

National Socialism in Context:
Russia and Christian Germany under Hitler

Matthew Raphael Johnson
Johnstown, PA

Hitler's works aren't secret. They're available to anyone who wants to read them. Its an unfortunate fact that even reading such materials won't have an impact on the deeply ingrained myths and fables that are told are "history." Reading Hitler's works can only lead to a totally revised view of the man and his movement. Due to fear, it usually doesn't. One major area is Hitler's connection of the nation to the Christian faith, in Germany shared by the modern Lutherans and the Roman Catholics, concentrated in the southern regions. Hitler's own speeches are living monuments to the ignorance of the talking classes in the west. He saw himself as a Christian nationalist bringing a great nation out of the violently imposed Versailles suicide pact.

The intellectual climate of the western world has become so corroded that, for some people, saying anything about them is accepted without comment. Adolf Hitler and Donald Trump, just to name two, are examples. A writer can say anything, so long as its a horrific accusation, and it will be believed by the public and, especially, peer-reviewers and the press. A common accusation – albeit a strange one – against Hitler is that he's a “pagan.” This accusation is used to gain the trust and support of the Right.

For people the ruling class want the world to hate, they must approach both general factions in the political world with different sets of “truths.” For Hitler, to the Left, he was a “racist” while for the Right, he must be a “pagan.” A similar technique is used against Stalin. Once he rounded up the Old Reds, who were almost all Jews, he was transformed into an “Antisemite.” He was no such thing, but the accusation was used to cover over the fact that the Bolsheviki were primarily a Jewish national movement. Overnight, Stalin became a “national communist” despite the fact that the Jewish Left backed Stalinism from the first day.

“Truth” for the ruling class is always strategic; it is coherentist at the expense of correspondence. To maintain the paradigm, facts stubbornly refusing to be absorbed into the juggernaut are violently repressed. This is essential to modern liberalism. Today's liberal pretends he cares about openness while vehemently backing campus speech codes that ban almost all forms of communication except that which is officially approved. The resulting cognitive dissonance is responsible for the screaming, overcompensating, pathetic liberal Beta male skulking around the faculty lounge in dire fear he won't be deemed Leftist enough. Tenure comes at a high price.

In this paper, Hitler's “pagan” credentials will be examined. Few historians know much about Hitler because they realize that, so long as the accusation is negative, it will be believed. Given this, there's no real motive to dig into the actual facts. This is reinforced by the fact that, as a historian at a university, the greatest fear is to be smeared as a “Holocaust denier.” Therefore, serious investigation is discouraged. If it leads to “improper” results, the possible cognitive dissonance might be excessively uncomfortable. This phenomena is of immense significance. Without it, the modern liberal is just an irrational screamer. This reality is exceptionally underrated among dissident writers. “Knowing too much” is a curse if you live in that

environment. This writer doesn't operate under such strictures.

I feel it necessary to state at the outset that the *Table Talks* are a fake and therefore, I won't be quoting from them. Konteradmiral Karl-Jesco von Puttkamer, present at all or most of these, stated that he never saw Martin Bormann ever taking notes. It's also stretching credulity to think that Hitler didn't notice the note taking. If he wanted his comments to be recorded, he would have had a stenographer present or just published these thoughts himself. Even if it did derive from real notes, David Irving has stated that it was so loaded with interpolations as to make them useless.

The most convincing evidence against these *Talks* is that Hitler wouldn't have said most of these. There are too many ignorant comments that give the author away. The writer of these forgeries must have been very ignorant of both National Socialism and the European world at the time. At the very least, he had an agenda.

For example, these *Table Talks* have this quote:

The best thing is to let Christianity die a natural death. When understanding of the universe has become widespread. . . Christian doctrine will be convicted of absurdity. Christianity has reached the peak of absurdity. And that's why someday its structure will collapse. The only way to get rid of Christianity is to allow it to die little by little.... Christianity the liar. We'll see to it that the Churches cannot spread abroad teachings in conflict with the interests of the State.

As the reader will see below, this is the precisely opposite of what Hitler believed. He personally subsidized the churches in Germany and encouraged them without fail. Hitler's Christianity might have been non-specific, but it was quite real. There is too much in his public speeches that belies the ignorant opinion cited in the book.

Here's another comment Hitler would never have made: "If this war had not taken place, the Reich would scarcely have increased its population during the next ten years, but the Russian population would have grown vigorously." This is idiotic because Hitler was aware of the toll that the purges and camps were taking on the Russian population. He had no reason to believe the population would grow, especially after Stalin's collectivization starved half of Ukraine. Hitler also granted substantial tax breaks for families having children. The population exploded under his early rule, right up until 1940.

Another is, "The safety of Europe will not be assured until we have driven Asia back behind the Urals. No organized Russian State must be allowed to exist west of that line. They are brutes, and neither Bolshevism nor Tsarism makes any difference — they are brutes in a state of nature." Making reference to this is curious. The "state of nature" is an ideological construct used in Enlightenment political thought, most notably Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. Would Hitler be familiar with it to this extent? It is unlikely, since he never referenced such doctrines elsewhere. Beyond that, it's a false quote because in speech after speech, Hitler makes a careful distinction between Russia and the Bolsheviki. Hitler usually speaks in fairly high regard of true Russians and, regardless, he argues that the USSR is ruled by Jews, not Russians. Hence, this wouldn't be a statement he would make.

In this same vein, we read "The Russians were entitled to attack their priests, but they had no right to assail the idea of a supreme force." Hitler would never make a stupid statement like this because his oft-stated belief was that the Jews attacked the church in Russia, never

“Russians.” Why would they attack their own priests? Just a page prior, he says Russians are “totally subject” to these same priests. One of his regular accusations is that the Jews who took over Russia in 1918 could be identified as Jews precisely because they attacked the church. Russians couldn't be “totally subject” to priests after the Jewish communists had destroyed the church.

After railing against Russians for pages and pages, calling them “uncivilized,” incapable of scientific thought and “stupid,” he says, “What confirmed me in my decision to attack [Russia] without delay was the information brought by a German mission lately returned from Russia, that a single Russian factory was producing by itself more tanks than all our factories together.” Either Russians are ignorant, or they're outperforming German industry. It can't be both. In fact, these alleged “table talks” go from thinking Russians are “very clever” to “stupid” constantly. Hitler wasn't known for inconsistency, especially on such a critical topic.

He also says a few pages later: “The war against Finland in 1940, for instance, was nothing but a great piece of camouflage on their part, for even then Russia possessed armed forces which placed her among the first of the Powers on a par with Germany and Japan.” This is quite an accomplishment for a group that is uniformly ignorant and uncivilized. Hitler would never be so inconsistent and foolish. Jewish Bolshevism was a major target of his attacks and was anything but a minor part of his mentality.

This one is just plain asinine: “The Jews must pack up, disappear from Europe. Let them go to Russia. Where the Jews are concerned, I'm devoid of all sense of pity.” Why would they “go to Russia?” The whole point of the invasion is to destroy the Jewish dominated Bolshevik regime. If Hitler wanted “living space” there, why send the Jews there? He would have been thought insane for saying something like this.

The constant references to “Russia” without the modifier “Bolshevik” are also suspicious, since Hitler was quite preoccupied with this topic. His railing against the “priest-ridden Orthodox church” is equally absurd since a) he rebuilt the Berlin cathedral of the Russian Church in Exile with his own money; b) he knew the Reds were demolishing the church and spoke about it often and c) he promoted Metropolitan Seraphim Lade, a German, as the head of this same church in the Reich. He would never speak of the “priest-ridden” church in an officially atheist state. The author of the *Talks* is not only a deceiver, but isn't even a good faker. Readers will believe this only because they need to.

Francois Genoud was the main promoter of these “*Talks*,” and over time, eventually admitted either forging these or misquoting them to an extreme degree. Genoud is also the “author” of the fabrication, *Hitler's Political Testament*. David Irving relates that he was told by Genoud, after admitting he changed many quotes, “But it's just what Hitler would have said, isn't it?” This is a common justification for invented quotes and forgeries such as the *Protocols of Zion*. He justifies his fraud by stating that, since it's what Hitler actually believed, it's not really a hoax.

Martin Bormann was one of the more anti-Christian ideologues in the Third Reich. He had every reason to misrepresent Hitler in this regard. Much of the content of the *Talks* are Bormann, not Hitler. Hitler didn't speak like this and never used such coarse language, especially around colleagues. He was famously an articulate speaker. He couldn't have expressed himself in this crude way. Even for this reason alone, one should doubt the veracity of these *Talks*.

Richard Carrier, while of spotty reliability on other issues, explains in his (2017) “Hitler's *Table Talk*: An Update”

Here we have, within literally just days, the actual words of Hitler being distorted and filtered through the faulty memories, wishes and interpretations, and deliberate alterations, of several parties. And this was not even oral transmission, but in writing! Picker relayed slightly different memories than Heim's, and even relayed the incomplete memories of Heim, who was continuing to 'alter the text' after transmitting an earlier version of it to Picker. And then, within mere years, less than a decade in fact, these distorted texts were altered even further, when they were translated into other languages.

These few paragraphs have shown that the *Talks* are a fake, but even if they contain a kernel of truth, they're useless. Hitler didn't speak or write like this. He denies some of his most important political positions. It makes no sense except as a fantasy Hitler from the mind of Bormann. Many parts go against what Hitler knew at the time. Not only do these *Talks* fail even a basic test of internal consistency, but they show an ideology totally at odds with Hitler's speeches, writings and policies. They are therefore rejected as source material.

*

World War II was by far the most significant event of the last 200 years. Nothing on planet earth was ever the same, especially in terms of political ideology. Nothing succeeds like victory in war. Your opponent is almost subconsciously discredited ideologically by all sides once it suffers such a total and all encompassing defeat as Germany and Japan did in 1945. Stalin and FDR/Truman then divided the world between the allied forces of the Left: liberalism and Marxism. Nationalism and traditional conservatism were relegated to the fringes of society. It should be noted, given official sponsorship, the same didn't happen to Leninism after 1990, proving how artificially propped up Leftism has become.

National Socialist writer James Miller nicely summed up the nature of the Second World War in his "If Hitler Won World War II We'd Have A Better, More Just World Today," published online at *Immigration, Globalization, Political Correctness: The Jewish Elites Attack On The Western World*. He explicates the above in some depth:

However, in the final analysis, WWII was essentially a war between two competing ideologies: Nationalism vs Jewish Internationalism/globalism. Adolf Hitler and his allies fought to preserve the concept of Nationalism, not just for Germans but for all peoples the world over. Nationalism really just means the sovereignty of an ethnic people and the right of such ethnic people/nationalists—within their own bordered country—to self-determination. What is meant by self-determination? Self determination just means an ethnic people preserving their unique culture and heritage and pursuing their collective goals as a unique people.

While Miller defines self-determination and nationalism identically, the idea here is valuable and reflects what Hitler actually thought he was doing. In an age of enforced ignorance and blind conformity, this definition is one of the best, simplest and most succinct expressions of the National Socialist idea in print. There is no nation without the *ethnos*. Nationalism is not intrinsically connected to the state or even a specific form of leadership. It is the specific ethnic group and those ties, biological, historical, religious and geographic, that hold them together.

Without the *ethnos*, no society can function. In fact, no society can exist at all.

National Socialism is not Fascism. Mussolini infamously defines Fascism as the nation being the product of state action. In other words, the *ethnos* is an artificial creation of the state. In his *Doctrine of Fascism* he says succinctly

In so far as it is embodied in a State, this higher personality becomes a nation. It is not the nation which generates the State; that is an antiquated naturalistic concept which afforded a basis for 19th century publicity in favor of national governments. Rather is it the State which creates the nation, conferring volition and therefore real life on a people made aware of their moral unity.

This differs radically from Hitler's idea of nationalism. For him, the *ethnos* is hardly artificial. While Mussolini's doctrine can be interpreted in several ways, he could not be clearer that the "nation," that is, an ethnic group, is non-existent without the state that brings it to life. Certainly, unifying two separate nations that make up Italy helped create this idea. When he refers to "19th century publicity" or publicism, he is likely referring to Johann Herder and the Romantic movement who theorized a sort of Ethnoanarchism that Mussolini finds repugnant.

What makes the 1920s and 1930s such an era of ferment was that first, the war had destroyed the best of European manhood; second, the Soviet Union was militant in its desire to subvert all the governments of the world by force and finally, liberal democratic capitalism was exposed as a decrepit, oligarchic malady that had plunged the world into Depression through short term thinking and speculation. Hitler alone brought Germany out of it. Therefore, the state form taken in Germany was a response to these realities.

Miller reminds us what the world would look like had Hitler won the war. There is a massive number of these, but Miller reduces it to 18. They are listed here, though I've abbreviated most of them:

- 1—No USSR
- 2—No Cold War
- 3—No Communist Eastern Europe/Iron Curtain
- 4—No Red China and Mao's subsequent killing of 40-60 million Chinese
- 5—No Communist North Vietnam
- 6—No Communist Cambodia and Pol Pot's slaughter of 2 million Cambodians
- 7—No dividing Korea into North Korea and South Korea
- 8—No Communist Cuba
- 9—No Communism anywhere
- 10—Liberalism and multiculturalism wouldn't dominate Western ethos
- 11—No Cultural Marxism and no political correctness
- 12—No third world immigration into Western nations
- 13—No depraved filth on TV, in movies, etc.
- 14—No widespread pornography
- 15—There would still be prayer in public schools
- 16—No man-hating radical feminist movement
- 17—No Israel and all the problems it has brought the USA and the immeasurable misery it has wrought on the Palestinians.
- 18—Jews would be living in Madagascar (perhaps) and would be carefully monitored.

(Madagascar was one place Hitler considered as a Jewish homeland).

No one can deny this. World War II was fought to make the world safe for Stalin and his successors, Mao and Pol Pot, to slaughter upwards of 80 million people. Yet, schoolchildren are told that this was all worth it in order to “rescue” the Jews from a “madman that wanted to conquer the world.” This is the essence of Jewish self-centeredness, arrogance and self-absorption.

Had Hitler won the war, his intent was clear as far as the Jews were concerned: without the British to veto the plan, he would have sent the Jews of Europe to the Mideast to create a Jewish homeland. Number 18 above does not conflict with 17. The *Haavara* (“Transfer”) Agreement, signed on August 22 1933, and the support he received from German Zionists is evidence of this. In fact, before the war, several thousand Jews were sent to the Middle East under the Agreement, subsidized by Hitler's Germany, with their assets intact. Coins still exist showing the Hexagram of Solomon (the so called “Star of David”) on one side and the swastika on the other. It should also be noted that most of the anti-Jewish groups of 19th century Europe, the Union of the Russian People included, wanted the transfer of Jews outside of Europe. Thus, Zionism and anti-Jewish thought found themselves allies. No one necessarily wanted it to be called “Israel,” which is an insult to actual Israelites, but the basic Zionist idea seemed an important aspect of this movement in general.

There are certainly far more than 18 positive consequences for an Axis victory, but those mentioned by Miller are the most important. The absurdity of a World War II vet “supporting the troops” in Vietnam or Korea reeks of an irony the English language cannot fully express. The average American university professor, the neoconservative “patriot,” and the liberal “progressive” seems incapable of understanding the simple fact that Hitler's loss made Vietnam inevitable.

When my classes on 20th century history reach World War II and Hitler's era, I begin my first lecture like this:

Consider a nation that has just lost three million of its best men in a horrifically bloody war. Almost every family suffered a combat death or serious battlefield injury. The people live in a state of shock from a carnage no one could possibly have predicted at the time. The nation's bankrupt in all senses and cannot care for the millions of men mutilated by the war. The victors have demanded that this nation pay for the entire cost of the war, running into what today would be trillions of dollars. This nation has been blamed for the war and propaganda to this effect floods the airwaves, creating a strong sense of alienation and demoralization. The treaty ending the war demands that any growth in its economy will be confiscated by its enemies. Tax collection is minimal and evasion is widespread. There's no functional economy because the victors have dismantled all industry. The currency is worthless. Unemployment runs anywhere from 40 to 60 percent. The central bank is controlled by foreigners who run the currency into the ground. Riots convulse the streets almost weekly and law enforcement has lost all control. There's no faith in political institutions. The legislature is ineffective and deeply divided. The birthrate has collapsed. To the east, a massive empire many times the size of this nation seeks to destroy it and says so loudly. In fact, its enemies have

already occupied strategic parts of the country and other regions seem on the brink of falling too. To the west, economically important parts of this country have also been occupied. Anything of value has been taken and this country's enemies have made it clear that, in order for it not to be a "threat" again, it will be turned into a pastoral economy used for labor and resources. Of course, there's no army, navy or airforce to speak of. The country is "ruled" by a small oligarchy that controls its remaining wealth in exchange for enforcing the treaty that holds that nation in bondage. Morality has collapsed. Culture has collapsed. Civic virtue has collapsed. Confusion reigns. The world's first sexual revolution has been launched by this nation's internal enemies. The culture and religion of the nation has been mocked and reduced to something of little value. Keep in mind too that the population is quite aware that, just a few years ago, this nation was a feared powerhouse both economically and militarily and with a scientific establishment considered then and now to be the best in the world. Now. . .
You've just been elected president.
What do you do?

Many undergraduates are unaware I'm speaking of Germany after World War I. The Versailles Treaty said all the above and more. Uttering this, students suddenly see Hitler not as a comic book bad guy, but a desperate man who sought all the power he could to wrest his nation away from these vultures. No one in the universe today thinks the Versailles Treaty was legitimate. At the time, it was seen as "progressive."

In order to understand any leader or national experience, the historian must understand them as they understood themselves. History is the analysis of contexts. Contemporary ideological fads and media-generated "issues" cannot be imposed on these events. That's the opposite of scholarship. It's what scholarship exists to combat. Yet, the only purpose for universities under the present, postwar Regime is the justification of Leftist and globalist doctrine.

Don't think I've avoided asking this precise, long question to other professors. They too have never considered Hitler in this context. "Hitler, love him or hate him, pulled off the impossible. In a few years, Hitler helped transform this disaster into one of the most prosperous, unified, energetic, culturally significant and militarily feared nations in the world." Not a word of the above is false and can't be denied by even the most rabidly anti-Hitler polemicist.

My lectures are famously objective. My goal is to express an ideology, philosophical school or historical event the way the actors themselves understood it, not in accordance with modern ideological trends. I've never, ever used editorial rhetoric in my classes, unlike my colleagues, some of whom treat the classroom as their own "re-education camp" which, in fact, it resembles. Yet, this objectivity is said to be my great sin. "We don't deny his ability," my academic detractors state uniformly, "we just don't like where his questions all seem to lead students." I'm sorry to say that this was said about me directly by the department chair after one of my firings, its a direct quote, but in my 22 years of teaching, I've heard this a half dozen times in various universities as I'm shown the door.

In the social sciences and humanities, students are not educated, they are indoctrinated. Universities are based on false advertising and fraud, but since "education" doesn't refer to anything, a university cannot be sued for it. Once, I was told, in writing, that "asking why Hitler didn't use poison gas to fight the Russians once the war was lost isn't scholarship worthy of the

name here.” Unfortunately, I no longer have this document, but it likely still exists on file somewhere.

Hitler's ideology has been entirely invented by this same class of tenured frauds. Any invention is acceptable and enters peer-reviewed texts as a “fact.” Opposition to this fantasy is met with threats of violence and employment termination. I know this from experience. It's cost me my career. Regardless of their frothing at the mouth, the facts remain stubborn and my conscience remains clear. I want to note that the chair who uttered the above words resigned that very semester. The student newspaper immediately said it was “because of the firing of Dr. J.” In fact, that university had to go on record denying this, so widespread was the sentiment.

Rather than fantasy, the real Hitler was quite different. As the Red Army began closing in on Berlin, Hitler stated:

God the Almighty has made our nation. By defending its existence we are defending His work. The fact that this defense is fraught with incalculable misery, suffering and hardships makes us even more attached to this nation But it also gives us that hard will needed to fulfill our duty even in the most critical struggle; that is, not only to fulfill our duty toward the decent, noble Germans, but also our duty toward those few infamous ones who turn their backs on their people (January 30 1945).

This represents Hitler's mature thinking on the matter. This is very late in the war and Hitler was just a few months from committing suicide and he was aware of what the Soviet animals were going to do once they reached Berlin. To say that God “made” the German nation is to say that nations are derived from God's will and are a part of creation. They represent a “species” of man no different than in the animal kingdom.

Much earlier, attacking the culture of the Weimar state I artfully described above, he said:

And culture meanwhile received no support. Instead, it was abandoned to the arbitrary reign of crazed ideas and distortions. Religion, too, had to take a back seat. In these fifteen years, not one Englishman recalled the Christian ideals of charity or of love for one's fellow man. The gentlemen went for walks not with the bible under their arms, but with the Treaty of Versailles in hand as their bible. It contained those 440 articles, all of which represented a burden, an obligation, an indictment, and an extortion of Germany. The League of Nations guaranteed this Versailles. It was not an association of free and equal nations. It was not even a League of Nations; its founding father refused it recognition from the start. It was a so-called League of Nations with the sole intent of guaranteeing this most vile of all Diktats. Its mission was to force us to fulfill this Diktat (January 30 1940).

Hitler was popular because he was the only politician who was willing to risk his life talking like this. He was correct on all counts and, if confronted, all anti-Hitler writers will be forced to concede the obvious. Like Nuremberg later on, Weimar was the creation of “victor's justice” and had nothing to do with righteousness in any recognizable sense. In the same speech, he said

Mr. Churchill is already dying to start [a war]. He cherishes the hope, as expressed

by intermediaries as well as by his own person, that bombardment should finally, and as soon as possible, feature in this war. And already they are crying that this war should not pay heed to women and children [*called "Browning" by the RAF – MRJ*]. For when has England ever paid heed to women and children?! After all, this entire blockade warfare is nothing other than a war against women and children, just as once was the case in the Boer War. It was then that concentration camps were invented. The English brain gave birth to this idea. We only read about it in the encyclopedias and later copied it—with one crucial difference: England locked up women and children in these camps. Over twenty thousand Boer women died wretchedly at the time. Why should England fight differently today? We have anticipated this and we have prepared ourselves (ibid).

Hitler hit a raw nerve. The “death camp” fictions were invented from the same people who actually used them. During World War I, the Hungarians had several camps where Serbs and other ethnic enemies were interred. Many died of exposure and malnutrition. After the war, millions of German civilians and POWs were slaughtered deliberately by the militaries of the US, UK and USSR, the “Allies.”

The Soviets “liberated” all the “death camps” to the East, inventing their own version of events as they had an incentive to do. Covering up their many crimes was an important drive at the time and therefore, Hitler had to be made as sinister as possible, but the term “Holocaust” wasn't created until right after the Six Day War when Israel began coming under heavy criticism. It's an arrogant neologism and misnomer.

Hitler invited the Red Cross into these “death camps” and they received a clean bill of health. The ICRC remarked on the substantial hospital facilities for inmates at all the major camps they visited. Strangely, this fact exists in no history book used in high schools or universities. Such a momentous statement by the Red Cross would be noteworthy for any other circumstance. Stalin, it hardly needs to be said, refused a visit from them.

In Mein Kampf

The Jewish doctrine of Marxism rejects the aristocratic principle of Nature and replaces the eternal privilege of power and strength with the mass of numbers and their dead weight. Thus it denies personal worth, contests the significance of folk and race, and thereby withdraws from mankind premise for its existence and culture. As a foundation of the universe, it would lead to the end of any order intellectually conceivable to man. . . .If, with the help of his Marxist creed, the Jew is victorious over the peoples of the world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of mankind and this planet will—as it once did for millions of years—move through the ether devoid of men (MK, Vol I, ch 2).

Marxism is just utilitarianism. Workers are “correct” because there are more of them. Marx nowhere tells readers why “labor” should be privileged in this system. That is, unless you already accept materialism as true, then physical production is all there is. Even Churchill recognized the Jewish nature of Marxism, as did all his contemporaries. Upwards of 80 percent of the first Supreme Soviet were Jews. They made up maybe two percent of the country at the time. Of course, the Soviet state had nothing to do with “workers” in any normal sense of the term. It was about enriching a small group of people at the expense of labor. In distinction to this,

Hitler said early on,

The National Government [of Germany] will regard it as their first and foremost duty to revive in the nation the spirit of unity and cooperation. They will preserve and defend those basic principles on which our nation has been built up. They regard Christianity as the foundation of our national morality, and the family as the basis of national life. They are determined, without regard for class and social status, to restore the nation to a consciousness of its political and national unity and of the duties consequent upon this realization. They intend to make respect for our glorious past and pride in our ancient traditions the ground principles for the education of German youth. In this way they will wage a pitiless warfare upon spiritual, political and cultural Nihilism. Germany must not, Germany shall not go under in the chaos of Communism (Proclamation by the Government to the German Nation, Berlin, February 1933).

Its one thing to objectively have a great history. Its quite another to be aware of this. Presently, the postwar west has had its history manipulated and distorted in the interests of the victors of World War II. Socialism is merely negative. Only the historical nation creates positive content, that is, ends to be pursued. Material production isn't a moral fact.

This is why National Socialism was popular. He was a man of his word. The description of Weimar Germany above was still very much in force when those words were spoken. National Socialism is “totalitarian” in the sense that the nation is a single, all encompassing entity affecting all parts of life. This certainly includes religion and education. In one of Hitler's essential ideological speeches from 1933:

The advantages of a personal and political nature that might arise from compromising with atheistic organizations would not outweigh the consequences which would become apparent in the destruction of general moral basic values. The National Government regard the two Christian confessions as the weightiest factors for the maintenance of our nationality. They will respect the agreements concluded between them and the federal States. Their rights are not to be infringed. But the Government hope and expect that the work on the national and moral regeneration of our nation which they have made their task will, on the other hand, be treated with the same respect. They will adopt an attitude of objective justice towards all other confessions. But they cannot permit that the fact of belonging to a certain confession or a certain race should constitute a release from general legal obligations or even a license for the commission with impunity or the toleration of crimes. It will be the Government's care to maintain honest cooperation between Church and State; the struggle against materialistic views and for a real national community is just as much in the interest of the German nation as in that of the welfare of our Christian faith (Speech to the Reichstag on 23 March 1933).

The unity of the nation came first in a time of extreme crisis. No Christian faction had any interest in anything else. Hitler clearly argues here that Christianity doesn't exist in a vacuum. It must be communicated to others and have an arena within which it works itself out.

This is the nation.

Atheism is the foundation of nihilism. In fact, it is nihilism. Atheism cannot be justified philosophically. The discovery of DNA destroyed the Darwinian mythology of the 19th century British ruling classes. Germany was at the point almost of no return when these words were spoken. She would have disappeared had Hitler not spoken them, which of course, would suit many just fine. Genocide against Germans, it seems, is always acceptable.

Weimar was a disaster for Germany, and, like it or not, Jews were at the center. The main ones were Gustav Landauer, Rosa Luxemburg, Kurt Eisner, Leo Jogiches, Ernst Toller, Erich Muhsam, Eugen Levine, Paul Levi and Karl Radek, just to name a few. As Leon Degrelle and others mentioned, the two delegates that helped impose austerity on Germany were Prussian Chief Minister Paul Hirsch and the infamous Otto Landsberg. It was Hugo Preuss who wrote that wretched Constitution.

Hitler made reference to the Jewish nature of Weimar. How Jewish was it? Walther Rathenau was Foreign Minister, Rudolf Hilferding was the Finance Minister, Bernard Weiss was chief of the federal police and Eduard Bernstein headed the Social Democratic Party.

Because of this, Germany became the Las Vegas of Europe. E. Michael Jones spends quite a bit of time on the work of Magnus Hirschfeld, the architect of the Sexual Revolution, creating the "Institute of Sexual Research," located in Berlin, which acted like an early Kinsey Institute, celebrating all kinds of sexual fetishes, conducting trans-surgery research and everything else hoisted on western man today.

The cinema was Jewish, the main directors and producers were, among others, Max Reinhardt, Paul Davidson, Joseph Mandel, Jules Greenbaum, Otto Wallburg, Josef von Sternberg, Fritz Kohn, Peter "Lorre" Lowenstein. Porn existed too and is traditional a Jewish enterprise. In Germany, it was in the hands of Kurt Tucholsky among many other Jews. The press was under the control of, among others, Theodore Wolff, Georg Bernhard and Rudolf Mosse. Keep in mind too that all of this was done under the dominance of a collapsed economy.

One of the most absurd charges laid at Hitler's feet is that he "invaded Poland and started World War II." This is absurd because Poland's army was about four times the size of Germany's at the time. Hitler was aware that his forces were hardly ready for a battle against a sizable and militant foe and therefore, settlements were always needed. Germany had little choice, but soon, the Allies, while assisting Stalin's invasion of Poland on the very same day in September of 1939, started the war over it. Then, in one of the most demented historical ironies of all time, ended up giving the whole country to Stalin in 1946 regardless.

More than a decade earlier, he stated:

And finally we were also the first to point the people on any large scale to a danger which insinuated itself into our midst – a danger which millions failed to realize and which will nonetheless lead us all into ruin – the Jewish danger. And today people are saying yet again that we were "agitators." I would like here to appeal to a greater than I, Count Lerchenfeld. He said in the last session of the *Landtag* that his feeling as a man and a Christian prevented him from being an anti-Semite. I say: my feeling as a Christian points me to my Lord and Savior as a fighter. It points me to the man who once in loneliness, surrounded only by a few people, recognized the Jews for what they were and summoned men to fight to fight against them and who, God's truth was greatest not as sufferer but as a fighter. In

boundless love as a Christian and as a man I read through the passage which tells us how the Lord at last rose in His might and seized the scourge to drive out of the Temple the brood of vipers and of adders. How terrific was His fight for the world against the Jewish poison. Today, after two thousand years, with deepest emotion I recognize more profoundly than ever before – the fact that it was for this that He had to shed His blood upon the Cross. As a Christian I have no duty to allow myself to be cheated, but I have the duty to be a fighter for truth and justice. And as a man I have the duty to see to it that human society does not suffer the same catastrophic collapse as did the civilization of the ancient world some two thousand years ago – a civilization which was driven to its ruin through this same Jewish people (Munich, April 1922).

Hitler saw Christ as a warrior for justice, not too far removed from his own crucible of suffering at Weimar. Hitler saw himself as continuing His work on the social plane. Those who believe he was some sort of atheist or pagan are either too ignorant or lazy to read. Hitler realized the truth that Christ wasn't some long haired hippy, but was rather a difficult, "extremist," often nasty and fierce prophet condemning an entire group of people, that is, the predecessors of the rabbis, the Pharisees and other faux-Israelite elites. Today, Christ would be in a German prison for "inciting ethnic hatred."

Christ's contempt for the Pharisees, from whom the Talmud derives, was as harsh and uncompromising as it was righteous. While Hitler's remark that these are the "same Jewish people" is only true in an ideological sense, the truth of the overall sentiment remains.

In that same speech, he stated:

And if there is anything which could demonstrate that we are acting rightly, it is the distress which daily grows. For as a Christian I have also a duty to my own people. And when I look on my people I see it work and work and toil and labor, and at the end of the week it has only for its wage wretchedness and misery. When I go out in the morning and see these men standing in their queues and look into their pinched faces, then I believe I would be no Christian, but a very devil, if I felt no pity for them, if I did not, as did our Lord two thousand years ago, turn against those by whom today this poor people is plundered and exploited.

Social policy was determined in no small part by the New Testament. Pity for the weak is a part of the National Socialist program and all the modern myths about Hitler fall to pieces. Its shocking to note how radical this was considered among the German "rightists" at the time, thinking that Hitler was preaching some sort of "Bolshevism." A few months later, he said:

Just as the Jew could once incite the mob of Jerusalem against Christ, so today he must succeed in inciting folk who have been duped into madness to attack those who, God's truth! seek to deal with this people in utter honesty and sincerity. And so he begins to intimidate them, and he knows that this pressure in itself is enough to shut the mouths of hundreds, yes, of thousands (Munich, July 1922).

On Palm Sunday, the Israelite population praised Jesus to the skies, bringing him into Jerusalem as a Savior. In a panic, the Pharisees, our Talmudists, needed to scam their way into

having these same people either go silent, or condemn him, which happened less than a week later. Political democracy is impossible when such people are powerful within it.

In his introduction to Hindenburg's speech on the occasion of the opening of the Reichstag on 21 March 1933, Hitler said:

The place in which we are assembled today summons up memories of the Prussia of former days which became great in the fear of God by devotion to duty, unflinching courage and selfless patriotism, which principles have welded the German peoples into one nation. May the spirit of this hallowed spot inspire the men of today, may it free us from selfish concerns and party strife and join us together in a feeling of devotion to the best of our national traditions and spiritual renewal for the service of a proud, free and united Germany.

The nation is no simple thing. Tradition is the combination of the law, theology and the state hardened in the fires of difficult times and harsh realities. He never reduced the nation to the "state." In Stuttgart in 1933, Hitler responded to a very powerful critic who said his movement was anti-Christian, a charge heard daily today:

And now *Staatspräsident* Bolz says that Christianity and the Catholic faith are threatened by us. And to that charge I can answer: In the first place it is Christians and not international atheists who now stand at the head of Germany. I do not merely talk of Christianity, no, I also profess that I will never ally myself with the parties which destroy Christianity. If many wish today to take threatened Christianity under their protection, where, I would ask, was Christianity for them in these fourteen years when they went arm in arm with atheism? No, never and at no time was greater internal damage done to Christianity than in these fourteen years when a party, theoretically Christian, sat with those who denied God in one and the same Government.

Just a few years later, Stalin crashed into Germany and imposed the most violent atheism on the eastern part of Germany, including Prussia. Yet, even with this reality starting the corrupt "Judeo-Christians" in the face, their mouths were not stopped. In the American mind, no connection is made between defeating Hitler in 1945 and the rule of the far left over the entire globe.

In September of 1922, Hitler said in Munich: "*We demand the immediate expulsion of all Jews who have come to Germany since 1914, and of all those, too, who through trickery on the Stock Exchange or through other shady transactions have gained their wealth*" (emphasis in the original) This was point #8 in the NSDAP's agenda at the time.

In April of 1923, Hitler said in Munich:

Before 1914 there were two States above all, Germany and Russia, which prevented the Jew from reaching his goal – the mastery of the world. Here not everything which they already possessed in the Western democracies had fallen to the Jews. Here they were not the sole lords alike in the intellectual and economic life. Here, too, the Parliaments were not yet exclusively instruments of Jewish capital and of the will of the Jew. The German and the genuine Russian had still

preserved a certain aloofness from the Jew. In both peoples there still lived the healthy instinct of scorn for the Jew, and there was a real danger that in these monarchies there might one day arise a Frederick the Great, a William I, and that democracy and a parliamentary regime might be sent to the devil.

So the Jews became revolutionaries! The Republic should bring them to wealth and to power. This aim they disguised: they cried 'Down with the monarchies!' 'Enthroned the sovereign people!' I do not know whether today one could venture to call the German or the Russian people 'sovereign.' At least one cannot see any trace of it! What the German people can trace, however, what every day stands in the most crass form before its eyes, is debauchery, gluttony, speculation ruling unchecked, the open mockery of the Jew.

The more simplistic among us usually yell that "Hitler wanted to conquer the world." Yet again, basic truth doesn't penetrate. Great Britain *did* rule the world at the time. Combine the banks of The Netherlands, the UK and France and nothing in the world was outside their dominion. More than anything else, the ideas in this speech are what turned the non-Zionist Jews of his day against him. There was nothing new about this since most Germans, many leftists included, accepted this as true. Empirically, Hitler's comments are verifiable, which made him all the more dangerous to the ruling class.

On the question of Russia too there has been great mythmaking. Did Hitler see Russians as inferior species? In an early comment, he said "Before 1914 there were two States above all, Germany and Russia, which prevented the Jew from reaching his goal - the mastery of the world. Here not everything which they already possessed in the Western democracies had fallen to the Jews" (Munich, 1922).

If this step on Germany's part has resulted in a community of interests with Russia, that is due not only to the similarity of the problems affecting the two States, but also to that of the conclusions which both States had arrived at with regard to their future relationship.

In my speech at Danzig I already declared that Russia was organized on principles which differ from those held in Germany. However, since it became clear that Stalin found nothing in the Russian-Soviet principles which should prevent him from cultivating friendly relations with states of a different political creed, National Socialist Germany sees no reason why she should adopt another criterion. The Soviet Union is the Soviet Union, National Socialist Germany is National Socialist Germany. But one thing is certain: from the moment when the two States mutually agreed to respect each other's distinctive regime and principles, every reason for any mutually hostile attitude had disappeared. Long periods in the history of both nations have shown that the inhabitants of these two largest States in Europe were never happier than when they lived in friendship with each other. The Great War, which once made Germany and Russia enemies, was disastrous for both countries (October 6 1939, Berlin).

This proves that Hitler wasn't interested in "world domination" and never sought the imposition of his ideology onto others. He may have thought that elements of Stalinism mirrored his own, especially since Stalin had just purged the party of the Old Bolsheviks, most of whom

were Jews. This wasn't an anti-Jewish policy, just a reminder of the fact that early Bolshevism was Jewish. Hitler was under no illusions: he knew Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin were identical in ideology, purpose, tactics and morality.

Economically, Germany at the time was self-made, the USSR was built on foreign investment from the west. As this writer has stated many times, Anthony Sutton long proved that the industrialization of the USSR had nothing to do with the USSR and everything to do with foreign capitalists who lined up to “build socialism.” This should come as no surprise, since few in the west could define a “Bolshevik” if a pistol were pointed at their heads.

At the time, Germany was far too weak to attack the USSR. As that speech was made, Stalin and Hitler had finished dividing Poland between them. While the attack on a much stronger Poland in 1939 was the cause of war with the west, the fact that the Soviets had attacked from the southeast hadn't occurred to anyone. Most writers on the subject have long forgotten about this inconvenient fact.

On June 22 1941, just as German armies attacked the USSR, Hitler said in Berlin:

The German people has never harbored hostile feelings against the peoples of Russia. However, for more than two decades the Jewish Bolshevik rulers in Moscow had been endeavoring to set aflame not only Germany but all Europe. At no time did Germany ever attempt to carry her National Socialist worldview into Russia, but on the contrary Jewish Bolshevik rulers in Moscow unswervingly endeavored to foist their domination upon us and other European nations, not only by ideological means but above all with military force. The consequences of the activity of this regime were nothing but chaos, misery and starvation in all countries.

It's true that Hitler invaded several neutral countries. He invaded the Netherlands a year before to secure Germany's northern flank. Had he not done this, Germany would be too vulnerable over land. In January of 1923, France and Belgium together invaded the significant industrial region of the Ruhr. This was after the Germans were unable to keep up with reparations payments. Any attack on Germany from these powers, now at war with it, would come through the Low Countries. The same goes for Norway. These invasions weren't done for fun, but to keep the Allies from using these states as beachheads against the German empire.

The Germans wanted to use the Dutch airfields to bomb France and England and to support their own troops. Further, they wanted to use the agricultural resources of the low countries in addition to Germany proper. The Dutch also had a large pro-German party that welcomed the invasion, a very common phenomenon.

The Allies declared war on Germany for its invasion of Poland. This is dark humor since they were the same who gave it away to Stalin a few short years later. The Allies ignored Hitler's many pleas for an alliance, or at least peace, while their own forces were massing in the northern parts of France. Regardless, Belgium and the Netherlands were hardly neutral, but were assisting the Allies at every turn.

There were no German soldiers on this border beforehand, but these two states had amassed armies on the German frontier. This doesn't make sense for a “neutral” stance. Unlike the USSR, the Germans did not impose National Socialism onto these countries. One of the more obnoxious ejaculations of the “Greatest Generation” is the slogan, said with varying degrees of command of the English language, “if we hadn't gone over 'dere, you'd all be speakin' German

today.” Often, its said at a high volume and with a bang of the first afterwards. They're still a few Archie Bunkers still around spouting this nonsense.

Not only did the USSR impose Leninism onto the countries they conquered, they often forced the Russian language on the elite too, especially through the school system. Being able to speak Russian was certainly a plus for those cooperating with the Soviet regime. Hitler could barely hide his shock at the fact that the western allies would ally against Germany and support a regime in the USSR that actively sought to destroy them all, at least in public.

This paper has shown without a doubt that Hitler was no pagan, no imperialist and nothing other than a nationalist politician in a war-torn and crisis-ridden Germany. As I used to say to students, what options were available to a president of a nation in the state Germany was in during the 1920s? Germany had fallen from the world's most advanced economy to the third world overnight.

The historian's job is to see historical actors the way they see themselves. Few establishments are less competent than the American academic historian. Tenured, overpaid and lazy, the average academic historian is content with the typical “white hat-black hat” version of events that makes a mockery of their position and brings their competence into serious doubt. The typical academic is far more concerned with being called a “racist” or “sexist” than telling the truth. White male professors live under a reign of terror and fear. Mentioning it to them will usually lead to a macho posturing and angry denials, thereby affirming it.

The average professor in the social sciences and humanities, at least the white males, are cowardly incompetents. Women are usually pushed through classes and installed in universities, so few actually know how dumb they really are. Black American professors are almost exclusively found in pseudo-academic fields such as communications or “marketing,” so their relation to this is quite insignificant. Africa is not exactly a repository of abstract thought and the number of black philosophers, despite insanely militant affirmative action, is precisely zero.

Because of this, academic history is untrustworthy, ignorant and based entirely on ideological uniformity and cliches. They produce a massive amount of papers saying very little and today, it's a stagnating intellectual world who's budget desperately needs to be cut to the bone. Nowhere is this more evident than in studies on Hitler, Latin America, fascism or the USSR. This paper has been a modest corrective to their stupidity.