main cell block, leaving Hess in the garden shed. During his absence the SAS men evidently attacked the old man who, despite his great age and great disabilities, put up a fight and these fiends tried to throttle him with flex, and then make it look like suicide. However, although rendered unconscious, the old man was still alive when the warder returned and summoned help. The U.S. officer in charge of the guard, seemingly a party to the assassination, called a British military ambulance which took Hess away, accompanied by the two SAS men who were seen getting into it. Hess then "died" on the way to the hospital. (Probably with further assistance from the assassins—our note.)

The guilty ones were well-protected from justice by the provisions of their masters. No public inquest, as normal under British law, was held because Hess, although in custody in the British sector of Berlin, was a prisoner of the four Allies, and any process concerning them on German soil requires the express permission of the Allied power or powers involved. The West Berlin state prosecutor, "following information received from numerous sources," initiated an enquiry into Hess's death in February 1988, but it was suspended the following month (*Independent*, London, 18th March, 1988).

The Chairman of the British Bar's European group commented at the time of Hess's death that Rudolf Hess was incarcerated under a sentence imposed by an ad hoc tribunal with no legal status under any national law (*Daily Telegraph*, London, 20th August 1987). Thus his custody—and all that followed from it, including his death—became a matter beyond and thus above the normal law by virtue of the inter-governmental pact of the victors setting up the tribunal. Murder at Spandau was thus by higher decree permissible. To complete the shrouding of the case of the corpse, already so well-attended to, the British government's Hess papers are placed beyond

reach till 2017, and by then you can be sure that anything revealing will have conveniently disappeared.

Hugh Thomas, a former British Army surgeon assigned to Spandau, believes the prisoner was murdered, but also believes that he was not Rudolf Hess but a double sent by Himmler who had the real man murdered in 1941. Thomas's case principally rests on his claim that the prisoner did not have the scars he should have had due to a wound in the First World War. As against this, it is a fact that scar tissue in such an old man could be difficult to detect. Also, for what it is worth, Mrs. Lynda Chalker, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, was reported in *The Scotsman* (26th February 1988) as stating that the British government had concluded on the basis of various studies and the British post mortem that the man was indeed Hess. Additionally, the *Sunday Times* (12th June 1988) reported that Charles A. Gabel, the French chaplain at Spandau, had, in a book of his published in Paris in 1988, revealed that after Thomas first published his theory in 1979, two allied doctors visited Hess and did with difficulty find the wound scars. If Thomas is to be believed—and if thus it is to be believed that Hess's wife and son have been deceived for decades as to the prisoner's identity—we are still left with the conundrum which Thomas never really comes to grips with: why would such an imposter as the prisoner still hide the truth decades after the war, and thus acquiesce in his imprisonment till death—when the insertion of deliberate anomalies in his letters to relatives of Hess could easily be made the means of communicating his imposture? The absence of any satisfactory answer to this must discredit Mr. Thomas's theory completely.

As the most recent important development in the case of Rudolf Hess's death, a witness who was at Spandau at the time has come forward to testify that it was murder. Tunisian-born Abdallah Melaouhi was the victim's nurse at Spandau for the last four years of his life, and thereby the closest person to him. Interviewed on the "Newsnight" programme of Britain's BBC Television Channel 2 on the 28th February 1989, Melaouhi had this to say, according to an official transcript in our possession:—

When shortly before his death, there were reports that the Russians were relenting and Hess would be freed, "Hess wasn't very happy about it. Hess said, 'Now something is going to happen to me.' ..... He told me 'Mr. Melaouhi, now they are going to kill me'."

On the 17th August 1987, Melaouhi was at lunch in the canteen adjoining the prison when a telephone call from the French warder

summoned him back urgently. He returned immediately to the prison and rang the bell. Usually he was admitted rightaway, but on that day he had to wait for 15 minutes. When he was let in he found his way to the garden hut was blocked. Eventually he managed to get to it by a long way round, taking 40 minutes instead of 4 minutes the normal way. He saw no cable around or anywhere near Hess's neck and the extension cable with which the authorities say Hess hanged himself was still in his normal place, one end connected to the lamp and the other in the wall socket. "His body was quite a distance away from the window where the TV claimed he hanged himself and the chair was in a totally different place from usual .... I know the garden hut very well. The floor was covered with a straw mat but on that day everything was upside down as if a wrestling match had taken place. The armchair where Mr. Hess always sat had flown about three-and-a-half metres across the room, the lamp had fallen over. It was as if someone had tried to kill him and he'd tried to save himself."

Melaouhi continued, "There were three people there, a warder who has been working in Spandau for eight years and two American soldiers, well they were dressed in American uniforms... [Our note: it would be hardly surprising if, in the circumstances of the American turn of duty, the SAS men had donned American uniforms with the connivance of the American authorities.] ...I'd never seen soldiers near Hess before, and precisely on that day they were there." He explained that soldiers were in Spandau to guard the prison, not the prisoner, which was strictly the job of the civilian warders. Said Melaouhi: "Rudolf Hess was so weak he needed a special chair to help him to stand up. He walked bent over with a cane and was almost blind. If he ever fell to the ground, he couldn't get up again. His hands were crippled with arthritis. He couldn't tie his shoe laces, let alone lift his hands high enough to kill himself."

"Newsnight" stated that Scotland Yard had been looking into the case for a month, following a visit by Hess's son with evidence including a signed statement from Abdallah Melaouhi and the second autopsy report of Prof. Spann; but that so far there had been no attempt by the Metropolitan Police to contact either of these witnesses, and official sources close to the enquiry had said that "it is unlikely the case will be pursued." (For readers wishing to tackle the Metropolitan Police on this, the address is New Scotland Yard, Broadway, London, SW1.)

Rudolf Hess Gesellschaft, Postfach 1122, D-8033 Planegg, West

Germany, has now replaced the former society for the release of Rudolf Hess, and incorporates its former French counterpart. It is an international association—President: Wolf Rüdiger Hess—existing as a memorial to Rudolf Hess, and as such concerned with his work in Germany prior to his flight to Britain, the flight itself, his subsequent captivity, and the manner of his death. Two publications are in course of preparation.

Gothic Ripples, whose editor has campaigned for Rudolf Hess for 40 years, proposed that henceforth May 10th each year be observed worldwide as RUDOLF HESS DAY in honour of this truly great and greatly harmed idealist. It was late on this day in 1941 that he landed in a field near to Floors Farm Cottage, itself near to Floors Farm near to Eaglesham House, the exact spot being marked by a stone. The area is a little south of Glasgow in Scotland. The Ordnance Survey Landranger Map 64 shows the spot as grid reference OS 561 540. Visitors to the spot should secure permission from the Farm or its Cottage before going on to the ground, taking care not to spoil things for others by in any way unnecessarily antagonizing the owner or occupant of the ground or other local people.

From *Gothic Ripples*, April 1989, Colin Jordan, editor;  
Thoragarth, Greenhow Hill, Harrogate, HG3 5JQ, England.

#### WHICH WAY, WESTERN MAN? SURVIVAL MANUAL FOR THE WHITE RACE

William Gayley Simpson has spent a lifetime of keen observation, careful analysis, and deep reflection developing the principal thesis of his book: that the single, undying purpose of all human activity should be the ennobling of man. In support of this thesis he looks at the foundations of Western Society, at the structure of our government, at the effect of technology and industrialization on man, at the roles of the sexes, at economics, and at race. The book goes to the roots of the problems facing the White Race today, and it shows the ways in which White society must be changed if the race is to survive. *Which Way Western Man?* is an encyclopedic work whose conclusions can be ignored by no one with a sense of responsibility to the future. For your copy of *Which Way Western Man?* send \$14.00 including postage and handling for the softback edition (Order No. 22003) to:

LIBERTY BELL PUBLICATIONS  
Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA.

# POSTSCRIPTS

by Revilo P. Oliver

## MORE ON AN ENIGMA

Since I devoted considerable space to Lyndon LaRouche in the February issue, there has come to me a copy of a journal published by what is obviously a subsidiary of LaRouche's still active organization. It is the January-February issue of the bimonthly *21st Century Science & Technology*, edited by a Carol White who is presumably the White mentioned in my article.<sup>1</sup>

The periodical does nothing to solve the political puzzle which I stated in February: Why does the concealed dictatorship in Washington want to suppress LaRouche? It does describe the way in which that alien government destroyed one of LaRouche's subsidiaries, the Fusion Energy Foundation.

A pseudo-legal terrorist, disguised as a Federal judge in Massachusetts, fined the Foundation \$5,000,000 (!) for what he called "contempt of court." The Federal goons then rushed to the offices of the Foundation in Virginia and seized all of its assets. The tyrants then threw the Foundation into involuntary bankruptcy because it could not pay its debts with the funds the goons had seized. A neat operation and only typical of the terminal stage of the "democracy" beloved by Americans.

What is noteworthy is that there still was an honest judge in the Federal judiciary, specifically in the U. S. Bankruptcy Court. He investigated the case and wrote a decision of 106 pages, in which, as he is quoted in the periodical, he said that "the government's actions could be liken[ed] to a constructive fraud on the court, wherein the court may infer the fraudulent nature of the government's conduct."

As I have said, nothing in the issue of the periodical I have seen gives us a clue to the reason why the thugs in Washington have singled out LaRouche for their pseudo-legal frauds and terrorism. It

1. A valued correspondent informs me that there may be more than one "Carol White" and suggests an identification of the one connected with LaRouche as a woman whose real name he states. Another sends observations that may or may not confirm the suggested identification, which the woman denies. See addendum below.

challenges some political propaganda, but it should compensate for that by endorsing delusions, including Christianity, that serve to keep the boobs in spiritless and mindless subjection to their enemies.

Surely no one will take seriously the pseudo-scientific jabbering about the dire consequences of the "greenhouse effect" until archaeologists have discovered the ruins of the many factories which must have been belching their smoke and carbon dioxide into the atmosphere c. 20,000 B.C. to produce the "greenhouse effect" that ended the third Wurm glaciation. When such ruins are discovered, we can begin to worry about industrial activity in all the preceding glacial ages, back to the Pleistocene. But until such ruins are discovered, we must treat the current trepidation about a "greenhouse effect" as we treat other propaganda for the Jews' "One World."

Denying the "greenhouse" scare probably does annoy the Masters of Deceit, but they should be grateful for the accompanying denial of genetic science and the madcap claim that there are no races and no innate differences in the quality of anthropoids, so that the faster biological scrubs breed, the happier the world will be. And the Masters should be particularly grateful for the attempt to plaster LaRouche's Oecumenical Christianity over scientifically ascertained facts.

The major article in this issue is "Roger Bacon and the Birth of Universal Science," by Paul Greenberg, an article that we read with great sympathy because its author is one of the five who were thrown into prison along with LaRouche by the lawless government.

Greenberg begins with what is evidently part of the LaRouche ritual: a denunciation of "Isaac Newton's petty imperial mind" and all empirical science, which seems to be like the Roman Catholics' habit of crossing themselves to affirm their faith. He doesn't explain the ritual. For a clear statement of that we must turn to a review by one David Cherry of a recent book on Newton, where we are told that "Science is a moral enterprise, in which the scientist always seeks to learn how anyone of good will can draw closer to God by discovering His ways, for the propagation of His will, as a builder." A scientist, in other words, starts by befuddling his mind with illusions that are the very antithesis of scientific inquiry. He knows that the story of Cinderella is true because she wore a glass slipper, given her by her fairy grandmother.<sup>2</sup>

2. I am sure the reader does not need to be told that the glass slipper was created by some early translator or scribe who mistook the French *vair* for *vaire* (modern *verre*). The mistake improves the story, as Per-

When one ignores the LaRouchean-Christian *lubie*, the article, after somewhat exaggerating or misdating the "technological progress" of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, gives an account of the work of Roger Bacon (c. 1214-c. 1292) that is, so far as I can tell, fairly accurate, except that, as a member of LaRouche's cult, Greenberg has to deny the Aristotelian thought that underlies Bacon's accomplishments in the observation of nature. Greenberg tells us that Bacon was the pupil of Grosseteste (c.1175-1253), but does not tell us that Grosseteste translated some of Aristotle's works, and was, of course, an Aristotelian in his methods of observing nature, although he wandered into a kind of Neoplatonism in his theological theories.

That Bacon was also a professed Christian is to be taken for granted in the Thirteenth Century, but when we try to define the actual beliefs of men of that time, we must not forget that they were prudent and, like Rabelais, expressed opinions *jusqu'au feu exclusive-ment*. There were atheists in the Thirteenth Century, probably including one of Greenberg's heroes, the great Hohenstauffen emperor, Frederick II, but even that bold monarch did not avow publicly such politically disastrous opinions,<sup>3</sup> and men of lesser rank had no desire to be roasted over a slow fire, which was the theologians' favorite means of proving the truth of their spiritual pretensions.

I have read no more than a hundred pages of Bacon's voluminous writings, and I have not seen the translations from which Greenberg quotes, but I feel convinced that Bacon was at least a deist, and was willing to identify the creative god in whom he believed with the one worshipped by the Church in which he was an ecclesiastic. In one passage, which Greenberg could have cited, he says that ancient writers, such as Aristotle, who investigated and ascertained the operations of nature, must have been directly inspired by his god. How much of Biblical mythology he believed is rault perceived. A glass slipper is not only something wonderful and fairy-like in itself, but it is rigid and would thus defeat the efforts of the women who tried to fit it onto their bigger feet, whereas a fur slipper (probably ermine, as befits princesses) would have been soon pulled out of shape.

3. He was accused of being the author of the famous and now lost treatise, *De tribus impostoribus* (i.e., the three scoundrels, Moses, Jesus, and Mahomet, who deluded their contemporaries with their fictions). It is most improbable that Frederick was the author, but it is quite possible that he had read and approved the iconoclastic book.

quite another question. He certainly expressed no doubts that would have been suicidal,<sup>4</sup> but some contemporary theologians believed him to be secretly a heretic; they may have been right, but we have no means of knowing. The basis of their accusation of heresy may have been no more than a perception that all scientific investigation of nature was deleterious to the superstitions that were their stock in trade.

It is not worthwhile to spend the time and energy needed to verify Greenberg's quotations and statements about Bacon's scientific achievements. The quotations seem to me to be accurate, and it is true that Bacon's achievements were amazingly great for his time. He probably did invent gunpowder and design, at least in imagination, a telescope, as he imagined a machine that would imitate the movement of a bird's wings and so enable men to fly. But these fanciful inventions were extrapolations from facts he had learned experimentally in the manner of Aristotle, and entirely apart from his Neoplatonic theological fancies.

There is one gross error that is significant since it illustrates the operation of a mental process quite commonly found among our political allies. Greenberg writes:

"The evidence that Bacon built a compound microscope and a telescope lies in a mysterious document, discovered in a chest in a castle in southern Italy by antiquarian Wilfrid Voynich in 1912.<sup>5</sup> This encrypted work [was] decoded in the 1920s by...William R. Newbold of the University of Pennsylvania.... Newbold's deciphering was dismissed as 'groundless'...after the untimely death of Newbold, when a neo-inquisition arose to suppress Bacon's work because of its potential to overturn the corpus of Aristotelian dogma."

This is what Greenberg says, although he has read or, at least, cites in his bibliography, an irrefragable demonstration that Newbold's "decipherment" was an illusion, because (a) Newbold takes as symbols not the characters of the otherwise unknown 'alphabet,' but small portions of them, probably marked off by

4. Polemics about the legal limitations of papal power and the corruption of the contemporary clergy are quite another matter. They might make a man unpopular, but were too well embodied in the traditions of the church and its internal competition to serve as a reason for overt persecution.

5. Greenberg cannot be charged with falsification here. He is following the cover-story told by Voynich when he agreed to conceal the name of the Italian family from whom he bought the unique and enigmatic manuscript as a profitable investment.

flaking of the ink on parchment, and (b) one of his symbols may represent two or even three letters of the Latin alphabet, thus permitting anagrams, of which the potential is seldom suspected even by persons who in the games of their childhood solved such puzzles as "Paddle your own OCEAN." Newbold's decipherment would permit one to find a statement in respectable Latin that I wrote the manuscript.

It is true that Newbold's prestige put into reference books for a while his claims that Bacon had invented a microscope and telescope, which were based more on what he had read in Bacon's known works and what he imagined the many pictures and diagrams in the manuscript to represent than on the scraps of text he had "deciphered." These statements naturally disappeared from reference works and the writings of responsible authors after the falsity of his "decipherment" was conclusively demonstrated.

For an excellent description of the Voynich manuscript, complete with photographs of some pages, and an account of the very many attempts that have been made to read it, see *The Voynich Manuscript—an Elegant Enigma*, by M(ary) E. D'Impero (Laguna Hills, California; Aegean Park Press, s.a.; still in print). I have written a fairly long critique for the author and publisher, but it does not deserve space in *Liberty Bell*.

The substance of the relevant facts is this. Palaeographic considerations, admittedly not conclusive, place the date of the writing in the Fifteenth Century or later. The first trace of the manuscript appears, perhaps significantly, in the time of the "Rosicrucian Enlightenment"<sup>6</sup> in the first part of the Seventeenth Century, when it was apparently in the possession of the celebrated British alchemist, fakir, astrologer, and spy, Dr. John Dee.<sup>7</sup>

6. On which see the magistral work of the late Dr. Frances A. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London, Routledge, 1972; paperback reprint still available).

7. For Dee's activities as a spy, which were greatly facilitated by his reputation as a master of astrological hocus-pocus, see Richard Deacon's *History of the British Secret Service* (New York, Taplinger, 1970), pp. 12-36, 41, with references to his biography of Dee. The latest work about the wily astrologer etc. is by Nicholas H. Clulee, *John Dee's Natural Philosophy: Between Science and Religion* (London, Routledge, 1989). The author is a partisan of his subject and does not sufficiently allow for the extent to which Dee's expressed opinions were shaped by opportunities for fraud and imposture.

The manuscript is either (a) a hoax, i.e., a meaninglessly mysterious concoction to support a fraudulent tale about a wonderful group of sages who had discovered cosmic secrets, or (b) a statement of a secret doctrine, probably influenced by the Hermetic corpus and the Jewish Kabbalah, and possibly by Dee's "Monas hieroglyphica," expressed in the specially devised symbols of an artificial language, i.e., a one-part code logically arranged.<sup>8</sup>

Greenberg, however, as a faithful hierodule of LaRouche and his Oecumenical Christianity, has to imagine a conspiracy and "neo-inquisition" to depreciate the work of Roger Bacon. It is the besetting sin of persons on our side to imagine conspiracies to account for events of which they emotionally disapprove but which are adequately explained by known causes, thereby providing material that our enemies use to deride "conspiratorial theories" and thus conceal the real forces that are hustling our race to the precipice over which nations disappear from history.

#### ADDENDUM

I have just received a letter from a man who may or may not be or have been a member of LaRouche's organization, of which he obviously has detailed knowledge. He informs me that "Carol White" is a Jewess, whose real name is probably Weiss, and is "one of the Jews who surround LaRouche and try to control the direction of his thinking and activity. They will probably have an easier time of it, now that he is out of the way, leaving the day-to-day supervision of his organization in their hands."

He further informs me that "LaRouche became a millionaire in the '60s through his computer consulting firm," and spent his own money to form his organization. I described the method by which the scoff-law government in Washington procured the fraudulent conviction of LaRouche, but my informant adds the very significant detail that at the trial at which LaRouche was convicted, "it was actually forbidden to mention in court that the reason the loan payments had stopped was that the government

8. In such a code, for example, using the Roman alphabet, A = astronomical terms; AB = stellar bodies; ABA = the sun; ABB = the moon; ABC = a planet; ABCA = Mercury; ABCB = Venus; etc. ABD = "fixed" stars; ABDA = Sirius; ABDB = Aldebran; etc. AC = constellations; ACA = Ursa Maior; ACB = Ursa Minor; etc. AD = the zodiac; ADA = Aries; ADB = Aquarius; etc. AE = aspects; AEA = conjunction; AEB = opposition; AEC = ascending node; etc. AF = phenomena; AFA = total eclipse, AFB = partial eclipse; etc., etc.

had seized the funds!" That is a memorable illustration of the way in which the terrorists who rule us use their hireling courts to give a sickly semblance of legality to their tyrannical oppression of our hated nation. At present, it is not expedient openly to treat Americans, who have not yet been disarmed, as the Semites in Palestine are now treated.

It is greatly to the credit of LaRouche, if, as my informant says, "both the Propositions 64 and 69 in California, requiring enforcement of the public-health laws against AIDS scum, were his work." Both were defeated by "saturation media propaganda," lavishly financed, more than \$20,000,000 for that purpose having been raised in Hollywood alone, obviously from the Sheenies, because the quarantine, "if enforced, would not only reinstitute segregation of the races, but virtually decapitate the Jew/Liberal government."

The writer offers the explanation that "LaRouche was brought up in the socialism of the 1930s with its economic determinism and racial-equality theology, and has never entirely freed himself of it. But, in his intellectual development, he has virtually rediscovered National Socialism, except for biology."

He concludes that LaRouche "has shown both sincerity and effectiveness, and deserves better than you have given him [in my article in the February issue], though his racial blindness is a grave fault."

This information will elucidate to some extent the character of LaRouche, who, however, is much less important than the fact that the slightly disguised dictatorship's effort to eliminate him gives you an excellent indication of the viciousness of the government to which the American boobs voluntarily subjugated themselves. And it is significant that the imprisonment of the leader has placed his organization effectively under the unmitigated control of Jews, with proximate consequences that you will be able to predict for yourself. □

**THOSE WHO WILL NOT READ  
HAVE NO ADVANTAGE OVER THOSE  
WHO CANNOT READ**

## KEEP THE LIBERTY BELL RINGING!

Please remember: *Our* Fight is *Your* fight! Donate whatever you can spare on a regular—monthly or quarterly—basis. Whether it is \$2., \$5., \$20., or \$100. or more, rest assured it is needed here and will be used in our common struggle. If you are a businessman, postage stamps in any denomination are a legitimate business expense—and we need and use many of these here every month—and will be gratefully accepted as donations.

Your donations will help us spread the *Message of Liberty* and *White Survival* throughout the land, by making available additional copies of our printed material to fellow Whites who do not yet know what is in store for them.

Order our pamphlets, booklets, and, most importantly, our reprints of revealing articles which are ideally suited for mass distribution at reasonable cost. Order extra copies of *Liberty Bell* for distribution to your circle of friends, neighbors, and relatives, urging them to subscribe to our unique publication. Our bulk prices are shown on the inside front cover of every issue of *Liberty Bell*.

Pass along your copy of *Liberty Bell*, and copies of reprints you obtained from us, to friends and acquaintances who may be on our "wave length," and urge them to contact us for more of the same.

Carry on the fight to free our White people from the shackles of alien domination, even if you can only join our ranks in spirit. You can provide for this by bequest. The following are suggested forms of bequests which you may include in your Last Will and Testament:

1. I bequeath to Mr. George P. Dietz, as Trustee for Liberty Bell Publications, P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA, the sum of \$ . . . . . for general purposes.

2. I bequeath to Mr. George P. Dietz, as Trustee for Liberty Bell Publications, P.O. Box 21, Reedy WV 25270 USA, the following described property . . . . . for general purposes.

**DO YOUR PART TODAY—HELP FREE OUR WHITE  
RACE FROM ALIEN DOMINATION!**