

Nikolay Starikov

**Who  
Set HITLER  
Against STALIN**  
Hitler's Fatal Blunder



 MTEP

# Nikolay Starikov

## Who set Hitler against Stalin?

[http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio\\_book/?art=11079428](http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=11079428)  
*Nikolay V. Starikov. Who set Hitler against Stalin?: Пумер; Санкт-Петербург; 2015*  
ISBN 978-5-496-01375-8

### **Аннотация**

This book will tell you who stirred Hitler into his suicidal decision to attack Stalin. It will tell you who were the real godfathers of the worst catastrophe in the history of Russia that went off on June 22, 1941. You will learn who gave money to Hitler and his party, helping the Nazi to power. Revealed in this book is the real reason behind the Nazi regime – aggression against the USSR to correct a previous blunder of Western intelligence that had led to Bolshevism in Russia. Instead of quietly disappearing with their loot, Lenin and his crew remained in the country and pieced it together into a global superpower, refusing to give it over to the West. Abundant evidence cited in this book helps trace the whole logic of events starting from September 1919 up to June 1941. The reader will emerge enlightened about who were the true preachers and masterminds of World War II, and who must share responsibility with the Nazi for their hideous crimes.

## Содержание

Foreword	5
Why is the World War II history still full of riddles?	6
Who helped Hitler with money?	12
Leon Trotsky – the Father of the German Nazism	34
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	62

# **Nikolay V. Starikov**

## **Who set Hitler against Stalin?**

Translators: Iskander Shafikov, Aleksandr Grebenkov

© English translation Piter Publishing House, LLC, 2013

© Design of English edition, Piter Publishing House, LLC, 2013

© ООО Издательство "Питер", 2015

## Foreword

*This book is dedicated to all those who laid down their lives for Russia.*

### **What this book IS NOT:**

This book IS NOT about the Great Patriotic War.

This book IS NOT about the Second World War.

This book IS NOT a reference on the tanks, artillery, or aviation in the opposing armies.

This book IS NOT a detailed analysis of field, marine, or air battles.

This book IS NOT a biography of Adolf Hitler, or a complete history of the Nazi Party.

This book IS NOT a thorough investigation of the ins and outs of the Nazi ideology, or a book of statistics on the countless victims of the Brownshirt butchery.

### **What this book IS:**

This book IS about those who made this dreadful war at all possible.

This book IS about those who financed Hitler and his party.

This book IS about those who helped them to their power.

This book IS about those who gave them ammunition, new territories, and confidence in their strength —

about those who can and must spend their lives behind bars, sharing the responsibility for their unspeakable villainy with the Nazi leaders.

This book IS about the true creators and masterminds of the most terrible war in human history.

## Why is the World War II history still full of riddles?

*This war, like the next war, is a war to end war.*

**David Lloyd George**

*I have dealt with the history of wars many a time, and all these times I have seen the same thing: contemporaries would refer a war to some time in the future, while it already stood at their countries' frontiers.*

**Carl von Clausewitz**

The many years that have passed since the end of the Second World War have produced thousands of books relating to it. It might seem there should have been left no gaps in this bloodiest and most horrifying conflict in the history of mankind. As it is, quite the opposite is true. Historians have done well calculating the exact number of tanks, cannons, aircraft, and troops that belonged to each of the involved countries, but have failed to answer the simplest questions. Such “inconvenient” questions invariably come to mind when reading books on this period in history. No sooner does one give more thought to the elementary explanations provided by these venerable scholars and investigators, than their absolute inconsistency strikes the eye.

You will, for example, read on one page that Adolf Hitler planned to conquer the entire world, while a next one will tell you, quite unexpectedly, that Germany proved totally unprepared for the war that broke out in September 1939. The Nazi only wished to attack Poland, they say, and speculated that Great Britain and France would not ally with it. That accounted for Germany's unpreparedness for a full-scale war. They state that the Wehrmacht was petering out of drop bombs, and after the routing of France (which in fact took Germany only six weeks) the army had run out all ammunition<sup>1</sup>.

Is that the kind of preparation for a global conquest? In order to occupy the whole planet a two-month ammunition reserve is obviously quite insufficient. Our blue ball of a planet has much space. And space, as we know, abhors a vacuum. To establish your sovereignty on some territory, you will first need to liquidate the current one. Now let's recall what countries were the greatest powers at that time. It was not Poland, which Hitler was prepared to fight against. The main players on the political map of that period were Britain, France, and the United States of America. It is these countries that Germany was not prepared to fight against.

To land in England and to subjugate America across the ocean, Germany would need a large fleet. Hitler did start building one, but the large-scale shipbuilding programme was to wind up as late as mid-1944<sup>2</sup>. Besides, Hitler himself would often tell his marines that the war with Britain would not start before that year.

Why then did Germany engage in war in 1939, some four years before the date it would be prepared for it? What an odd way to embark on a global conquest for the head of the German Reich! He must have known, must he not, that starting a war before one is prepared for it guarantees one's defeat. Why then did he make such a terrible blunder? Why fight unprepared?

Two years later, though, Hitler made a still graver blunder by attacking the Soviet Union. The countdown for the Third Reich began on that day – June 22, 1941. Notwithstanding its initial phenomenal success, Germany rolled down to its imminent ruin, for it now found itself fighting on two fronts. As unanimously held by historians and military experts, this simultaneous war on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Taylor, A. J. P. The origins of the Second World War. Dva vzgl'ada. M., 1995. P. 420.

<sup>2</sup> Jacobsen, G.-A. 1939–1945. The Second World War. M., 1995. P. 17.

Eastern and Western fronts doomed the German military power to total destruction. Could Adolf Hitler have failed to foresee this?

He couldn't – in fact, he knew everything perfectly well. In his famous memoirs *The Voice of Destruction* (aka *Hitler Speaks*), Hermann Rauschning cites a number of conversations of the Führer on various subjects, including his war plans. Interestingly, when asked about the possible result of a triple alliance of Russia, France and Britain against Germany, Hitler replies point blank, “That would be the end”. But the glib Führer doesn't stop there. “But that stage will never be reached”, he adds. “It would only happen if I failed in all my undertakings. In that case I should feel I had wrongly usurped this place”<sup>3</sup>.

November 23, 1939, sees Hitler delivering a speech at a Wehrmacht high command council, putting forth plans and drawing conclusions. And here again he rides his hobbyhorse – the First World War and the importance of no second front. “In 1914, a war on several fronts began. It did not solve the problem. Today, the second act of this drama is being written. We must state for the first time in these 67 years: we do not have to wage a two-front war! What we have been dreaming of since 1870<sup>4</sup>, and have considered nearly impossible, has now happened. For the first time in history we have to fight only on one front, there is none other to bind us. <...> The situation now is such as we used to think unachievable”<sup>5</sup>.

But what happens then? Something quite inconceivable – the Führer deliberately changes the situation for the worse by attacking the USSR while engaged in a war with Britain! Adolf Hitler, realising the crucial importance of no second front for Germany, knowing that such a war would be doomed to failure, with his own hands adds the Eastern front to the existing Western front.

Let us see how this seemingly absurd act on the part of Hitler is explained by historians. They say that Hitler did that to destroy the last potential ally of Britain on the continent.

Mark these words. Look at the map. Summon your knowledge of history.

### **Hitler attacks the Soviet Union to secure a total destruction of Britain!**

Now if the present-day United States is worried by Iraq, it attacks Iraq and not Pakistan. And a threat from Tehran will hardly be addressed by the Americans by bombing, say, Beijing. When one country is seen as a threat by another, the latter will normally campaign against the source of the threat. Can there be any exceptions? Indeed; in that case, the targets for the attack will be the rival country's closest allies and associates, without whose assistance it will no longer pose a threat. Now what was the Soviet assistance to Britain in 1941? Did the Soviets ship ammunition, weapons, foodstuffs or raw materials there? Nothing of the kind. The only thing ever sent from Moscow to London was some hearty communist salutations, submitted, besides, to the Soviet embassy. The Soviet Union never was Britain's ally; never exported any arms or ammunition to it; never leased any of its territory for British military bases. Quite on the opposite, when Germany waged wars in Europe, the Soviet Union adhered strictly to its current trade agreements with Berlin, providing Germany with vital products, including petroleum, wheat, and other commodities of strategic importance. While at war with Britain, Germany was greatly affected by the naval blockade thwarting the incoming and outgoing shipment of commodities necessary for military production chains. In such dire straits, Germany was much relieved by its continuing good relations with the Soviet Union, which purchased goods and materials required by Germany on the global market and then transported them safe and sound to the very borders of the otherwise blockaded country<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Rauschning, H. *The Voice of Destruction* (Hitler speaks). M., 1993. P. 100. Hereinafter *The Voice of Destruction* (Hitler Speaks) is quoted from the G. P. Putnam's Sons English-language edition (New York, 1949) available from the Internet Archive Universal Library here: <https://archive.org/details/VoiceOfDestruction> (Translator's note).

<sup>4</sup> That is, since the Franco-Prussian War.

<sup>5</sup> Taylor, A. J. P. *The origins of the Second World War*. M., 1995. P. 105.

<sup>6</sup> For example, 100% of crude rubber was imported by the Reich via the USSR. Other materials were imported using the same

These shipments could not be sunk or otherwise destroyed by British submarines and aircraft. We must therefore make one simple conclusion: **It makes no sense for any country attacking a global superpower with which you have a non-aggression pact, and which supplies you with vitals, not your enemy!** Why should one multiply one's enemies, depleting one's friends, or, to put it more precisely, one's benignly neutral partners?



Why did Adolf Hitler attack the Soviet Union, although he had admitted that a war on two fronts would bring Germany to its ruin?

Here historians play their last trump. By routing the USSR, they explain, **Hitler was hoping to coerce Britain into a peace agreement.** All would be well, but does the shortest way from Berlin to London really lie through Moscow? Clearly not. There would be a far shorter one, by crossing the English Channel from the occupied France. One would not, in reality, lose oneself in the devious expanses of Russia with the view to ending up in England. This is utterly preposterous. What sort of “Hitler’s hopes” are they talking about?

The sheer inconsistency of such and other statements cannot but strike the eye of today’s attentive reader. But it was as conspicuous even before the USSR was attacked. For example, it was plain to Count Galeazzo Ciano, Foreign Minister of Fascist Italy from 1936 until 1943. Not only was he an Italian minister, but he married to the daughter of Mussolini – he was a member of the family. As we know, Italy was not a mere observer in the Second World War; it declared war to the USSR after Germany. Now here is an extract from Count Ciano’s personal diary.

---

scheme (those which the war-torn Germany was not able to purchase directly).



*Numerous sources point to the fact that the operation against Russia will begin shortly. The idea of war against Russia is in itself quite popular; for the defeat of Bolshevism must belong among the most important events in the history of human civilisation. However, this war doesn't appeal to me as a symptom, for it has no adequate and convincing reason underlying it. A popular explanation of this war is that it will take place for no better reason than an attempt to find a way out of a difficult situation that has emerged against all odds<sup>7</sup>.*

Such evidence is abundant. Funny to think, everyone at present is quite confident about the reason of Hitler's aggression against Russia. Go ask anyone, ask yourself, and you will hear that hackneyed explanation of Hitler's move. Wherefore all that clarity and unambiguity? Our contemporaries have read tons of books of the Second World War, and have got thoroughly imbued with this notion. But the contemporaries of the war itself, many of them being top-notch and highly competent politicians, found the idea of Germany attacking the USSR not just surprising, but completely off-the-wall. Why so? Because they hadn't had the notion of no other possibility for Hitler than to attack the USSR pounded into their heads for sixty years, as we do now! As a result, those who lived in the 1940-ies considered that sort of "way out" rather a "way in" for the Reich into inferno; whereas we consider it the only possible solution for the Nazi.

Besides, many of the Third Reich's élite were strongly against the ruinous move against the Soviets, to include the Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop who would end his life on the gallows at Nuremberg.

*Russia is no potential ally of the English. England can expect nothing good from Russia. Hope in Russia is not postponing England's collapse. With Russia we do not destroy any English hopes. <...> A German attack on Russia would only give the British new moral strength. It would be interpreted there as German uncertainty as to the success of our fight against England. We would thereby not only be admitting that the war was going to last a long time yet, but we might actually prolong it in this way, instead of shortening it<sup>8</sup>.*

Why on earth did Germany's leader commit what even his diplomats saw as the worst of all possible blunders? Such questions are not quite so naïve as may at first appear. Why, some 130 years before Hitler's time, the same "route to London" was chosen by Napoleon. His catastrophic failure that had its roots in 1812 was a prominent and awful lesson to consider for militarists in all countries who were thinking of a war against the Russians. And Hitler remembered well that lesson. Still, he was about to walk twice into the same water. Why? What drives Britain's biggest enemies to take such odd steps? Different in their nationalities, different in their slogans and their forces, these men take the same old path over and over again – the path they *know* to be a blind-alley!

#### **Why do they go for Moscow and not for London?**

Instead of disembarking in England, Napoleon's 600-thousand-strong army wades knee-deep in Russian snow blizzards. Could they have at least tried to disembark in England? Even if some 200 thousand had gone down to Davy Jones in the English Channel, the remaining troops would have surely pounded the British Isles into a stair carpet leading right up to the great Emperor's feet. But the Russian campaign went all wrong.

However, what Hitler does is still more ridiculous. Routing France in summer 1940, he proceeds to attack Britain from the air. That rather brief series of air combats went down in history as the "Battle of Britain", which was of course won by the British. You know why? Because the Germans had not employed all their air forces to win it – they used them sparingly, to be more precise. That the German Luftwaffe incurred heavier losses than the British air forces during the

---

<sup>7</sup> Jacobsen, G.-A. 1939–1945. The Second World War. M., 1995. P. 153.

<sup>8</sup> Joachim von Ribbentrop. Memorandum by the State Secretary in the German Foreign Office (Weizsäcker). The English translation is quoted from the public-domain materials available at ibiblio: The Public's Library and Digital Archive: <http://www.ibiblio.org/> (Translator's note).

“Battle of Britain” is a well-known fact. This was the reason, as we will read in history books, why Germany almost completely ceased its air attacks of England. So Britain stood out.

The reason why Hitler spared his aviation is also given in books. He did that, you will read, because he wanted to spare his fighters and bombers for the future Russian campaign. So they could not use them right now against the British. They could not bomb British air facilities, cities and sea ports; they could not destroy British fighters in the air and British troops on the ground. The Luftwaffe should be economised on, otherwise there won't be enough planes and pilots for the Russian campaign – not enough to defeat Russia. And why defeat Russia? To be able to defeat Britain afterwards, to be sure<sup>9</sup>.

Churchill's memoirs reflect the same nonsense:

*Hitler's plan for the invasion of Russia soon brought us much-needed respite in the air. For this new enterprise the German Air Force had to be re-deployed in strength, and thus from May onwards the scale of air attack against our shipping fell<sup>10</sup>.*

But another page in the same book expresses the opposite view:

*He wishes to destroy the Russian power because he hopes that if he succeeds in this he will be able to bring back the main strength of his Army and Air Force from the East and hurl it upon this Island, which he knows he must conquer or suffer the penalty of his crimes. His invasion of Russia is no more than a prelude to an attempted invasion of the British Isles<sup>11</sup>.*

One can't but admit that Hitler chooses a very singular way of invading Britain: without winning it over from the start, he goes on to attack the Soviet Union, only to resume his campaign against Britain sometime in the future!

He would probably have done better to use all his forces against Britain from the first, without any such “cunning” plans. Why attack the Soviet Union just to return to the Channel having already no able fleet to neutralise the British one? Such questions do not normally go down well with historians.

As we know, all anti-British adventures and campaigns of all sorts meet the same end. Some three years after Napoleon's Russian campaign, the great French Empire was erased from the global map. It took Hitler's Third Reich less than four years to come to ruin after a similar attempt.

Now if such astute state leaders as these two men (for only an astute politician is capable of taking over power in a country) – if such persons commit apparently self-destructive actions that precipitate their empires into the abyss with equal and surprising rapidity, then we are inevitably left with one idea. *Might it be that these politicians are not inept dense-headed laymen (as one would be forced to think), but we are deliberately being kept partially in the darkness about the reasons why both Napoleon and Hitler chose the road to hell for themselves and for their countries?*

As it appears, the “darkest” part of this information is also the most essential. What kind of information is it?

Not only the Nazi leader's actions seem enigmatic, but often those of British, French and American politicians. Suffice it to recall that the beaten Germany after the First World War was completely disarmed. How did it then happen that the best forces of the world were engaged in a six-and-a-half-long desperate struggle against one German army in the Second World War – the

---

<sup>9</sup> For example, we can read these lines in the war diary left by the German General Franz Halder: “Adequate air forces for a siege of Britain will not be available until the Eastern campaign is substantially concluded and the Air Force is refitted and enlarged”. (Entry of September 13, 1941). Quoted by: War journal of Franz Halder, V. VII // Combined Arms Research Library Digital Library, <http://goo.gl/J1VLQw>

<sup>10</sup> Churchill, *W.* The Second World War. V.1. P. 23.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. P. 174.

army that Germany was not supposed to have? How could Germany have recuperated and indeed enhanced its military power between the two world wars? How did Germany's neighbours let it slip by? And most of all, how *such* a politician as Adolf Hitler could at all have gained power, after laying out his plans openly in his *Mein Kampf*?

Questions, questions, questions... One could put endless questions and have the same cock-and-bull stories for an answer. These countries, they overlooked him; they didn't have enough strength to stand up against him; they did not recognise any threat in him; they trusted him; etc. etc. Some game of hide-and-seek, not big politics. Describing any of such "fatal blunders" of some of the largest political figures of that time, World War II historians will as often as not use quotations that impugn their prior statements. Here is one example – an extract from the testimony of Hjalmar Schacht, former Minister of Economics under Hitler, at the Nuremberg Trials.

*I must say <...> it was a disappointment to me that Germany's rearmament was not in any way replied to by any actions from the Allies. This so-called breach of contract on Germany's part against the Versailles Treaty was taken quite calmly. <...> Military missions were sent to Germany to look at this rearmament, and German military displays were visited and everything else was done, but nothing at all was done to stop Germany's rearmament<sup>12</sup>.*

The history of the Second World War that we are being fed with cannot account for the motives and actions of most state leaders of the time. Those persons were the locomotives of history. It was the decisions made by Hitler, Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt that directly affected the course of the future events. Turning over the pages of historical books and memoirs, we cannot realise why these otherwise "sensible" and certainly outstanding figures erred so grossly and so obviously. What does it all mean?

**It means that the whole history of the Second World War that can be considered the "official version" of modern historiography has been concocted with one single purpose – that of disguising the truth about the horrors of that time.**

Disguising the truth and concealing some real criminals who must bear responsibility for millions of deaths from the trial of man and of history – that is the ultimate purpose. Nuremberg tried and convicted only those villains whose crimes lay on the surface. Blood-handed executives went to prison and up the gallows, while the *masterminds* of World War II were sleeping soundly in their beds.

Nowadays tampering with historical evidence is picking up momentum. You can now hear some people say that it is the Soviet Union to blame for this war; that it was the "bloody" and "rapacious" Stalin who actually helped the obsessed Hitler to his position in Germany; that it was the aggressive Soviet Russia that aided and abetted the vicious Führer in turning Europe into a bloodbath. But once the USSR failed to invade the *whole world* in 1945, it means that the Russians (together with all the other Soviet nations) *lost* the war.

Well, let us try to make some sense of the mess that those now far-off years presented.

And we'll start by the simplest question —

**Where did Adolf Hitler find money to be able to occupy the whole planet?**

---

<sup>12</sup> Quoted from: Nuremberg Trial Proceedings V. 12, 118th day (Wednesday, 1 May 1946), Morning Session // Contents of The Nuremberg Trials Collection at the Avalon Project, Lillian Goldman Law Library, Yale Law School: <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/imt/05-01-46.asp>

## Who helped Hitler with money?

*It was immaterial whether they laughed at us or reviled us, whether they depicted us as fools or criminals; the important point was that they took notice of us...*

**Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf***

*There will be no revolution in Germany, for all revolutions are banned in that country.*

**A British joke**

On September 12, 1919, a meeting of a tiny political party held in the Sterneckerbräu, a Munich beer hall, was joined by an unknown war veteran. His name was Adolf Hitler. Millions of people were just starting to recover from the First World War, when human history had insensibly taken a path that led to still more dreadful battles, still more harrowing crimes – to the hideous ovens of Majdanek and Treblinka, to the Siege of Leningrad, to the Battle of Stalingrad and the Kursk Salient.

The date when that meagre sprig that was eventually to grow into the Cyclopean tree of the German national socialism can be established with some accuracy. On March 7, 1918, one Anton Drexler founded a society under the poetic title *Freien Arbeiterausschuss für einen guten Frieden* (Free Workers' Committee for a Good Peace) that totalled some forty workers as the members. At their quite harmless meetings during the World War, that set of lotus-eaters would sit around there with their beer mugs, theorizing on the pleasures and benefits of universal peace.

There are but three ways to reach peace in any war – to win it, to lose it, or to end it in a tie by parley. While Drexler's followers were jabbering it in the beer hall, events in Germany went along the first possible scenario – the Kaiser's Empire, subverted by external revolutionary propaganda and the "live" example of the Russian Revolution, went all to pieces. Peace did settle in, but not the one Drexler and his ilk had been dreaming of. It was the treaty of Versailles. It was that town near Paris where, on June 28, 1919, the well-known Treaty was signed, to give rise, in the long run, to the Nazi Party and a new, more terrible, war. But why should we consider this *peace* treaty as a forerunner of a new *war*? The fact is, this "treaty" was daylight robbery in the guise of a harmless – and important – international document, which, nonetheless, didn't change its true face. What may be most surprising, the Treaty was thus condemned not only by Lenin and not only by German politicians, but by members of the Triple Entente! For example, Marshal Ferdinand Foch of France, Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Armies from 1918, is famous for saying that the Treaty was "not a peace, [but] an armistice for twenty years" – the words that would prove a prophecy. Other statements also went down in history, though less widely known. "The economic clauses of the treaty [of Versailles] were malignant and silly to an extent that made them obviously futile [condemning] Germany to pay reparations on a fabulous scale", – these are the words pronounced not by Adolf Hitler (who rode the wave of the Treaty's critique), but by Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom<sup>13</sup>.

As it is, the Germans were simply robbed. Germany lost about 73 thousand square kilometres of its territory (ca. 13.5 %), with over 6.5 million people living there (ca. 10 %). What is more, the "truncated" country forfeited its overseas colonies, and was to repair all the damage entailed by the conflict to the victorious parties. As to the indemnity, its total sum at first remained undetermined;

---

<sup>13</sup> Churchill, *W.* The Second World War. V.1. P. 21.

it was named only later. The sum was fantastic. And it was altered several times. The final version of the calculation would have Germany make their last payment as late as in 1988!<sup>14</sup>

It was as if a hurricane had swept over the once prospering land. Large amounts of state property were seized in compensation of the damage, including, for example, 140,000 dairy cows. But before being bled dry, Germany must first be hog-tied to have no chance of rebelling against the “victorious” looters. “Germany was disarmed. All her artillery and weapons were destroyed. Her fleet had already sunk itself in Scapa Flow. Her vast army was disbanded. <...> No military force of any kind was allowed. Submarines were forbidden <...>”, Churchill would testify in his book<sup>15</sup>.

The German army was limited to one hundred thousand men; the country was not allowed to produce military aircraft, or tanks, or men-of-war. Chaos and anarchy ensued in the defeated and bled country, multiplied by an economic collapse.

It was against this catastrophic backdrop that Anton Drexler made up his mind to turn his club-like society into something more serious, when on January 5, 1919, he formed the German Workers’ Party (*Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*). Remarkably endowed with oratory skill, young Adolf Hitler quickly became the Party’s new leader, outshining its founder. Eventually he was the one and only Leader – the Führer of the new political force. He changed not only the philosophy of the Workers’ Party, but its name, prefixing it with the word “national-socialist”, so it went down in history as the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (*Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, or *NSDAP*).

A great mass of various literature is devoted to the history of the Nazi Party and its leader. You can go to any book market, and will be surely faced with the half-insane eyes of Adolf Hitler staring at you from a couple of front covers, or the heavy-set outlines of his troopers. You may think all questions have long been answered. And yet, as soon as you take a more disinterested look at the history of the Third Reich, every new book you read will bring in more and more obscurity and ambiguity. Very soon you will learn that even the most “authoritative” researchers refer in their books to facts that are strangely at variance with each other. Figures will differ grossly even where they have never been called in question – for example, the membership of Hitler’s party. What can be easier, it seems, than to look up the Nazi literature in the archives for the key figures of the party’s development? We know that the Nazi spoke and wrote much about their “years of struggle” and “fallen comrades”; we should naturally expect the growing number of the Nazi Party to be well documented... Nothing of the kind!

“As of November 1923, the Party numbered 15,000”, writes Konrad Heiden in his *Hitler’s Rise to Power*, a book he published in 1936, while the party was in its heyday<sup>16</sup>.

“The party was rapidly growing. At the end of 1922, it had some 22,000 members. At the time of the putsch [it] numbered some 55,000”, writes the British historian Ian Kershaw in his 1990 book *Hitler*<sup>17</sup>.

Recalling that Hitler’s failed putsch took place exactly in November 1923, we have a tremendous disproportion in the two quoted figures – within the 55 years between the appearance of the two books the Nazi Party membership was estimated four times as large! Keeping that kind of pace, the “historians” of some three hundred years later will subscribe the entire population of Germany to the Nazi Party.

For reassurance, let’s take down a third book for reference – that written by Alan Bullock, another influential “expert” on the Nazi Germany. And once more, we bump into quite different

---

<sup>14</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. Perm, 1993. V.2. P. 92.

<sup>15</sup> *Churchill, W.* The Second World War. V.1. P. 25–26.

<sup>16</sup> *Heiden, K.* Hitler’s rise to power. M., 2004. P. 178.

<sup>17</sup> *Kershaw, I.* Hitler. Rostov n/D, 1997. P. 64.

figures. “The membership rose from about 1,100 in June 1920 to 6,000 in early 1922, and about 20,000 in early 1923”<sup>18</sup>.

We might suppose that the historians of the Nazi Party each use their own, separate source – a separate archive or documentary, which should explain the discrepancies. But the archives and documents are always the same – it is the *quotations* that differ! Where on earth are all these figures taken from? – this secret is worse than all the secrets of the Nazi Germany.

To be short, each author has his own version. These versions are then blindly copied by smaller-scale authors, to result in a total mess in literature.

**How then can we study the history of the Second World War, where it is essential to know the real numbers of artillery, tanks, and troops involved in battles, once we can’t depend on historians for such an easy question as the number of “members” of the Nazi Party?**

But why ask about the number of the Nazi? Why do we need it at all? There is one good reason – to show by a very simple example the amount of sheer ignorance of facts on the part of the Nazi leader’s biographers. This is to warn you against taking for granted all that fudge written about the Second World War – not without checking and double-checking it with your own mind. No fewer cock-and-bull stories are written about the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people. I conceived this book as an attempt to put in some order the tons of motley information concerning this period in history; to extract that grain of truth that would help us realise the real causes of Russia’s worst tragedy that began on June 22, 1941.

History has its stereotypes. These stereotypes, or clichés, are well known to anyone, though no one can tell who and when created them. Go ask who gave money to Hitler, and you will hear the same reply – German manufacturers. This stereotype has variants, including “major capitalists”, “the Krupp group”, “German corporations” and so on and so forth.

But let us get down to brass tacks. All the political activity of any party is financed by those who take sides with it. This is a naïve point of view. The correct one is as follows: the political activity of a party is financed by those who expect to achieve something by it. This phrase is far more sinister. For example, a party that calls for support of national industry can be sponsored by the owners of textile and footwear factories. The idea is, if this party comes to power, it will raise import fees on shoes and clothing, which will bear a direct benefit to domestic manufacturers. Is this bad for people? Probably not – unless all business competition is destroyed in the country under the banner of boosting “national industry”. Likewise, a party oriented for national defence will be aided and abetted by the military lobby expecting the blabbering of the politicians to be followed by new orders on missiles, radars, tanks, and aircraft. Again, is this bad for the country? Not unless the military expenses go beyond the reasonable. To put it in a nutshell, financial support of political forces by tycoons has always been there, and will always be. This is not something invented in Russia, but a common phenomenon in every country where the supreme authority is elected by the nation. Democracy as the ultimate form of people’s rule leads any politician to one sad conclusion – the largest electorate is won by money, not by nice slogans. Money is needed not to bribe the voting public, but just to get your ideas across – to bring them home to people from television and newspapers – to say and be heard! You will have to pay through the nose for all that, bearing in mind the simple rule: the larger the country, the larger the target electorate, the more money you need.

After the fall of monarchy in 1918, the same kind of democracy was established in Germany. Even the country itself between its defeat in the First World War and Hitler’s rise to power is known as the Weimar Republic, after the name of the city where the new German Constitution was enacted. Admitting that Germany was a republic, everything said above holds true for the country of that time. Any political activity must be fed by money, just as the furnace of an engine must be

---

<sup>18</sup> Bullock, A. Hitler and Stalin: Parallel lives. 1994. V.1. P. 102.

fed by coal. You won't get anywhere without that "fuel". Both the success and the duration of your future political "trip" wholly depend on the amount of banknotes to be spent. Here we come to the question for which we have undertaken this brief foray into the theory of politics.

**What was the source of financial "coal" for Adolf Hitler, who only fifteen years after his "seminal" appearance in the Munich beer hall came to the top power in Germany?**

The question is no sooner asked, than a ready reply given. The same old stereotype: he was sponsored by German industrial magnates. A good reply it is – and a very convenient one, too. Convenient for everybody. Soviet-time historiography did with that explanation alone. In the West, another ready reply is common, thanks to Suvorov-Rezun. They say that it was Stalin who guided and helped Hitler to his power, seeing him as a new "icebreaker of revolution". This should mean, according to that judgment, that the Bolshevik communists gave money to the Nazi – a statement that has zero logic in it. One might as well blame the Yeltsin Russia, too poor even to print currency, for financing international terrorism on a large scale. Accusing the Soviet Union under Stalin of fostering the Nazi is similarly absurd. The Russian Civil War had not yet ended, when Hitler's party was already toddling to its might. How could the Russian communists possibly have financed the German *anti-communist* movement? One might as well name Lenin the benefactor of Kolchak and Wrangel! Why concoct such obvious apple-sauce? That is to accuse Russia of the whole bag of tricks. There is a second reason as well – to avert suspicions from the true forces that stood behind that cannibal party...

German industrial magnates did go down in history as Hitler's sponsors. But we will ask again: **Did they have any reason for sponsoring the National-Socialists?**

Why, you will say, the Nazi were all fiercely anti-communist; by sponsoring them, the bourgeoisie sought to prevent the risk of a Red revolution. This is another common bag of lies that has nothing to do with reality. Small wonder that no figures or dates are cited in books that use this kind of argument. We will yet take pains to compare things.

In November 1918, immediately after the monarchical regime came to ruin, Germany was teetering on the brink of a Bolshevik revolution. What is more, this Socialist revolution did take place in the country – a long time before the appearance of the obsessed Führer on the political stage. The period of chaos and anarchy caused by the fall of the Kaiser was followed by the emergence of two main political forces – a social democrat government and communists who sought to deepen the revolutionary movement. The situation came to a head in 1919, with mass skirmishes in Berlin, and the arrest and execution of the German Communist Party leaders Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg (the so-called "Spartacist uprising").

The struggle did not end there, though. The Bremen communists proved quicker on the draw, and on January 10, 1919, the Bremen Soviet Republic was declared. To back up the new-born Red republic, a detachment commanded by Ernst Thälmann set out for Bremen from Hamburg. But no backup could help the rebels – the German army was firmly on the side of the current government. As early as on February 4, the Red Bremen was seized by a division commanded by General Gerstenberg. The Bremen Soviet Republic bit the dust so quickly that all the children in the USSR knew that city only by the wonderful Grimm brothers fairy-tale and the still more wonderful Soviet animation film.

Early March 1919 saw a new wave of conflicts in Berlin. A national walkout organised by the communists took the form of an all-out revolt that was eventually crushed down, with some 1,200 casualties. The volunteer paramilitary units formed by regular and non-commissioned officers (the so-called *Freikorps*, literally "Free Corps") and the police suppressed the uprisings with firmness and savagery. There are confirmed cases when a group of striking workers was mowed down by machine-gun fire just for flying a single red banner.

Who was it who made such a blood bath of the revolting communists? It was Gustav Noske, a German member of the Council of the People's Deputies (*Rat der Volksbeauftragten*) during

the November Revolution. This “glorious son of the German nation” went down in history as “the Bloodhound<sup>19</sup>”. The connection between this alias and the blood of those massacred by his command is but incidental, characteristic as it is. It was Noske’s own words about himself in the days of the revolt – “Someone has to be the bloodhound; I shall not shirk the responsibility”<sup>20</sup>.

Still, April had new waves of chaos in store for Germany. On April 13, 1919, the Bavarian Soviet Republic was proclaimed in Munich. It was not to live long, however, and already on May 5 it collapsed. But in the beginning, everything looked not unlike the Bolshevik power grab in Russia. The short-lived republic had its own Council of Actions to represent the supreme authority, as well as an Executive Council headed by communists but comprising at first also independent social democrats. The young Red republic’s strategy would be easy to understand for everyone who is acquainted with the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The immediate programme included disarmament of the police and the “bourgeoisie”; confiscation of private property and nationalisation of banks; holding of hostages; workers’ control of enterprises; and even a German version of the Cheka<sup>21</sup> (a Committee for Combatting Counter-Revolution)<sup>22</sup>. The German “comrades” had yet some inventions of their own, for instance, the prohibition of history as a school subject, or the emission of banknotes with an expiration date<sup>23</sup>.

Even a German Red Army was formed, which at once carried out a number of successful operations. At first, it routed the governmental forces north of Munich, taking over control of Karlsfeld and Freising. The German Red Army’s subsequent operations were also attended by success, markedly the battles for Dachau, the Bavarian town that was yet to gain its notoriety during the Second World War. But there the winning streak for the Munich communists ended – a 60-thousand-strong army commanded by Gustav “the Bloodhound” Noske pushed forward, surrounding the rebelling region. The army which consisted of regular units and volunteer veterans went down on the Bavarian Republic, destroying the rebels with as much atrocity as did the communists. House-to-house fighting in Munich lasted for five days, ending up in firing squad executions in a prison yard...

Notably, the counter-revolution actions in Bavaria were bloodier than the revolution itself. The Reds were guilty of shooting eight hostages (all members of the Thule occultist society). At the same time, the White volunteer units destroyed a Red medical convoy; shot 21 members of the Catholic Apprentice Society; 12 workers from Perlach; 50 recovered Russian prisoners of war; as well as the leaders of the Bavarian Soviet Republic – Rudolf Egelhofer, Gustav Landauer, and Eugen Leviné. Both Ernst Röhm and Rudolf Hess took part in the recapture of Munich. However, Adolf Hitler, who at the time was in the city, was oddly inert and did not take any active steps to help the struggle against communism. The Nazi historiography took pains to leave this page in the Führer’s biography in the dark.

The Red revolution in Germany was suppressed, but that was no merit of the Nazi. Simply because at that time no “national socialists” even existed; instead, there were some twenty or thirty beer-drinking gossips sitting around at their leisure in Munich struck by the Civil War. As to Adolf Hitler, he was a young self-conscious ex-serviceman and had nothing to do with big politics.

---

<sup>19</sup> The Bloodhound is a large hound (dog breed), famous for its extraordinary sense of smell. In medieval Britain, these dogs would be frequently engaged in the pursuit of thieves, murderers, and other criminals. A bloodhound could take the scent of the fugitive(s), start the trail, and almost invariably track them down. Also, the bloodhound was sometimes used to dispatch a wounded animal in a hunt. In medieval times, these dogs were often trained to pursue the fleeing enemy on a battle field.

<sup>20</sup> The original phrase in German is: “Einer muss der Bluthund werden, ich scheue die Verantwortung nicht”. (*Translator’s note*)

<sup>21</sup> The All-Russian Extraordinary Committee for Combatting Counter-Revolution, Speculation, and Sabotage. (*Translator’s note*)

<sup>22</sup> *Fest, I. Hitler*. Perm, 1993. V.2. P. 182.

<sup>23</sup> *Preparata, G.D. Hitler Inc.: How the UK and the USA created the Third Reich*. M., 2007. P. 97–98.



Did the communist do anything further to seize the reins? They did. But all such attempts were suppressed by the army and the police, and never by Hitler's storm-troopers. A new wave of violence caused by the "struggle of the proletariat" surged across Germany in 1923. In October 23 to 25, riots struck Hamburg, spearheaded by that same Ernst Thälmann. For three days and three nights the rebels fought behind barricades in the city and on its outskirts. Neither did national socialists participate in these fights. Adolf Hitler had his own "number one" problems to take care of – the planning of his takeover operation, later known as the Beer Hall Putsch, had entered the homestretch.

On the 8th and 9th of November, the Nazi attempted a takeover in Munich. Hitler himself was heading the demonstration, pistol in hand and helmet on head. The police opened fire, and the Führer had a very narrow escape. His party comrade, Max Erwin von Scheubner-Richter, who was marching by his side, was killed by a shot, and in falling, he clutched at Hitler and pulled him down on the ground, dislocating his collar bone. Hermann Göring was badly wounded about his groin – that injury would prove so intolerable as to force him to take to analgesic drugs forever after, and eventually reduce the future Reichsmarschall to an inveterate drug addict. In total, some fourteen Nazi and three policemen remained were left dead and prostrate on the ground.

We can see that all the attempts by the communists at a military takeover were always brought down by the government in power. Not only did the Nazi fail to offer any assistance, but they actually made things worse. See for yourselves – only a fortnight after the Red Putsch in Hamburg, the Brown, or Beer Putsch struck Munich!

Now, if you were in Krupp's or Thyssen's shoes, who would you give money to? The ruling social-democratic party that could beget some outstanding "bloodhounds", if need be, or someone else? Why would you pay the radicals? Why would you burn your house if it became infested with rats, once there are other good ways to get rid of them? Hitler with his radical party may be indeed compared to burning the house to rid it of vermin. Why would the German industrial elite sponsor the Nazi – the radicals – the mad heads? The Nazi were evidently not a protection against the "Red menace"; what is more, they even tried to take over the reins.

It seems more probable that the capitalists of that time would have thought that it's as broad as it's long. And it is not the similar colours of the Communist and Nazi banners, or their similar ways of propaganda that matter. It's another thing: both Communism and National Socialism, albeit antagonistic, are revolutionary doctrines!

*We demand that profits not earned by labour and the slavery of interest rates be made away with.*

*We demand that military profits be confiscated without pity.*

*We demand that industrial concerns be nationalised.*

*We demand that industrial and office workers have their shares in the profits of large commercial enterprises.*

*We demand that a healthy middle class be brought up and supported; that large commercial stores be immediately withdrawn from private ownership and leased at moderate fees to small entrepreneurs.*

*We demand that a land reform be enacted that would meet the interests of the German nation; that a law on irrevocable confiscation of land for public needs be adopted; that land lease interests and land speculation be forbidden.*

If you thought you were reading an extract from a communistic brochure, you are mistaken. These are all clauses from a Nazi political programme. These are the "protectors of the national capital". They were even prepared to deprive owners of their land irrevocably. Some Bolsheviks, you would say! So again – would you give money to such radicals whose slogans are so much like those of your hated communists? Or would you instead try to reinforce the existing Weimar Republic? Say, inject money into the police and increase their size, and raise salaries in the army.

I imagine you would be more at rest if your life and your private savings and enterprises were protected by government bodies and not Brownshirts, right?

If that be so, then go on with your propaganda and make a hero of Gustav Noske who brought down the communists in 1919. He is a defence minister as one should be, with his heavy hand, iron nerve, and readiness to answer for his actions. But no – already in 1920, the “Bloodhound” is made to retire, never to reappear on the political stage. Why would anyone want an even bloodier ruler in the person of Hitler who would evidently make even the “bloody” Noske look like a blue-eyed boy scout? You would do well to create images of the “true German courage” from the police who have proved so efficient in depleting Thälmann’s gunmen at the Hamburg barricades. Here’s a good replacement to Gustav Noske. These policemen were surely commanded by someone who had guts.

Why would you pay Adolf Hitler? When will he be capable of putting down riots and crush the German Communist Party? How would you know at all if he can do that? As of 1920-ies, Hitler is not even “a bird in the hand”, not to say “two in the bush”; he is a crocodile, so far a little one, but with sharp teeth. And your house is already alive with rats... You could, of course, take up taming the croc, teaching him to catch rats. But this is a dangerous enterprise – someday your new “pet” will devour yourself together with (or instead of) the rats. And so he did. Together with the Communists, all the other parties were disbanded – the Social Democratic party; the Independent Social Democratic party; the Economic party; the German Centre party; the Bavarian People’s party; the German Democratic party; and even the German National People’s party, as well as all the smaller ones – all at the same time<sup>24</sup>. The Nazi packed all these into concentration camps “to think better”. Do you really need this, you German industrial magnates?

Ironically, after their almost synchronic attempts to overthrow the government, the Nazi and the Communists waxed strictly law-abiding, again almost at a time. When out of prison in 1924, where he had been kept but a short time, Hitler took a once-and-for-all pledge to gain power by purely legal means. A clandestine Ninth Convention of the German Communist party held in April 1924 also adopted a completely legal roadmap. From then on, the Communist party made its presence in the Parliament and struggled for power by legal elections, discarding the idea of a coup d’état. Communists were now occupied by propaganda, public demonstrations and meetings, and the manufacturing of red banners and flyleaves. True, they did have their own armed squadrons, just the same as the Nazi, but they never conspired for another coup. At least, there is no dependable historical document to prove the opposite – none at all!

The “Red menace” in Germany had subsided. Communists could hardly come to power, even by parliamentary elections. The best result that these followers of bearded Karl Marx could achieve was on November 6, 1932, when they garnered 5,980,200 votes, or 16.9 % of the electorate. Was that a risk? Not at all. A Communist majority in the Parliament was definitely out of the question. Knowing that, one would wish nothing more than to let them keep their quiet struggle for the rights of the proletariat, sitting, as it were, in the Parliament. Why would one think of fuelling the Nazi who would then ban all the other parties and declare themselves the best protectors of the German working society?

Most ironically, the German “Red menace” was not believed even by its prime antagonist, Adolf Hitler. “Such a danger [Bolshevism in Germany] does not exist, and has never existed”, he told in his conversation with Hermann Rauschning. “I have always made allowance for this circumstance, and given orders that former Communists are to be admitted to the party at once. The petit bourgeois Social-Democrat and the trade-union boss will never make a National Socialist, but the Communist always will”<sup>25</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> The Weimar Republic had a total of 38 active political parties.

<sup>25</sup> *Rauschning, H. The Voice of Destruction (Hitler speaks). M., 1993. P. 107.*

And so they did. A great many former communists entered the NSDAP. Such immigrant party members were later dubbed “beefsteaks”, being “brown” on the outside, but “red” inside.

Germany would see no other riots from that time – neither from the right wing, nor from the left one, which to us is of special importance. Once there was no fear of poison, there was no need for an antidote. It would have been reasonable to start fortifying the law and its enforcing bodies, cracking down on the left and right radicals. Yet someone did want to see Hitler in power very badly. And that “someone” was surely not a group of German industrialists.

So far we have found no good ground for German magnates to finance the Nazi. There were, of course, some of them who did give money to the Nazi, but this is by way of exception. Those who did so had evidently been ignorant of the Nazi political programme, or had failed to see in it a heavy socialistic bias. But even putting aside the programme, the very name of Hitler’s party – the National Socialist German Workers’ Party – would suffice to rule out the question of being favoured by large capital owners. Have you known a tycoon sponsor a socialist workers’ party, while there are others out there, and more respectable too?

There is another point to mention. Let’s ask when those “German industry magnates” could have been actually financing the Nazi. It took Adolf Hitler fifteen years to rise to power, from 1919 to 1933. When reading literature on the road of the Nazi leaders to the very top of German political Olympus, one can but observe one striking fact – the closer is Hitler to victory, the more information on his sponsors is given by historians. True, when Hitler had already been made Chancellor, only the silly or the lazy wouldn’t contribute to the budget of the NSDAP. As the Nazi took another long stride to power, still more were willing to support them. The party’s leader could now negotiate financing affairs on a par with any German magnate. Hundreds of thousands of storm troopers and regular party members stood at his back, as well as the sympathy of millions of voters. It was at that moment that Hitler could really address “German industry magnates” and receive their material help. However, historians would rather overlook one very important detail. Almost all the evidence of such financial support refers to the last two years preceding the power grab by the Nazi. The well-known German industrialist August Thyssen declares in his book *I Paid Hitler* that the accumulated financing Hitler received from industrial companies totalled two million Deutschemarks<sup>26</sup>. The North Rhine-Westphalia group of industrialists also gave Hitler over one million Deutschemarks during 1931–1932, as testified by Funk at the Nuremberg Trials<sup>27</sup>.

But the winners of the Second World War somehow closed their eyes on that. None of Germany’s industrial élite was ever tried for having financed the party who had the blood of millions of people on their hands. For example, in 1947, Alfried Krupp (Alfried Felix Alwyn Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach) was convicted to twelve years imprisonment with confiscation of property – but not on the charge of having extended financial support to the Nazi, but for having practiced slave work at his factories, exploiting innocent people brought by force from Eastern Europe. The industrial magnate Kirdorf from the Ruhr region went so far as to pay the tithe of five Pfennigs to the NSDAP from every ton of coal sold. This amounted to a stunning six million Deutschemarks per year. Some money! But he was never charged or tried for that. If that same coal had been mined by concentration camp prisoners who had been dying by thousands from sheer emaciation, the “sponsor” would certainly have been punished. Once there are no exploited prisoners, there’s no charge – that’s how it was.

Indeed, no one was brought to book for paying Hitler! And not because those industrialists were thought to be beyond the reach of law, but because their donations were grossly dwarfed by the expenses of Hitler’s party. Their help was of importance, but not of *key* importance, for even

---

<sup>26</sup> Melnikov, D.; Chernaya, N. Criminal Number One. M., 1982. P. 138.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

in the roaring 1930-ies, the Golden Age of Hitler and his party, the Nazi's expenses did not tally with their income!

According to some estimations, the expenses of the NSDAP spent on political propaganda, the wages of the storm troops, and the endless election campaigns must have totalled from 70 to 90 million Deutschemarks!

And now hear them talking about donations of one to three million Deutschemarks! Even the six million from the coal industry is quite disproportionate to what they really spent. Adding party membership fees and miscellaneous donations by German citizens, we still end up with 30 to 40 million Deutschemarks unaccounted-for. Is this possible that the industrialists might be lying to conceal their real contribution to Hitler's budget? Hardly so. Who was it then, who gave him those millions? He couldn't have made them out of nothing, could he?

This question still remains without an acceptable reply. Precisely speaking, there have been replies readily given by some, but only to lull the readers out of asking unwanted questions. The fact that almost 90 % of the NSDAP financial documents vanished during the last days of the party may give some colour to this matter. In the spring of 1945 the Nazi made haste to destroy evidence. Only the archives of the Gestapo and the correspondence between the top commanders of the SS and the party leadership (for example, between Kaltenbrunner and Bormann) survived to be seized by the winners in the war. Still, the surviving documents sufficed to confine many leaders and top officials of the Third Reich either to the hangman or to decades behind bars. Why on earth had the Nazi not taken care of those documents as well? The answer is readily given – they were too occupied with destroying their *financial* history. It was that which they had been making every effort to get rid of in the first place. And only after that, they had proceeded to burn the less “grave” papers, like mass execution and deportation warrants, in order of significance. But why, among the smoking ruins of Berlin and Munich and on the brink of total annihilation, why should anyone take such pains to prevent the world from knowing the source of money used by the Führer to come to his power? What difference would it make to Göring or Himmler if everyone knew the “heroes” of the financial backstage dealings? They would stand trial in any case, and be condemned to at least many years in prison. Why would they think of burning folders with bills and receipts instead of those with warrants and reports of executions?

Göring and Himmler had no reason to do that whatsoever. Their crimes were too grave to bother about petty things like that. But there were those smaller fry in the Nazi hierarchy who had plans to live on. One example is the unchallenged treasurer of the NSDAP and SS Obergruppenführer Franz Xavier Schwarz. It was he who destroyed the bulk of the party's financial documents in the Munich “brown house”. Herr Schwarz was privy to all the monetary transactions of the party, and of course its financing. Hitler himself would often remonstrate that Schwarz wouldn't give him a Pfennig, with “his arse glued to the gold chests”, and that he (Hitler) would sooner get something “begging on the church porch”. So raging and fuming with indignation, Hitler still never thought of firing or even punishing Schwarz. Because Schwarz was exactly what a Minister of Finance is supposed to be.

Now why did Xavier Schwarz burn the financial documents? And still more interestingly, why didn't he burn *all* the documents, but left some untouched? That was all because he had plans for further life, to fulfil which he must make certain steps. He must destroy all the compromising materials and leave only the most harmless ones. On that condition only could he hope to be spared by those who had his life and well-being in their hands.

But who were they? German industrialists like the Krupps and the Borsigs? Of course not. They were those who defeated the Nazi Germany – the leaders of the Antihitlerite nations. Which occupation zone did the Nazi bigwigs try so desperately to get into after the defeat? Not hard to guess – that controlled by the United States and the United Kingdom. So it happened that Franz Xavier Schwarz was arrested in Munich by the allied forces who had entered the city not long

after he had destroyed everything “unfit” in his archive. It is those remaining documents that have enabled latter-day historians to judge that Hitler was financed by German industrialists.

Here comes the miraculous conclusion: once the 10 % of the documents that have actually been preserved state that financing was made by German capitalists, the lost 90 % must have been to the same effect! This kind of inference was drawn by both Western and Soviet historians and scholars, and has never changed up to the present day. The layman can't see beyond this conclusion to notice the logical fallacy. But why would one burn documents, saving *some* of them, if the preserved part could later be used to restore the content of the destroyed ones? It is evident that the destroyed documents must be radically different from those preserved. To destroy that which no scholar will ever find – that is logical enough! To destroy that which would compromise the leadership of the victorious parties in the war – their secret services and intelligence bureaus, and to preserve the sort of things Schwarz did – materials bearing on donations from Krupp, Borsig and others of the kind – those magnates who could now do nothing to alter the situation of the NSDAP ex-treasurer.

What happened next to Franz Xavier Schwarz may serve to confirm our conclusions. Having obliterated the papers which could cast a shade on the winners, he was given an almost “baby” term, when considering his important position in the NSDAP and the SS – only two years' imprisonment. Already in 1947, the ex-treasurer walked free from jail. Everything was as agreed – at least, that's what he must have thought. Schwarz says his say at the trial, silencing what should be silenced, gets his two years and then goes at large. The one thing he forgot was that “the only good witness is a dead witness”. So right out from jail, Schwarz died – that same year. When in prison, he had been safe and sound.

The people who sponsored Hitler and his party have been named quite often. But these names are either the same old “Krupps and Borsigs” or peripheral figures. When Hitler was tried for the Beer Putsch, it was elicited that he had received money for the party from the director of the Bavarian Industrial Union, privy councillor Aust, the Union's lawyer Doctor Kulo, and so on.

These names can go on and on, but they won't tell us anything. Their donations are too ridiculous to believe that they could have helped Hitler to seize the top power in Germany. But why should history books be so persistent in their moving tales of how Hitler was supported by burghers? One of those tales you will find in nearly all such books narrates about the donations made to the NSDAP by one Helena Bechstein, the wife of the owner of a large piano factory. That old woman, as the story goes, felt a mother-like affection for Adolf who was an orphan. When later he was spending time in prison, she would even call herself his mother to gain a visit. A similar generosity was evinced by a Frau von Seidlitz – according to Hitler's biographers, she gave all her money to the Nazi party<sup>28</sup>. Does it mean that those overactive old ladies should have been placed into the prisoner's box? Do we call narrow-minded middle-class dames past their prime responsible for the millions killed by the Nazi?

Those who are so colourful in their descriptions of those old ladies' affections and sympathies are either totally ignorant of how political parties are financed, or, quite on the opposite, too expert in that field. It is clear that the donations extended by a few tender-hearted women are not enough to support a whole party, not to say storm troops. But there must have been some persons who did give the needed sums to the Nazi, for the storm troops grew by leaps and bounds! And every trooper was fully provided for by the party. Every member of the SA (Strurmabteilung) was paid his wages, not exuberant, but regular, even during the total unemployment that had paralysed Germany. It was money and not Hitler's famous oratory skills that was the most convincing argument in recruiting new members. You can just put on a brown shirt – and you'll have something to feed your family with. So the SA was constantly growing in number, as did the party's expenses to

---

<sup>28</sup> Heiden, K. Hitler's rise to power. M., 2004. P. 179.

keep it. Where could the Führer take the required sums of money from? Neither can membership fees be an adequate explanation; otherwise, we'll get into the absurd. Let's say a would-be storm trooper enlists in the party and pays the due fee. And that fee is then used to equip him and pay him wages? Preposterous!

Strange as it may be, the truth about the real sources of money for the Nazi lies in the same books about Hitler. "Hitler also organised systematic collection of money abroad", Heiden remembers. "One of his most zealous collectors was a Doctor Hanzer in Switzerland"<sup>29</sup>.

I must confess, when I read this, I had to go back and reread it more than once to make sure I had grasped the meaning.

**Hitler, just making his first steps in politics, is on a hunt for money abroad!**

But the authors of books on Hitler do well to spare our nerves by inserting the word "also", lest we should by any chance surmise that the young and hungry Nazi party received *all its funds* from other countries! To make assurance double sure, these "historians" always have a couple of Aryan old women up their sleeve, or some German industrial tycoon who donated a tithe of his earnings to Hitler.

It is quite conceivable that citizen of some country should make donations to their countrymen who are in politics. They may have a fancy for the leader or his programme, or some other thing. One can't ban donations to political parties, after all, can one? Let them donate. However, any autonomous country does not allow accepting donations or material contributions from abroad: it is well-known that those harmless-looking gifts conceal the work of the secret forces of a rival country whose ultimate goal is to set up its own protégé ruler in power, which is certainly solely to its own benefit. For the same reason, any country that values its independence and liberty should have a keen eye on all sorts of funds, foundations and charity associations bankrolled by foreign "philanthropists". In Russia, there is a generic word for all such formations – "nongovernmental organisations". Why do you think they are paid so close an attention in this country? That is to preclude financing internal political struggle from without.

This makes sense. However, this book is not about the problems of young Russian democracy. It is about those of another democracy, also young, but German. That of the Weimar Republic, to be precise. To judge even by the scanty and disjointed sources available to us, things were turned upside down in the Germany of the 1920-ies. And unlike today's Russian Government, no one among the top authorities of Germany of that time seemed to take any interest in the who's and why's of the NSDAP foreign financing scheme. The sad result of the lack of such interest that could have saved the ruling government is known to us – in 1933, Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany.

But what foreign country or countries could have been willing to help that dark horse in German politics with money? Historians propose several different versions, which one can hardly read without a smile.

"The party, which had proved so successful in bringing itself to the foreground, was also supported by Czechoslovak, Scandinavian, but chiefly Swiss financial groups"<sup>30</sup>, states Joachim Fest who is widely recognised as one of the best biographers of Hitler.

This comes unexpected. Where are the "German industrialists" we've heard so much of? It appears that the more serious investigators of the Nazi history do not trust stereotypes, as would the gullible reader (though they don't oppose them either).

Why should Czechs sponsor the young, but obviously already fanatical Hitler? He hasn't got anything in his bag yet but his speeches in beer halls and circuses. And brilliant these speeches are, for sure, he's got a gift for them, indeed! For that, he is so far but a small figure on the local

---

<sup>29</sup> Heiden, K. Hitler's rise to power. P. 181.

<sup>30</sup> Fest, I. Hitler. Perm, 1993. V.1. P. 271.

Bavarian political stage. And it's not even that! The very Nazi party is yet a tiny society. This will later be confirmed in the writings of the “great connoisseurs” of the Third Reich. “Until 1930 the Nazis remained a minor party on the fringe of German politics”, writes Alan Bullock<sup>31</sup>.



The young politician Adolf Hitler bore no marks or makings of the great leader he was eventually to become

But what business could Czechs have had with the Nazi? What reason could Scandinavians have had to finance Hitler? What could Switzerland have had to do with the national socialists? No good reply to these questions is given by historians and scholars, simply because no good reasons can possibly be found for such conjectures. As a rule, you will come across some kind of general phrase; for example, “The motivating reasons for supporting the party were as diverse as the funding sources”<sup>32</sup>.

What we need is answers, not run-arounds! It may be good to write books and publish them in millions of copies to secure a comfortable life for yourself, without ever really getting your head round the things you write about. I am not saying anything against authors and investigators living in comfort. But I would certainly want them to respect their readers at least!

---

<sup>31</sup> *Bullock, A.* Hitler and Stalin: Parallel lives. Smolensk, 1994. V.1. P. 102.

<sup>32</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. Perm, 1993. V.1. P. 272.

In 1938 to 1939, Czechoslovakia would be torn apart and devoured by Hitler. Was it that which these mysterious Czech “friends” on the NSDAP gave their precious money for? They would have been blind to do that.

The neutral “Scandinavians” were also said to have helped Hitler. But who were these Scandinavians? Were they Norwegians whose territory would be occupied in 1940 by the one they sponsored? Could it have been the King of Norway who had been bored enough to start a game of political roulette, granting a lump sum to the would-be Führer and later fleeing from his country aboard a British man-of-war? You must admit, there are simpler ways to set on a sea voyage. Or, maybe, the word “Scandinavians” meant Danish who would be occupied with no resistance on their part? Or Swedish who miraculously preserved neutrality throughout the war?

I have already said that any act of funding a political party has a definite goal to achieve. Especially so, if the funding is made from another country. In that case, the goal must be very serious and on a global scale, and the benefit must be not only economical, but primarily geopolitical and strategic.

Well, for the life of me, I can see no reason for any of Hitler’s “donors” to pay him. What could be their gain? What geopolitical advantage? What profit to Czechoslovakia or Norway, or Switzerland from the revival of a strong Germany? Zero profit. Or were all they secret Nazi adherents? But have you heard of any in Denmark, Czechoslovakia, or, most of all, in Switzerland? True, there were a few hundred fanatics who were enlisted into SS divisions and later found their rest in common graves. But money donors and cannon fodder are completely different things!

According to Fest, “in the autumn of 1923, Hitler went to Zurich and was said to bring back with him “a coffer full of Swiss francs and American dollar banknotes”<sup>33</sup>. To put it simply, someone granted the future leader of Germany a substantial sum in foreign currency, on the very eve of his attempted coup. Hear them talking about Swiss themselves who did it!

Let me explain something. In April 1917, Vladimir Lenin returned to Petrograd (St. Petersburg) from Switzerland, having travelled across Germany in a sealed armoured carriage. Why then do they so often write that the money the Bolsheviks so suddenly procured had been provided by the German General Staff? What absolute nonsense! Lenin had been staying in Switzerland – in fact, in that very city of Zurich that was only six years later visited by Adolf Hitler, for his own motives. So, if use the logic proposed by the books on Hitler, we must conclude that Lenin had accepted money from Swiss! The Swiss intelligence services organised the October Revolution! It is to be regretted that no one should have gone so far in their speculations. That idea would really have taken the cake. As with the Nazi, Switzerland had no conceivable reason to back either a Russian revolution, or a German left-wing society. We might as well suggest that they did it to boost demand on Swiss chocolate and wrist-watches in a war-torn Europe.

We won’t get anywhere trying to analyse Hitler’s rise to power and his role in the outbreak of the Second World War without ruling out the notion of Czechs and Swiss as the Nazi’s principal benefactors. But why on earth do Hitler’s biographers stick to that downright rubbish? Could they indeed be so naïve to suggest in full earnest?

No, they can’t, and that is why they resort to prevarication. But faithful to their labour, these authors can’t but mention the fact, having abundant evidence that Hitler’s gold streams ran through Czechoslovakia, Scandinavian countries, and Switzerland. And though mentioned but in a few lines, this brief testimonial speaks louder of the causes and effects of world wars than volumes of historical treatises.

**The financing of shady dealings and obscure occurrences in world politics is always effected via banks and personalities that belong to neutral countries!** Should such an affair surface up, the blame can at any moment be laid on the neutrals to avert suspicions from the

---

<sup>33</sup> Fest, I. Hitler. P. 271.



superpowers. And it is only the neutral countries that Hitler's historians put the blame on. Swiss bankers only did their job, as it appears. They had been "told" to give money to Herr Hitler, and so they did it.

There is another question of importance – why these "kind-hearted" neutrals sponsored Hitler's party, out of all out there. Or maybe they sponsored all the German parties, hoping for a good "roll of the dice"? No, they didn't. They only gave money to the most promising ones. And not only Adolf Hitler. "Kurt W. Lüdecke, who was regarded as a "dark horse", also obtained considerable funds from some sources, unknown to the present day, but most likely, foreign ones, which enabled him, for example, to run a payroll of his "own" SA detachment of over fifty troopers"<sup>34</sup>.

Who was that Kurt Lüdecke? A Nazi panjandrum? Not at all. You will see books describe him as "one of the earliest supporters of the movement", "one of the comrades", or even "an agent of Hitler's". And now we have this quite inconspicuous "comrade" digging some unknown, but on all presumption foreign, sources for money to finance Hitler's yet budding endeavour. Then we see the same "dark horse" as a reporter for the *Völkischer Beobachter*, a newspaper controlled by the NSDAP central body. Why wasn't this valuable provider of funds and a "comrade" of Hitler's appointed as Gauleiter, or SS Gruppenführer, or even as editor-in-chief, but only a humble reporter? An old friend in need could be a friend indeed for the newly appointed Reichschancellor Adolf Hitler, especially so astute a man as was Lüdecke, who instead is sent off to write reports for a periodical.

Small wonder, though. A "dark horse" reads "agent" or "spy". A newspaper reporter is the favourite and rather hackneyed story of intelligence officers working under cover. We can infer with reasonable accuracy the source of the financial "Renaissance" of the yet nascent Nazi movement in 1920–1922 from Lüdecke's itinerary in the 1930-ies. Where does he go? To Bremen, Rostock, or Berlin? To Moscow, Prague, or Geneva? Nothing of the sort. Kurt Lüdecke goes to the United States of America.

**A still more curious version exists, suggesting that Hitler was sponsored by the French intelligence service!**<sup>35</sup>

But we are quite familiar with kind of logic. There is evidence that the Nazi received financial help from the bordering France. One can't obviate that fact in a book. There must be some explanation for it. So our "investigators" will say that the French financed the Nazi as Bavarian separatists!

True, France had always backed Germany's disintegration. So the idea of financing those who wished to separate Bavaria from the rest of the country should be a sound one. There is only one point – neither Hitler, nor his followers had ever expressed such intents. What is more, Hitler regarded France as Germany's number-one enemy. "We must fully realise that the deadliest foe of the German nation is, and will always be, France. No matter who should be in power there – the Bourbons or the Jacobins, Napoleons or bourgeois democrats – the ultimate objective of French external politics will always be that of seizing the Rhine. And to keep this great river in their hands, France will always invariably seek to see Germany a weak and disintegrated state", Hitler would write some time later in his notorious *Mein Kampf*. Could the French intelligence be headed by sheer idiots?

At the time of these "French" money transactions Hitler's book had not yet seen light, which fact may, in the eyes of "hitlerologists", account for this oddity. It is true that Hitler hadn't yet published his "landmark" work; but the NSDAP certainly had a programme, which one would

---

<sup>34</sup> *Fest, I. Hitler*. P. 271–272.

<sup>35</sup> *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, of April 29, 2005.

certainly have done well to browse through at least, before giving money the party. Just to be able to tell between separatists and radical nationalists.

The French, however, appeared to be totally unacquainted with the NSDAP political programme. We can only suppose that the French intelligence service was so rich that they didn't bother to read the official documents of those organisations it was about to finance. They simply drew the budget earmarked by Paris for the special purpose of sponsoring German extremist organisations.

Why do we come to this funny conclusion? Simply because anyone who has ever seen the programme of Hitler's party knows that it has nothing whatever to do with separatism! Likewise, any "capitalist" could clearly see in it points which hardly breathed capitalism; say, those about the "irrevocable confiscation of land" and "nationalising industrial concerns". As it is, the NSDAP stood fast for a solid and integral Germany. The very first clause in the programme can suffice to clear all doubts:

*We demand the integration of all the Germans, based on the right of national self-identification, into Great Germany.*

Let us suppose that the French went the hard way by deciding to read the programme starting from its end. But even in that case it would have been as clear as daylight. The NSDAP programme of April 1, 1920, was known informally as "The Twenty-Five Clauses", consisting of this many clauses (articles). The last, twenty-fifth, clause reads as follows:

*With the view to achieving all the aforesaid, we demand the formation of a strong centralised imperial government. The indisputable authority of a central political parliament over the entire territory of the Empire and all its organisations – [etc.]*

One might as well accuse of separatism the Russian White Army General Denikin, with his slogan of a "United and Indivisible Russia", or Minin and Pozharsky's militia. Does it mean that the French had indeed been too lazy to read the Nazi's brief programme? Or maybe it means that they *had* read it, and fully realised who and why they were financing? Why then should they assist those who only fifteen years later would devastate and occupy their homeland? Such things do happen: a man can breed and train a ferocious brute of a dog as protection against his neighbours, when one day the animal, breaking loose from his chain, goes at his master.

The events that took place in Germany after the First World War require some digression. The payment of the war reparations brought about an unprecedented inflation and pushed the unemployment rate sky-high, which together dropped the living standard to a catastrophic level. Starving war invalids is just one commonly seen picture of the Germany of the 1920-ies. Unheated households, famine-stricken children, a wave of suicides... The weaker ones saw only one way to put an end to the horrors of their life – a gas stove or a well-soaped hemp rope. Sometimes whole families would take that final step.

Picture to yourself comparatively well-dressed people, whose clothes have not yet worn out since the war began, rummaging in rubbish dumps in search of something to eat. Prostitution is rampant. Paupers, beggars, invalid demonstrations crying out for raising subsidies – subsidies enough to buy a glass of milk, nothing more.

Those who remember the Perestroika and the collapse of the Soviet Union are familiar with this image of chaos and poverty. But what happened in Russia after Yegor Gaidar's notorious reforms in the 1990-ies is like living in Paradise when compared to German post-war reality. Germany walked and crawled through a Purgatory, though all the circles of a Dantean hell. The inflation was unspeakable. In the autumn of 1923 one egg cost the price of 30 million eggs in 1913!<sup>36</sup> A young American newspaper reporter whose name was Ernest Hemingway retells a touching story he heard from a German waiter who had saved enough money to purchase a hotel.

---

<sup>36</sup> Bullock, A. Hitler and Stalin: Parallel lives. 1994. V.1. P. 111.

But now he could buy only four bottles of Champaign for the same price. Herr Ernst Hanfstengel (to whom we will return presently), returning home, can't get milk for his little son. Milk is dispensed only for ration tickets, and those are nearly unavailable. The only solution for him is to order huge amounts of coffee at a five-star hotel and pour out the tiny portions of cream into a bottle for his son<sup>37</sup>.

Those who would like to know more about the life of Germans in the years immediately following the First World War are strongly advised to read the novels of Erich Maria Remark, in particular, *The Black Obelisk*. This novel has some vivid descriptions of situations when, receiving one's salary before lunchtime, one would make directly for a nearby shop – there would be another zero added to the price tags after lunch.

But that's the life of ordinary German citizens. The Nazi met with many financial hardships, too, at first. The first storm troops were not able to hold parades in winter, for they had no warm boots. But little by little things went better. Higher storm troop officers and party functionaries were now paid in foreign currency<sup>38</sup>. This meant stability and a sustainable, decent life in an inflation-strangled Germany. Like any other party, the NSDAP collected contributions and donations. Storm troopers went about the streets with coin mugs, and one was supposed to buy a ticket to attend one of Hitler's speeches that gave in circuses, like some actor. All that was there, for sure, but such income was received in the Deutschemark that was continuously losing its value. And the good old ladies also made donations in Deutschemarks. "No party could then live on membership fees paid in Deutschemarks", as has been characteristically pointed out by historians<sup>39</sup>. And still we are never the wiser about who actually gave US dollars and Swiss francs to Hitler. Let's try to find an answer ourselves then. By understanding whose interests Hitler and his party suited most nicely we can guess who financed their development and rise to power. How do we know whose game Hitler was going to play, you will ask? Simple enough – we can read his programme book (which the "unfortunate" French spies failed to do). So let's get down to *Mein Kampf*.

As it is, the book has many threads woven together – personal reminiscences of a retired soldier, anti-Semitic statements, all in one heap. But we are interested only in the author's political views – anything that can throw light on his political plans. Hitler's sponsors did not enjoy our present position to see into the future and foretell the result of his political career.

The book opens with an analysis of the causes of Germany's defeat in the First World War.

*If European territorial policy could be carried out against Russia only with England as an ally, then, on the other hand, colonial and world trade policy was conceivable only against England with the help of Russia. <...> However, one did not at all think of forming an alliance with Russia against England, nor with England against Russia, for in both cases the end would have been war <...>*<sup>40</sup>.

This sole statement reveals the plain direction that Hitler's politics was taking. In order to be able to take something from somebody, Germany must ally with someone else that it was not going to take anything from. The Kaiser's diplomats had not thought this far, and had got the country embroiled in a war against the whole world.

*Since, however, it was generally not desired to have anything to do with planned war preparation, the acquisition of territory in Europe was abandoned owing to the fact that instead of this there was devotion to colonial and trade policy, and an otherwise possible alliance with*

---

<sup>37</sup> Hanfstengel, E. Hitler: Lost years. M., 2007. P. 23–24.

<sup>38</sup> Fest, I. Hitler. Perm, 1993. V.1. P. 272.

<sup>39</sup> Heiden, K. Hitler's rise to power. M., 2004. P. 178.

<sup>40</sup> Hereinafter *Mein Kampf* is quoted from the Reynal And Hitchcock English-language edition (New York, 1941) available from the Internet Archive Universal Library here: <https://archive.org/details/meinkampf035176mbp> (*Translator's note*)

England was sacrificed, without, however, logically getting backing from Russia, and finally the government stumbled into the World War, abandoned by all<...>.

Surely, one can't win if one struggles against all. That is the first conclusion the author arrives at. Then he proceeds to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of his country's enemies.

*We must at last become entirely clear about this: the German people's irreconcilable mortal enemy is and remains France.*

But Germany's other enemy from the Triple Entente, Britain, is characterised using a completely different modality. It is even vindicated.

*Precisely in order not to allow France's power to grow too great, participation in her hankerings for loot was England's sole possible form of action for herself. In reality England did not achieve her war aim.*

The sons of "perfidious Albion" had always attempted to weaken the strongest country on the continent. Quite recently, it had been Germany. But now that it had been ruined and devastated, it no longer presented any threat for the British. In Hitler's view, now Britain could only be looking askance at France!

*Thus the fruit of the struggle against the development of German power was politically the precipitation of French hegemony on the continent.*

However, the pillars of British politics are forged not for decades but for centuries. And so, Hitler reflects, Britain has no reason to back out this time.



Cover of the first edition of Mein Kampf, the pivotal book of the Third Reich. The crucial political idea is that Britain must be Germany's primary ally

*England's desire is and remains the prevention of the immoderate rise of any continental power to world political importance; that is, the maintenance of a fixed balance of power relation among European States; for this seems to be the premise of British world hegemony.*

Here the author comes to another conclusion – the crucial one in his book, the one it was written for.

*Whoever undertakes, from the above viewpoint, an estimate of the present possibilities of an alliance for Germany must reach the conviction that the last practicable tie remaining is only English support.*

Hitler wants to let bygones be bygones, without looking back at Britain's old sins. The 1918 defeat, the revolution, the sunken German fleet, the exorbitant reparations – all that he was prepared to forgive and forget. For the British hadn't done all that out of spite; nothing personal, only business.

*Now, alliance policies are not advanced from considerations of backward-looking discords, but rather fructified by a knowledge of past experiences. Experience, however, should now have taught us that alliances for the achievement of negative goals suffer from internal weaknesses.*

Think positive, that's what he is basically saying! No need to bear a grudge against the British, no need to expect them to pat you on the shoulder. One can't expect them to turn suddenly pro-German, a well. Such politicians have never existed in England.

*Every Englishman as a statesman is, of course, first of all an Englishman, every American an American, and no Italian will be found prepared to play any other politics than pro-Italian politics. Whoever, then, thinks of succeeding in concluding alliances with foreign nations on the basis of a pro-German sentiment of their leading statesmen is either a jackass or a fraud. The premise for the linking of national fates never lies in mutual respect or even congeniality, but in a perspective of mutual expediency for both contracting parties. That is, let us say, however invariably an English statesman pursues pro-English policies and never pro-German, **quite definite interests of these pro-English policies can, for the most diverse reasons, duplicate pro-German interests.***

The notion of "duplicate interests" is that launch-pad that can propel Germany into the bright future and Hitler to the political Olympus in his country.

*England desires no German world power, but France desires no power at all called Germany: a really quite essential difference. Today, however, we are not fighting for position as a world power, but we must struggle for the existence of our fatherland, our national unity, and for daily bread for our children. If, with this viewpoint, we want to keep our eyes open for European allies, then there remain practically **two States: England and Italy.***

It is curious that both Soviet and Western historians and politicians never investigate Hitler's devoted affection for Britain. It is hardly mentioned at all, or but in a few words, for example, those of Winston Churchill: "England and Italy are the only two possible allies for Germany"<sup>41</sup>.

Hitler next expounds that a strong France would be the bane of the existence of England and Italy, out of all other countries. The Führer's logic is plain as daylight. Since these two countries would hate to see the strengthening of France developing its hegemony in Europe thanks to the weakness of Germany rather than its own intrinsic power, these countries become Germany's friends, if not on purpose. My enemy's enemy is my friend. Well, maybe not exactly a friend, but certainly not an enemy!

*On the soberest and coldest reflection, it is today primarily these two States, **England and Italy**, whose most natural self-interests, at least in all essentials, do not oppose the conditions of existence of the German nation, indeed, to a certain degree are identical with them.*

The very word "England" is repeated in the quoted chapter with surprising frequency. Hitler keeps driving home the same idea, under various sauces.

*For Germany, however, the French danger means an obligation to subordinate all considerations of sentiment, and to reach out the hand to those who, threatened as much as we are, will not tolerate and bear France's drive toward dominion.*

---

<sup>41</sup> Churchill, W. The Second World War. V.1. P. 43.

What is Hitler talking about? Could he be trying to make friends with Britain? And that almost a decade before his establishment in power? Exactly. And no buts about it.

**In Europe there can be for Germany in the predictable future only two allies: England and Italy.**

The key to success and proliferation for a weak and beaten Germany is a union with the defeateds that have no more interest in weakening the already weak Germany.

And then it occurred to me – it is not for German burghers and Hausfraus that Hitler wrote his book. Not for the lads in the Hitlerjugend, not for the burly storm troopers, nor for the “men in black”, the SS. For Hitler, *Mein Kampf* was a splendid opportunity to address the rulers of the world of that time – England, and bring home his message, which was plain enough. A powerful movement is being born in Germany headed by Hitler. It has not yet gained its full swing, so it asks for help. Like a green sprout reaching for light, the Nazi party is making its way through the political “soil” of Germany. The party needs only two things: money and once more money. And there should be no fears about the party – the Nazi are “good guys”, they pose no threat to the British. The ambitious German politician Adolf Hitler sets up a forceful Anglophile movement and tries to bring it up to political power. The British could as well consider supporting him; for when he mounts the German political Olympus, he is going to enforce politics favoured by the United Kingdom; for there are no discrepancies between his political programme and that of Britain. Hitler needs no other allies.

*...How every one of these points <of the peace treaty of Versailles> could have been burned into the brain and feeling of this nation until, finally, in the heads of sixty million men and women the same sense of shame and the same hate would have become a single fiery sea of flames, out of whose glow a steely will would have risen and a cry forced itself <...>*

The treaty of Versailles indeed drove Germany to the very brink of destruction. The huge reparations due to be paid, famine, cold, poverty, unemployment, suicides... What kind of “cry” did Hitler expect to “force itself” from the souls of the Germans? “Feed us”? “Make us warm”? “Give us jobs”? “Cancel our reparations”? “Rescind the treaty of Versailles”?

Not at all. *Mein Kampf* suggests something completely different, being intended for quite a different audience than scholars are inclined to think.

**We want arms once more!**

That is the exact phrase in the book that ends the previous one.

Will Germany ask for arms from its defeateds to turn them against those who have devastated their *Vaterland*? Will it attempt to recover its lost territories and overseas colonies? But who will arm Germans against themselves? No need to worry. Hitler gives a ready answer in his book, and very clear one.

*The premise for the winning of lost territories is the intensive advancement and strengthening of the remaining remnant State as well as the unshakable decision <...> to consecrate at the given moment to the service of the liberation and unification of the whole nation <...>: that is, setting aside the interests of the separated regions.*

Hitler is not going to claim back the “separated regions”! Just because an alliance with Britain is Germany’s only chance to recover and regain its bygone grandeur. This goal is worth any sacrifice. The victorious Britain must have no fears to rearm Germany, as long as the arms will be used for quite different purposes, such as conquering new territories for the benefit of both nations.

*National fates are solidly welded together only through a perspective of a common triumph, in the sense of common gains, conquests, in short, a joint expansion of power.*

What “conquests” does Hitler plan to set out on for Germany and England to benefit from? This is the subject of the next chapter (Chapter 14) in *Mein Kampf*, with a tell-tale title – *Eastern Orientation or Eastern Policy*. This chapter is the most favoured source of quotation for many Soviet historians. However, it cannot well be understood without the previous chapter; so I must

ask for an excuse from my readers for these long quotations. Now this Chapter 14 is extremely important for the understanding of the roots of the Second World War. But to be able to find a reply to what really happened on June 22, 1941, still more important is the direction of thoughts that had formed themselves in the head of the future Führer and Reichschancellor Adolf Hitler before it all began.

In Chapter 14, Hitler expounds where the Nazi will send the German troops after being armed by the First World War victors.

*The demand for the re-establishment of the frontiers of the year 1914 is political nonsense of such a degree and consequences as to look like a crime.*

Let me remind that Germany's defeat in the First World War resulted in massive forfeiture of its territories. These territories were grabbed by France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Lithuania. The overseas colonies were re-colonised by the United Kingdom. A demand to return these territories would mean war with the countries that now occupied them. Poland, Czechoslovakia and Lithuania are controlled by the Union Jack, while France is its number-one ally. The British will have no interest in such a war, hence no desire to sponsor it. For this reason, Hitler attempts to dissipate their doubts once and for all. We don't want back our Alsace and Lorraine, says he, you may rest on it. There are other places of interest – far to the East, far beyond Poland and Lithuania.

*With this, we National Socialists consciously draw a line through the foreign-policy trend of our pre-War period. We take up at the halting place of six hundred years ago. We terminate the endless German drive to the south and west of Europe, and direct our gaze towards the lands in the east. We finally terminate the colonial and trade policy of the pre-War period, and proceed to the territorial policy of the future.*

*But if we talk about new soil and territory in Europe today, we can think primarily only of Russia and its vassal border states.*

That's clear enough, isn't it? "We draw a line through the foreign-policy trend of our pre-War period" means no expansion of Germany to the territories it strove to occupy before the First World War, namely, China, Africa, and Asia. As it is, those lands are already divided among the English, the French, and other European nations. Even America has an axe to grind on these continents. Hitler won't go there – he will go to Russia. There is land enough for everybody there; not only for the Germans, but for the British as well!

Like an experienced clairvoyant, Hitler strives to dispel all the doubts and shilly-shally of the British intelligence services for who he intended his book. An alliance between Germany and Russia is the perennial nightmare for the Anglo-Saxondom. What happens if these two continental powers become friends? In that case, arming Hitler's Germany might be "cruising for a bruising", once he starts claiming the world hegemony in a tie with the Soviet Union.

Such jejune speculations are utterly ruled out in Hitler's book.

*The former Russia, divested of its German upper stratum, is, entirely aside from its new rulers' private plans, no ally for a struggle of the German nation for freedom. Considered purely militarily, in the event of a Germano-Russian war against Western Europe, which would probably, however, mean against the entire rest of the world, the relations would be simply catastrophic. The struggle would proceed not on Russian but on German soil, without Germany being able to get from Russia even the slightest effective support.*

After these reassuring words, the author again addresses his target audience – those in London, not in Berlin. Considering exactly who the following words are addressed to, one can't but see the book in a different light.

*See to it that the strength of our nation is founded, not on colonies, but on the European territory of the homeland. Never regard the Reich as secure while it is unable to give every national offshoot for centuries his own bit of soil and territory.*

It seems Hitler has made his point quite clear already; basically, he owns that:

- he stands for an alliance with Britain;
- blessed by the English and French to rearm Germany, he is ready to attack and conquer the Soviet Union not only in the interests of Germany, but in those of other “forward-looking” nations;
- he is prepared to withdraw claims to restore the former German territories that have been occupied by his Anglo-Saxon “friends”.

Clear as it is, Hitler keeps harping on the same string of a British-German alliance, as if to make assurance double sure.

*The most important is first the fact that an approach to England and Italy would in itself in no way evoke danger of war. The only power which would come into question as opposing the alliance, France, would not be in a position to do so.*

Besides, why should France stand up against Hitler who, though calling France Germany’s enemy, is going to make his conquests in the direction of Smolensk and Kharkov and not Marseille and Toulon?

*A further consequence would be that Germany would be freed from its adverse strategic situation at one blow. The most powerful protection of the flank on one side, the complete guaranty of our supply of the necessities of life and raw materials on the other side, would be the blessed effect of the new order of States.*

In all events and circumstances, Hitler sees his alliance with Britain as a panacea for all the pains and aches of the German nation. A kind of balm on the wounds of the fatally injured country.

*But almost more important would be the fact that the new union of States comprises a capacity for technical performance which, in many respects, is almost mutually complementary. For the first time Germany would have allies who do not suck like leeches on our own economy, but which both could and would contribute their share to the richest completion of our technical armament.*

You are still in the dark about the proposed source of the technologies, money, and ammunition? About those with whose help Hitler could not dispense in his war plans? Why, he writes quite openly about it. The concluding chapters of *Mein Kampf* are one endless train of eulogy on the United Kingdom, page after page.

*The English mother country is really only the great capital of the British world empire <...>*

*The greatest world power of the earth <England> and a youthful national State would constitute different premises for a struggle in Europe <...>*

**England means everything for us Germans – that notion concludes Mein Kampf.** The book having a total of fifteen chapters, we find that a seventh part of Hitler’s fundamental literary work is devoted to the blessings of a friendship between England and Germany.

But the Anglo-Saxon rulers of this world do not easily extend their graces. “*Of course, as I already emphasized in the previous chapter, the difficulties standing in the way of such an alliance are great*”, Hitler stresses. One must prove one’s helpfulness, loyalty and malleability; only then the British intelligence bigwigs may condescend to notice the otherwise inconspicuous German politician.

So Hitler expresses his readiness to make every effort for the alliance to come true.

*And this is possible the moment when, filled with warning need, one single course, conscious of its aim, is adopted and held, instead of the past decade’s foreign-policy aimlessness.*

What course is that? What is Hitler’s objective? These questions are simple to answer if you have read this chapter.

**The recovery and rearmament of Germany immediately followed by an intrusion into the wide expanses of Russia is the Nazi leader’s first and foremost goal. The one essential condition for it, the basis for the recovery of Germany’s economic and military strength is an alliance with Great Britain.**

How could one fail to notice, encourage and support this well-minded patriot?

How could one leave such a helpful leader without a penny?



How could one forbear to help this Anglophile politician to his power?

## Leon Trotsky – the Father of the German Nazism

*A state always is the first to fall, and economy follows it, never the other way round... Economy can't prosper, if it isn't protected by a powerful and prosperous state.*

**Adolf Hitler**

*Strange though it may appear, being sovereign and conservative to the core at home, England always tended to patronize the most demagogic strivings in its foreign relationships, steadily encouraging every popular movement intended to weaken sovereign terms.*

**Report of Durnovo N.P. to Nicolas II, the Emperor. February 1914**

It is important to answer who brought the Hitlerite regimen to power to understand all the further tragic events. Incorrect estimate of the early Nazi period leads to misunderstanding of reasons of World War II. Mysteries and compelling issues multiply. According to books in history, political leaders act in spite of any logics and common sense. However, that is hardly possible. We have already mentioned that driveling idiots don't normally stay at power. Statesmen act in the interests of states entrusted to them and follow their own logics at that. If a puppet is at power, it also follows demands of the state, though, it is not the state it belongs to. It is important to understand that every action is taken to provide political or economical dividends to the country. If the country's sovereignty is phoney, every action is taken to bring dividends to the host-state. If after reading a research in history you get the impression that before World War II all states were led by fools, who didn't understand simple things obvious even to the Reader, then the author of that research must have failed to comprehend that historic period!

To judge actions of the World's leading politicians correctly, one must go back in time and take a dive into the greasy midst of the Russian and the German revolutions. Let's start with the latter, which is the German one. It broke out against hard struggle Germany was going through in every sphere. However, it can't be explained with military defeat. Well, it can, if some of important facts are disremembered. It was in 1945 that the enemy completely occupied Germany, which had resisted to the last. When the revolution started in Autumn 1918, there wasn't a single enemy soldier in the German lands. Germany didn't suffer from carpet bombing, which could obliterate entire towns. It went through serious economical problems, but in 1918 Berlin and Hamburg didn't starve like Leningrad in 1941. Why did the revolution happen, then?

Because it was being prepared. The same powers which crushed the Russian Empire in February and October were doing it. At that time they were going to overthrow their second geopolitical rival, Kaiser Wilhelm. And they managed to do it! Artificiality of this crush in Germany provided the Nazi with splendid grounds for agitation.

"I am telling you, if I come to power in a legal way, the Nazi Court shall be established, and the November revolution will be avenged, and many shall be decapitated in a legal way"<sup>42</sup>, Hitler announced in the open. Might he have not been telling the truth or might he have been exaggerating stating that Germany had been backstabbed, or was it another trick of Goebbels's propaganda?<sup>43</sup> Judge for yourself...

---

<sup>42</sup> Bullock, A. Hitler and Stalin. V.1. P. 278.

<sup>43</sup> Curiously, General Malcolm, the Head of the British military mission in Germany was the first to pass the word about Germany having been "backstabbed" and thus having lost the war. (*Preparata, G.D.* Hitler Inc. How Britain and the USA created the Third Reich. P. 148.)

When Germany crushed, Prince Maximilian of Baden was the Chancellor. Actually, when he came to power on October 3, 1918, a new government was established, where not ceremonious Kaiser officaries but right-wing social-democrats ruled, headed by Ebert and Scheidemann. In the end of September 1918 the situation at front-lines was complicated. The Germany Allies started to hesitate<sup>44</sup>. On September 30 Bulgaria concluded armistice with the Entente countries. Leaders of Austro-Hungary and Turkey also started to consider saving their regimes instead of winning the lasting war. At that time it was most important to reinforce their spirit and confidence of winning.

It was obviously true for Germany. Its competitors had to solve another problem number one, which was holding separate negotiations with German satellites. The matter was that if allies of Germany seceded from it, it would inevitably loose, though, if they remained, the war could have lingered on. And population of London and Paris was at the edge of exhaustion; they might not have withstood millions of new death notices. Even the USA that had just joined the struggle didn't wish this struggle to linger on. It was not by chance that Washington had been waiting for almost four years and had declared war on Germany in half a year before it was defeated. The point was to come and get everything made, not filling inaccessible German trenches with dead bodies of American soldiers.

And some real miracles started in this crucial moment. The German Chancellor Prince Max of Baden caught a cold. It was bad for him, of course, but it wasn't too disastrous for the country. Though, it wasn't the Prince's illness that caused the trouble, but its consequences. What happened? Nothing important, really. Nonsense.

**Prince Max of Baden fell asleep.**

And he was sleeping for some really long time. As long as normal people never sleep, even if they are extremely tired and busy. You will find no information about it in school books, as historians normally miss out the facts they can't explain. However, this information can be learnt from memoirs of the British Prime-Minister Lloyd George. It wasn't the matter of uncommonly long sleep of the Reichschancellor, it was that Germany actually lost the war while he was asleep!

“Excessive dose of dormitive made him unconscious for 36 critical hours, since November 1 till November 3. When he awoke, he discovered that the last German allies, Turkey and Austro-Hungary, had broke off the war. Disturbances enkindled by Bolsheviks agitators were breaking up all over Germany”<sup>45</sup>.

Actually, Vienna and Istanbul made separate peace with the Entente, and the Head of the German Government was fast asleep at that time. When he opened his eyes, his country was at the Death's door already...

Do you believe that the Reichschancellor could have spontaneously fallen asleep and slept for 36 hours? Do you believe that no one could have woken him up? Or that no one felt like that despite what was going on? Stalin would never sleep the battle of Moscow away, no matter how tired he would be! Hitler would never sleep the battle of Berlin, no matter how badly his nervous system would be stressed! Even overtired and ill George Bush, as well as any other President, would be woken up, if something as catastrophic as the event on September 11, 2001 would happen in the USA. Their position obliges them to manage their country, to give directions and to react to rapidly changing conditions.

But Prince Max of Baden was sleeping. There are only two reasonable explanations of him sleeping that calmly on the decisive moment of the German history. Both of them make us feel that the German “revolution” is very similar to a plot or to an operation of an Intelligence Service.

---

<sup>44</sup> Not many can give a correct answer, if asked who the Entente and Russia within it were fighting during World War I. Let us remind you that Germany had three allies, which were Austro-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria.

<sup>45</sup> Lloyd, *George D. War memoirs*. M., 1938. V.6. P. 145. (Quote from the book by *Shatzillo, V. World War I 1914–1918*. M., 2003. P. 349–350.)

- It wasn't by chance that the ill Prince got the horse drench of dormitive and that no one who could have woken him up was allowed to see him.

- Prince chose that pathetic alibi himself, pretended to be ill and quietly “slept” in his study, not interfering into crushing of his country (as all of it had been agreed before).

Let inquisitive historians determine what really happened there. In this case more details doesn't really make more sense. However, we will mention one more interesting point, featuring the German revolution and “the Sleeping Beau”, Prince of Baden. As it is well-known, crush of the Kaiser Empire started from the sailors' revolt in Kiel. Just as in Russia, sailors were “beauty and pride” of the revolution. Both our and their Naval forces spent most of the war in ports. Dreadnoughts and battleships were too expensive to let them sink during battles in vain. Thanks to idleness and propaganda, sailors became the impulsive force of “changes”...

The revolt in port Kiel took place, because “the buddies” disaccustomed to military service didn't wish to take part in the decisive battle with the British fleet. German admirals had a good idea, actually, they wanted to give a fateful battle. And then let the luck hold. Victory could have totally changed the situation, but defeat wouldn't have made things any worse. Anyway, dying in a battle suits military honor better than capitulation. Though, sailors propagandized by social-democrats failed to support such great idea and started a revolt.

How shall we call this? A military rebellion. Such fault has always been severely punished in every army. In wartime Court martial of any army would simply sentence the guilty ones to execution. However, the German government, including social-democrats, didn't use force against rebels. Moreover, Prince Max issued an order, prohibiting to use weapons for suppression of expanding disturbances. When his inaction weakened the regime enough, the Reichschancellor instantly woke up and called to headquarters of Kaiser Wilhelm in the town of Spa, suggesting that Kaiser should abdicate. “Only his long-drawn sleep prevented Prince Max from making certain suggestions to Wilhelm before”<sup>46</sup>, the British Prime-Minister Lloyd George wrote in his memoirs. You might not feel so, but the more I studied the miracles of that time, the more I doubted that the valiant German Prince Max was sleeping, indeed...

This situation looks very alike our February revolution, when the Monarch was made to abdicate. It was this abdication, not “the revolution situation”, which instantly put the country on the Death's door. Though, whereas Nicolas II yielded to blackmail, Kaiser showed some temper. He was able of doing it, because unlike his Russian cousin he wasn't under arrest. However, such persistence of the Monarch prevented starting of the further mechanism, intended to quickly liquidate the entire German Empire as the powerful military country. So, it was necessary to tell some bold lies.

Max of Baden made something absolutely incredible, which Prince and Prime-Minister could never have done. He announced that Kaiser had abducted despite the fact that the latter clearly refused to do so!

---

<sup>46</sup> *Shatzillo, V. World War I 1914–1918. M., 2003. P. 350.*



The Head of the German government Prince Max of Baden “fell asleep” in autumn 1918. That time was so crucial for history of Germany that he can be easily convicted of treachery

In fact, Wilhelm abdicated only three weeks after his abdication had been announced!<sup>47</sup> And Prince wasn't just Reichschancellor, he was the cousin of Kaiser. If this was not treachery, what shall treachery be like?

There are some other “accidental coincidences” assuring us that both our and the German revolution were made with one pattern. February disorders in Petrograd started on February 23, right after the Tsar left for his Headquarters in Mogilev. Eight days later Russia learnt that he had abdicated. It was all the same in Germany. On October 28, 1918 Wilhelm left Berlin for his Headquarters in Spa, and twelve days later Germans learnt that they didn't have a Monarch anymore...

It is well-known that when the Moor has done his work, the Moor can go. Having appropriated the God's authority (as the Monarchs were the Lord's Anointed), Max of Baden instantly announced his retirement and appointment of Ebert, leader of social-democrats, to the Chancellor's post. At first he ceded his Kaiser, then he ceded his post. In an hour (!) after that the second leader of the social-democratic party Scheidemann extended the revolution even further, having arbitrarily announced Germany a Republic!

The Government of “the sleeping” Prince Max stayed at power for only a month. And within this period it managed to loose all German allies, and even Germany itself! Later Hitler called these gentlemen proditors and traitors. And it wasn't only about smooth liquidation of Monarchy. Scheidemann, Ebert and their accomplices hastily signed cessation of arms with the Entente countries, as soon as they came to power. It was made so handily that Germans were outwitted as a middlebrow in a shellgame. When one reads this document, no doubt about sponsors of the German revolution remain.

---

<sup>47</sup> The Global History. M., 2001. V. 20. P. 188.

“Clause 4. The German army shall cede the following military goods: 5 thousand cannons, 25 thousand machine guns, 3 thousand trench mortars and 1,700 airplanes...”

Clause 7. ... The Allies get 5 thousand steam locomotives, 150 thousand wagons and 5 thousand trucks...

Clause 9. The German Government undertakes to support occupation armies in the Rhineland (excluding Alsace-Lorraine).

Clause 10. Immediate one-sided repatriation ... of all army prisoners, who belong to armies of the allies...”<sup>48</sup>

Besides all the above-mentioned, Germany was obliged to provide its entire fleet to the Entente, i.e. 6 heavy cruisers, 10 battleships, 8 light cruisers, 50 destroyers and 160 submarines<sup>49</sup>.

How do you like this armistice? Can text related to armistice contain such clauses? The other wording for armistice is ceasefire. However, the document offered by the Entente and hastily signed by the new German government can only be considered as unconditional surrender. At the same time, if Germans learnt what the British and the French demanded, the population would go on rebelling. That is why the document was called armistice. At first, Germany surrendered its weapons, obliged to withdraw its troops from occupied lands and to hand over its fleet to the Entente’s supervision, to hand over all of its heavy armament and transport means and to release all captives. Only when Germans had no more army and means of resistance the peace talk was to be started. In fact, at first Germans surrendered their weapons, and only then they learnt the terms and conditions of the deal!

Germany was crushed without a hitch. With Kaiser’s consent the German delegation started peace negotiation as early as on November 7, 1918, even before Wilhelm had abdicated. The allies let Germans consider the offer for 72 hours, which expired on November 11. But Kaiser would never have agreed to such predatory terms. Signing such document actually meant that Germany lost World War I! So, it was necessary that by the time of signing the truce Kaiser wasn’t the Head of Germany anymore. Otherwise, this ceasefire, looking more like surrender, wouldn’t have been signed. That is why Max of Baden had to lie about Kaiser’s abdication on November 9. And the new puppet government instantly signed the documents till November 11, as demanded by the enemy.

These papers were all right! When did the Entente’s leaders manage to calculate military property and steam locomotives that Germans were to hand over? Or did the German delegates kindly bring a list with them? Or may the allies have prepared the agreement in advance, as they knew about the revolt being prepared?

The Entente’s propagandists were assuring Germans that as soon as Germany got rid of its Kaiser, equitable peace agreement would be signed. To a certain extent such attitude made many Germans unwilling to support him.

Germans overthrew its leader, brought the country to chaos and made it impossible for its army to fight further. However, Germans weren’t spared in any way, when terms of the armistice agreement and the Treaty of Versailles were being compiled. Conversely, that were the harshest terms of armistice since the Punic wars between Rome and Carthage. Consequently, Germans felt deceived and betrayed. It has to be mentioned that vengeance caught up with most of the traitors. Thus, Matthias Erzberger, who signed “the peace agreement”, was shot in August 1921 by two young Nationalists. Most of those who signed the Treaty of Brest from the part of Russia perished in 1937–1938...

---

<sup>48</sup> *Shatzillo, V.* World War I 1914–1918. P. 338.

<sup>49</sup> *History of World War I 1914–1918. M., 1975. P. 508.*

Naturally, the predatory Treaty of Versailles was signed after that. You know what happened next. Reparations till 1988, starvation, chill and unprecedented inflation. Germans sobered fast, but they had no way back. Goods output reduced to the level of 1888, but since that time the population increased by 30 %!<sup>50</sup> Germans could only stand it or shut their windows and open gas valves in their kitchens. That is when Adolf Hitler started his way to the political arena. He understood who had won the last world war and who kindly permitted Germany to be put back on its feet.

### **So, who organized the February and October Revolution in Russia and the November Revolution in Germany?**

Almost all my books are dedicated to inquiry into this matter. There are loads of proof there<sup>51</sup>. It is absolutely impossible to repeat all of it in the research related to mysteries of Adolf Hitler coming to power. Let the Reader refer to the books already published, and let me only repeat the conclusion that matters for our research of causes and reasons of World War II.

**Revolutions in Germany and Russia were organized by the British Intelligence Service at adequate support of the USA and France.** The aim of the World Slaughter I was to play off one great country against the other and to later unleash revolutions in both of them, thus destroying these countries<sup>52</sup>. All possible political parties were used to reach this goal. In Russia these were SRs, Kadets, Mensheviks and Bolsheviks; in Germany that were ace-deuce social democrats. However, it didn't went smoothly for the British Intelligence Service. If Germany had its own "bloody dog" Noske, in Russia murdering of political competitors was firmly undertaken by Bolsheviks. Having been delivered to Russia by the British Intelligence Service in a sealed wagon as agreed with German security services, they didn't want to get away from the political arena. Having turned out to be gifted and merciless organizers, Bolsheviks won the Civil war and got out of control of British curators.

When dust from crushing of the great Russian Empire settled down, the surprised British saw something impossible. Instead of a huge but predictable Royal Empire there was a smaller but absolutely unpredictable new country, the USSR. It was headed by people, who were personally aware of how revolutions had been made and who thus were worthy competitors in political struggle.

However, the Soviet Union wasn't dangerous because of its new ideology. At least, its mottos, "-isms" and configurations of regimes were only means for reaching the intended goal, not the goal itself. That is why Bolsheviks, who collapsed Russia, had to continue politics of their incoronated predecessors, when they came to power. They quickly got almost all the lands lost back, though, it was made in the name of Marxism at that time. However, the true reason was not the ideological triumph of the bearded man from London, but logics of geopolitical opposition and protection of the country's interests<sup>53</sup>.

When we say that Great Britain used revolution as a weapon to destruct its geopolitical rivals, it must be understood that Britain and the USA had been kind of a single whole for a long time. Once Brits were in the lead, but since 1945 Americans took up the reins. There were certain disagreements between them, of course. But disagreements between the Anglo-Saxon were absolutely minor, if compared to their monolithic solidarity in matters of grabbing global resources.

---

<sup>50</sup> How the German sword was forged. M., 2006. P.7.

<sup>51</sup> Refer to *Starikov, N.* 1917. Not revolution, but a special operation! 1917. Who murdered Russia?; Betrayed Russia. Our "allies" from Boris Godunov to Nicolas II; From Decembrists to Mujahidins. Who fed our revolutionaries?

<sup>52</sup> Refer to *Starikov, N.* 1917. Not the revolution, but the special operation! M., 2007.

<sup>53</sup> For 37 years Carl Marx lived in London. That is where he wrote his "Capital" and where he is buried. And the First Communistic International was established in this city. It was not by accident. For about 200 years all anti-Russian forces find shelter with this city. Simply remember the most recent events of contemporary Russian history to see how fair this statement is.

That is why not only the British but the American Intelligence Service as well participated in crushing of their geopolitical competitors<sup>54</sup>.

There was also a place for the French in this block of “progressive mankind”. Differently speaking, the so-called Western world was getting more and more close-knit in regard to pursuing of common objectives since Napoleon Bonaparte had been defeated. One of the objectives was to destroy all dangerous rivals, such as Russia and then Germany, who prevented them from using global resources. And “the imaginative disagreements” started, when it was necessary to determine shares of goods due to each of the parties. However, such disagreements had no effect on solidarity of Western democracies. Mind, this is how historians call the sworn friendship of Britain, France and the USA in the period between two World Wars<sup>55</sup>.

Yet, only two latter states are called republics, whereas Great Britain is constitutional monarchy. That difference of political regimes makes us comprehend that comparing countries basing on the method of management is rather conventional, at the first place, and that these states weren't united by some “global human values” or “struggle for human rights”, but something deeper and permanent, which was the self-interest, at the second place.

Now, let's consider the situation in the Earth in early 20-ies of the XX century. Immeasurable wealth of Russia is well-known. Even without any geological investigations it can be assumed that 1/6th of land can hardly contain only sand, clay and pebble stones. The powerful Russian Empire was located on vast lands. As any other country or empire Russia had a lot of problems, conditioned by its history, geography and ethnic composition. The British Intelligence Service was aiming at every point of tenderness of its rival. However, Russia didn't collapse in a moment, and subversive activities against it took months and even years. The work took a lot of time, about 100 years, and it was methodical, hasteless and long-term. It started right after Napoleon Bonaparte had been defeated, as Russia became the most powerful empire in the European continent then. This work finished with the February and the October Revolutions and the Civil War.

This is how the Russian Empire was finally crushed. However, political struggle is as endless as politics itself. And as soon as the USSR appeared in the map, the attempts to crush it started. After it was finally managed in 1991, the subversive activities against the Russian Federation started. **Let's not flatter ourselves. Until we become as small as Monaco or Luxemburg, they will still wish to weaken us and to divide us into pieces despite our political regime and its “democratism” or “openness”.** The scope of investment also proves that. In 2007 the USA invested 43 billion dollars into activities of their Intelligence Service. In 1996 the amount was 26 billion dollars<sup>56</sup>. The amounts spent by Great Britain are strictly confidential<sup>57</sup>.

The Anglo-Saxon organized the revolution in Russia not only because they wished to strike their opponent. They also wished to manage all values that would become “nobody's”. However, things turned out to be very different. Bolsheviki led by Lenin surprised everyone, and even themselves, and managed to assemble Russia anew. When the founder of the Soviet state died in 1924, everything was rather fragile yet. Economy should have been built anew. And that was when

---

<sup>54</sup> Despite obvious domination of the USA in the late XX – early XXI century, the British Intelligence Service MI6 still was the most powerful in the global arena. Famous movie character James Bond worked for this Service, not for CIA. Even our “freedom fighters”, involved into something very alike espionage, were leaving for London, not for Berlin or Geneva, for some reason.

<sup>55</sup> After World War II “progressive mankind” took Italy and Germany under its wing. Though, to get there these countries had to sacrifice some of their foreign policy sovereignty. And occupation troops of the winners still remained in German lands, and that weren't only American troops. A patrol of the French Military Gendarmerie could be met somewhere in the German wilderness.

<sup>56</sup> Echo Moskvyy, radio broadcasting, October 30, 2007.

<sup>57</sup> To read about stages of subversive activities of the British Intelligence Service in Russia refer to *Starikov, N.* From Decembrists to Mujahidins. SPb., 2008.



struggle of two ideas, two personalities and two philosophy systems for the country's development ran high in the USSR. Over the coffin of the dead Ilyitch Stalin and Trotsky came to grips, fighting for leading the VKPb (the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks), for the right to move the party and the country wherever each of them needed. We won't describe biographies of these Communist leaders in detail, and won't tell about all the peripeteias of the intraparty struggle in the Soviet Union, as thousands of books were written about it. We only have to understand the essence of the encounter and dates of key events related to it. In fact, it was this encounter, taking place in offices of the Kremlin and far away from Munich, which might have played the crucial part in fate of the unheard of Adolf Hitler, a Gefreiter of the German army...

If all the stump oratory of party leaders was narrowed down to simple and comprehensible phrases, the essence of the encounter would be as follows. Trotsky considered that revolution in Russia wasn't the aim, but was a way to start a revolution fire in more mature countries, which in the end should have lead to the global victory of Communism. Stalin considered that Bolsheviks' victory in Russia was so unique that it was valuable on its own, and it was necessary not to export the revolution further, but to start building Socialism in the country relived from burden of Capital.

“Struggle for the party” began around this ideological core. Trotsky announced that “construction of the independent socialistic society wasn't possible in any country of the world” and thus called to start external revolution war. “The socialistic revolution, – he wrote, – starts in the national arena, develops into the international one and finishes in the global one. Thus, the social revolution becomes permanent in a new and wider meaning. It can't end until the new society finally triumphs all over the planet”.



Leon Davydovitch Trotsky was going to do “the global revolution” further, as Western security services ordered him to. This meant he was ready to sacrifice millions of Russian men to foreign interests

Stalin and his followers objected to that and accused the author of the permanent revolution theory of oppositionism and of attempts to divide the party. “We can and must built socialism in the USSR. However, to build socialism it is necessary to exist in the first place. It is necessary to take a break from war, to prevent intervention attempts, to win a minimum of international conditions...”<sup>58</sup>

Trotsky applied his entire gift of oratory and polemics to outmatch his less eloquent rival. At that period Stalin and Trotsky spoke a lot to convict each other. Having expressed their arguments, they started to crack each other down. The most dreadful weapons applied were quotes from Lenin, whose works could provide anything at all, which is well-known. There is no point in providing all arguments used by the opponents, as these were rather dull and could take even the most interested reader to the land of Morpheus. Let’s find out some more interesting things. What was going on at the top of the Soviet party? What was there behind the theoretical (prima facie) argument of Stalin and Trotsky?

Historians are trying to find some grains of sense in tons of verbal shells of Marxist kind, which the opponents produced during this discussion. However, the truth is somewhere else. It is in the biography of Stalin and Trotsky, in history of our revolution and its origin. It is even with where the opponents had been before the Russian Empire crushed and in how they appeared at the top of the Bolsheviks’ party.

During the February revolution Joseph Stalin stayed exiled to Siberia. As he needed to get to the boiling Petrograd, he simply took a train after he had been amnestied by the Temporary Government and came to the capital of Russia. Then the hot-tempered Georgian became a true follower of Lenin and obediently fulfilled all instructions of the Leader. Stalin was rather indirectly involved into organization of the October revolution<sup>59</sup>. And he had nothing to do with opaque financial support provided to the Bolsheviks’ party...

It was all the difference of the world with Trotsky. When the February revolution happened, he was in faraway America, where he was doing nothing, according to his story. Trotsky was a revolutionary by profession. By all accounts, he was a highly-paid worker, because he had 10 thousand dollars in his pocket, when he was leaving for his Motherland. Now after quiet devaluation of fazool this amount may seem laughable. But in the beginning of the century the American currency was no match to what it is nowadays. This amount can easily be multiplied by 20 or 30. And mind, he had the money in his pocket, some kind of cash allowance. Primary amounts the Americans bankers provided for the Russian revolution were received through accounts of the neutral Sweden and brought by unfeatured persons of no-reputation in their cases. No one claims that Vladimir Ilyitch himself brought a thick case with money in a sealed wagon. Though, anyway, Bolsheviks had loads of money. Who did they get that money from? From Germans? Well, some of it, indeed, but it is to be understood that significant amount of “German” money received by Lenin was paid through credits, provided to Germany by America. Just like Lenin, Trotsky was related to opaque backstairs, related to foreign security services. Having come back to Russia, Trotsky and Lenin quickly united and instantly forgot about their bygone disagreements. It must also be noted that Trotsky joined the Bolsheviks’ party as late as in summer 1917. However, he applied much more efforts to organize the October revolution than any Bolshevik leader, including Lenin.

---

<sup>58</sup> *Stalin, J.V.* Collected edition. M., 1953. V.9. P. 25.

<sup>59</sup> It is not the open preparation of the October revolution, but the main backstage kind of work. By now there is not a single fact confirming directly or indirectly that Stalin was related to Western Intelligence Services. Stories of his cooperation with the tsarist secret police are a different thing, but still there is no proof of that. Joseph Vissarionovitch can be called “an honest revolutionary”, as far as the term of honesty can be applied to this category of people.



Joseph Vissarionovitch Stalin pursued interest of Russia, which at that time was called the USSR, in his politics

Differently speaking, Leon Davydovitch Trotsky was a representative of the American capital (or Anglo-Saxon Intelligence Services) in the new revolutionary Russia. Thus, he performed certain actions and expressed certain ideas...

One fact shall be announced, and everything about Trotsky will become clear. In early 20-ies he was the Head of the People's Commissariat of communication lines. Being headed by Leon Davydovitch, this company signed an agreement that would do credit to any Plunder and Flee Inc., and which made the Securities and Exchange Company look as a derisive and amateurish project. It was the agreement about bulk purchase of steam locos in Sweden from Nydqvist & Holm AB.

Everything was so very interesting in that order. Firstly, the amount, which was 1,000 steam locos. Secondly, the price, which was 200 million golden rubles. However, other details were also peculiar. Everyone knows that Sweden is not the Motherland of elephants, but the signees of that agreement somehow left out that Sweden was not top-of-the-range in regard to global locomotive construction. Nydqvist & Holm AB even had no production opportunities to produce the goods ordered by the Soviet party. So, the parties agreed that Russia would pay money, the Swedish would build a plant with that money, and then the locos would be produced and sent to us.

When you want to buy shoes, do you have to credit the shoe seller, so that he would to build a tannery? If someone needed locos that much, why didn't they order them somewhere else? And if they were needed that much, why did the Soviet party agree to wait for five years?

Nydqvist & Holm AB had never constructed more than 40 locos per year. But at that time it decided to brace itself up and to produce as much as 50 locos in 1921! After that the order was evenly spread within five years, when the Swedish should have been building a plant with our money. In 1922 the buyer should have received 200 locos, and since 1923 till 1925 it was 250

locos per year<sup>60</sup>. At that the Soviet party wasn't only a buyer, it was a creditor. And it wasn't the advance payment for the locos. In May 1920 the Swedish company received not only an advance payment of 7 million Swedish crowns, but also a non-interest loan of 10 million crowns "to built a mechanical workshop and a boiler-house". According to the agreement this loan should have been paid back during the period, when the last 500 locos would have been delivered.

If the Soviet party decided to reduce its order, the Swedish would be allowed not to pay the loan back! And the Soviet party could do so, if dispatch of locos would be delayed due to the fault of the Swedish part. And the agreement didn't contain any conditions that would allow to terminate the agreement with the Swedish company.

However, it wasn't all. The price of ordered locos was about twice as big as their cost during pre-war times. And they were paid not with devaluated paper money but with golden rubles!<sup>61</sup> The case was rather spicy, as the price was too high, the money was paid and the goods weren't provided. And it wasn't clear when they would be provided! Any tax inspector or auditor would start to rub his hands, if he discovered something like that. Trouble was in the air, and the person who would discover fraud, might have been promoted.

Weirdness of "the loco case" was described in the Soviet magazine *Economist* in early 1922. Mr. Frolov, the author of the article, felt puzzled about such a strange way of making business. He also asked a logical question, why these locos should have been ordered in Sweden, namely. Wasn't it logical to develop or, to be more precise, to recover the local industry? The Putilovsky plant was able of producing 250 locos per year before the war. Why didn't it get the loan? That vast amount of money would have allowed "to put our own locomotive plants and to feed our own workers"<sup>62</sup>.

And indeed, the proletarian authorities should have strived to start there own industrial facilities as soon as possible and to let proletaries earn money, as supposedly the bloody massacre in Russia was started for their profit. As early as in late 1923 RSFSR had about one million unemployed<sup>63</sup>. And the Soviet government signed an incredibly stupid and enslaving agreement, definitely damaging itself, trying to feed Swedish capitalists. Why was that?

Are you surprised how weirdly Mr. Trotsky was making business? You will be surprised even further, when you learn how Lenin reacted to the article in the *Economist* magazine. "All of them are definitely counter-revolutionaries, the Entente supporters, a company of its slaves and spies, and youth molesters. We have to do something, so that these military spies would be caught. We have to systematically arrest them and exile them from our country"<sup>64</sup>, the Proletary leader wrote. And he asked Felix Edmundovitch Dzerzhinsky to close this magazine down...

Let's get back to the price of the agreement, the one so unfavorable for Russia, which was almost prohibited to criticize. It was 200 million golden rubles. Was it much or not? To understand this we need to find out what a golden ruble was. In 1922 Lenin's government passed through a monetary reform to get economy out of crisis. New monetary units were produced, chervonets. They contained 7.74 grams of gold. One new chervonets was worth 10 golden pre-revolution rubles. This arrangement turned out to be rather successful. In a short period of time rate of the Soviet chervonets against global currencies became even and then became even more profitable than the tsarist pre-revolution ruble was<sup>65</sup>.

---

<sup>60</sup> The Russian State Economical Archive. F. 4038. Op. 1.D. 31. L. 22. (Quoted from the book of *The New Historical Messenger*. 2004. No. 1.)

<sup>61</sup> *The New Historical Messenger*. 2004. No. 1.

<sup>62</sup> *Frolov, A.N.* Modern state and nearest perspectives of railway transport. *Economist*. 1922. No. 1.P. 176. (Quoted from the book *The New Historical Messenger*. 2004. No. 1.)

<sup>63</sup> Brief course of history of VKPb. M., 1938. P. 251.

<sup>64</sup> *Lenin, V.I.* Collected edition. V. 54. P. 266.

<sup>65</sup> In 1924 one dollar was worth one ruble and 94 kopecks. Compare: in 1907 one dollar was worth two tsarist rubles.

The golden ruble was a sterling monetary unit. When Bolsheviks came to power, golden reserves of the State bank in Russia was 1.101 million golden rubles. Some of gold (650 million rubles) were evacuated to Kazan, then Kolchak got it, and after he was defeated, about 409 million rubles were returned<sup>66</sup>. Though, this would have been like that, if Bolsheviks wouldn't have spend a kopeck, but we know that it wasn't so.

**So, 200 million rubles didn't just make a colossal amount. It was one quarter of the gold reserve of the country!**

Why did it happen? Why was Trotsky doing it, and why Lenin was covering this colossal mess up? Were Ilyitch and Davydytch flatly stealing for a rainy day? Could they have been stealing that especially large amounts? Wasn't that absurd? Why would the Head of the Soviet Russia Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin deliver money to the West in such clumsy way? He was never going to move there himself. And why would he need as much as ¼ of the country's golden reserve?! Lenin can be accused of any sins, but monetary symbols weren't of decisive importance in his life ever. On the contrary, Bolsheviks would desperately need money to construct the new state. The loco agreement was signed in the end of 1920 – beginning of 1921.

Wrangel's army evacuated from Crimea to Constantinople in November 1920. In fact, it was the end of the Civil War. Money should have been transferred from the country before that, in 1918–1919, when Denikin had a short bound to Moscow and when Judenitch was at Petrograd. In 1921 it was time to blow the steam off and to start recovery of the country and establishment of new socialistic peace in it.

So, what can such strange actions of Lenin and Trotsky mean? It just was that debts should have been repaid and that agreements should have been fulfilled. Amounts spent for crushing of Russia should have been paid back. It was one of the agreements between representatives of Western government and Bolsheviks. Lenin managed to stay in power for so long, because he didn't breach all his agreements with the Anglo-Saxon "partners" at once, because he was doing it step by step and because he violated only some of the agreements. Having come to power in Russia with the aim to crush it, he aggregated all of its lands on the quiet. This can explain certain logics of his actions. Let's not pay tsarist debts, but let's provide concessions. Let's not return the power, but let's repay the money spent.

They were paying the money back in many ways. The simplest way was to take values abroad. If you think that money were spent for "the global revolution", please, note the following. Lenin and Co were preparing the so-called "global revolution" only in Germany and Austro-Hungary, but they didn't do any preparations in either France or Great Britain. And foremost, amounts of financial support that Bolsheviks provided for crushing of the German Empire never matched the amount of values really transported away from Russia. The Swedish police announced that Bolsheviks provided 2 million rubles for revolution propaganda abroad (meaning, only in Germany). However, in autumn 1918, right when the coming German revolution was being financially backed up, Isidor Gukowski, Deputy People's Commissar of Finance, arrived in Stockholm. He had crates full of money and gems. Hands at the Swedish police assessed the amount of that from 40 to 60 million rubles<sup>67</sup>. What were these amounts intended for? How come they were 20 to 30 times bigger than the official amount Lenin had provided for the German revolution? Mind that values were mainly transported through Sweden, where the Soviet Embassy was opened in the end of November 1917, headed by Vatslav Vorovsky. Millions of rubles started to be transferred to

---

<sup>66</sup> Archive of the Russian Revolution. M., 1991. V. 5–6. P. 103.

<sup>67</sup> Björkegren, H. Traffic in Scandinavia. Russian Revolutionaries in Scandinavia in 1906–1917. M., 2007. P. 425–427.

banks of Stockholm, in particular, to Nya Banken of Olof Aschberg, whose name is often met in books telling us how Bolsheviks financially supported Germans. And what is interesting, money arrived in Russia and went away from it through the same channels. At that, when money was being transferred to Russia through Sweden, it was kind of German money. But did Ilyitch provide the money to Germany, when it was transferred back in the same way? Did Kaiser spend that money to start revolution in his own country?

It is not as difficult to answer this question as it may seem. On one hand, Bolsheviks were transferring money from Russia to repay the “debts” to their curators from the British Intelligence Service. This money was directly transferred to Kaiser’s Germany and used to crush it, which the Anglo-Saxon needed. On the other hand, Soviet Russia won the Civil War, which involved acquisition of the necessary equipment abroad. And finally, pumping Russian values to the USA and Great Britain ensured that authorities of the most powerful countries of the world would be loyal to Bolsheviks. All the above-mentioned together allowed Bolsheviks to win in the Russian civil strife so unexpectedly.

This is what the American Historian Guido Giacomo Preparata tells us in his book: “The significant number of contracts, concessions, and licenses subsequently released by Lenin’s empire to American firms during the Civil War, and in its immediate aftermath, formed something of a smoking gun of Bolshevism’s early Allied sponsorship: \$25 million of Soviet commissions for US manufactures between July 1919 and January 1920, not to mention Lenin’s concession for the extraction of asbestos to Armand Hammer in 1921, and the 60-year lease granted in 1920 to Frank Vanderlip’s (the Chairman of the Board of the National City Bank of New-York. – *N.S.*) US consortium formed to exploit the coal, petroleum and fisheries of a North Siberian region covering 600,000 square kilometers”<sup>68</sup>.

This was the top-level political pliantness, refusing and agreeing at once. If they would have totally refused on all accounts and have decided not to pay the borrowed money back, that might have caused new murderous assaults, and even their own comrades might have liquidated them. So, it was necessary to return THAT money anyway!

Though, how could money have been returned to Western bankers? Could it have been transferred to the West with a payment slip saying “Bank of New York; to American bankers”? And the description of payment purpose should be “Repayment for the Russian revolution and Bolsheviks’ victory in the Civil war”, then. Naturally, that was impossible. Proletary leaders can’t provide “people’s” money to Western bourgeois. Especially when such troubled times came. Let me remind you that in March 1921, when Russia received its first 50 locos, the revolt in Kronshtadt burst out.

How can one quarter of the country’s golden reserve can be transported away without a weak spot anywhere? An EXCUSE is required, and the true receivers of the payment could help with that. You simply need to buy something from the West, and there will be no problem with departure of the money train. For instance, you can buy locomotives, which Russia needs really bad. Trotsky organized this purchase, but Lenin’s rather rough reaction to the article published in the Economist magazine can be explained by the fact that these activities had been planned and approved by Ilyitch himself. So, you still fail to understand why Bolsheviks won the Civil War, and the White Armed Forces aided by “the Western democracies” lost it?<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> *Preparata, G.G.* Hitler Inc. How Britain and America made the Third Reich. P. 120.

<sup>69</sup> For more details about support the Allies provided to the Whites and reasons of their defeat check *Starikov, N.* 1917. Who

By the way, money for revolution were transferred to Russia through the Swedish bank system. Then they were repaid through it. With interests and words of gratitude. However, that was where “friendship” and “cooperation” ended. And Lenin and Co had control over the USSR in their hands. That was more important than money and more valuable than gold.

To comprehend background of relationship between Bolsheviks and the West one must remember that Leninists had scammed the Anglo-Saxon, in fact. The latter were substantially tricked, as neither the country or its treasures were surrendered to them. However, while the Civil War was going on in Russia, and while it was hoped that Bolsheviks would have “cleaned up their acts” and would have done everything as it should have been done, Communism and Bolshevism fighters weren’t too popular. Though, they were still needed to a certain extent, as someone should have been “the bloody dog” and the bugaboo to ensure better pliability of fervent revolutionaries.

After that active stranglehold of the Russian White armed forces started. If you haven’t read memoirs of generals and officers, who left with Wrangel, you should do it. Their point is that firstly the British and the French refused to supply to the Wrangel’s army after leaving, though later they agreed to provide their support, having taken Russian battle ships as payment, though. At the same time they started active propaganda among soldiers, calling them to leave the army and to become refugees. Only adamant wills of Wrangel and Kutepov allowed to keep the troops under control. However, sooner or later members of the White army would have to spread all over Europe, living at misery and taking the hardest jobs.

And there was no real need for the German national socialists in 1920–1921, either. That is why they didn’t get any support, and they should have thanked Hitler’s talents and enthusiasm of his first comrades and supporters for their first minor success. This was the time of those soft-hearted elder ladies, who would spare some money to the hungry Nazi. The point was that “the true Arians” were “as all right as soot is white”, “Till the middle of 1921 the Party couldn’t afford a cashier, and bill-carriers had no money to buy any glue!”<sup>70</sup>

Hitler’s portraits of that period show him in simple and sometimes shabby clothes. He was living in a beggarly furnished small room in Tirstrasse, its floor covered with rubbed-off linoleum. There was only a bed, and a bookshelf, and one armchair, and a self-made table there<sup>71</sup>. Friedelind, granddaughter of Richard Wagner, the favorite composer of Hitler’s, remembered him like: “In Bavarian leather breeches, short thick woolen socks, a red-blue-checked shirt and a short blue jacket that bagged about his unpadded skeleton”<sup>72</sup>.

And here is one more description of Hitler, “In his heavy boots, dark costume and leather vest, half-upstanding collar, with that weird moustache, he didn’t make any striking impression. He looked much like a waiter in a landside café”<sup>73</sup>.

The Führer also had some attitude to business, “He made everybody desperate, because you could never be sure, if he would attend the meeting appointed, and it wasn’t possible to wrest any decision out of him”<sup>74</sup>.

When Pfeffer von Salomon, future Head of storm troops (Sturmabteilung), saw his Führer for the first time, he simply refused to get acquainted with him. That was because the Leader was dressed as a homeless vagrant, an old morning coat, yellow leather boots and a rucksack on his back. Another description of Hitler’s appearance of that time said he was wearing a blue costume, a violate shirt, a brown vest and a bright red neck-tie<sup>75</sup>. The future Führer made a poor show, didn’t

---

finished Russia? M., 2007.

<sup>70</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.1. P. 270 .

<sup>71</sup> *Hanfstaengl, E.* Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 44.

<sup>72</sup> *Bullock, A.* Hitler and Stalin. V.1. P. 106.

<sup>73</sup> *Hanfstaengl, E.* Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 27–28.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.* P. 76.

<sup>75</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.1. P. 221.

he? In modern language, stylists and imagemakers had a lot of work to do. And they did! Can anyone imagine Hitler of 1941 in shorts?

Hitler's personal expenses were also very minor. As late as on Easter in 1923 he borrowed several Deutschemarks from Göring to take a festive trip to the mountains. Talking of these years later he stated, "For years I lived on Tyrolean apples. It's crazy what economies we had to make. Every mark saved was for the Party"<sup>76</sup>.

As they say, beggars are not choosers. That is why all first supporters of Hitler were ideological. It was because their leader didn't work for money, he worked for the sake of the idea, and this caused certain respect and attracted people to Hitler as much as his gift of oratory did. When did the Nazi's financial position start to improve? As soon as they were needed for the first time. As we see they weren't required in 1921, and in the beginning of 1922 there was still no need in them. Historians don't report any financial miracles in regard to the Nazi of that period.

Since April 10 till May 19, 1922 the Soviet Russia under the name of RSFSR participated in the International conference in the Italian town of Genoa<sup>77</sup>. In fact, it was the first "beauty parade" of Bolsheviks' leaders in front of the entire "civilization". And as usual, money was discussed. The Western governments pushed immense financial claims out, which included both pre-war and war debts plus interests. Besides, Bolsheviks were required to repay all property provided to the White governments, which they hadn't paid (!) with interests, as well as to reimburse cost of all enterprises, which had been owned by foreign citizens. In opinion of Western experts, all of it was worth 18 billion golden rubles.

Naturally, Bolsheviks couldn't pay that much. Annual payment would have equaled 80 % of Russia's state balance of that time. Naturally, it was expected that Bolsheviks incapable of paying back would have surrendered Russia and have finalized its enslavement, passing it to their ex-partners from the Entente, who had crushed the Russian Empire by means of revolution, aided by Kerensky and Lenin.

And that was then that Vladimir Ilyitch gave the finger to the negotiating partners. Instead of implicit acknowledgement of debts and driving Russia into financial servitude the Soviet delegation didn't hesitate to push a counterclaim out, which included foreign intervention and the Blockade. The total amount was 30 billion golden rubles. Several days later dumbstruck Western diplomatic officials were offered a softer version of the claim. Bolsheviks agreed to acknowledge pre-war debts of Russia and were ready to provide former owners with the right to lease their ex-property or to take it on concession terms. In exchange England, France and Italy were to acknowledge the Soviet government de jure, provide it with financial support, "forget" about nationalized enterprises, as well as forgive war debts and corresponding interests.

No one had ever talked to the winners in World War I that boldly. Besides, while Western delegations were discussing incredible Bolsheviks' demands, the Soviet delegations managed an extremely important diplomatic step. On April 16, 1922 a termless agreement between RSFSR and Germany was signed in Rapallo, the Genoa suburb. Parties mutually gave up their claims in regard to reimbursement of military expenses and non-military losses; moreover, Germany acknowledged nationalization of the German state and private property in the RSFSR! **This Agreement was signed in secret, at night, and diplomatic officials of other Western delegations learnt about it only after it had been signed**<sup>78</sup>.

That was too much! Actually, Lenin's Russia managed to trick both the British and the French. Naturally, the Genoa conference ended in nothing. Right after it another attempt to make

---

<sup>76</sup> Geiden, K. Way of the NSDAP. Führer and His Party. P. 178.

<sup>77</sup> The USSR will be established on December 30, 1922. It will include Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia and the Transcaucasian Republic.

<sup>78</sup> Danilov, A.A., Kosulina, L.G. History of Russia. The XX century. M., 1998. P. 235.



Bolsheviks surrender Russia to the West failed. During the Hague conference on June 15–22, 1922, the Soviet delegation held to the same stand as it had done in Genoa. It became clear that Bolsheviks got out of control and should have been talked to in a different way. And it was also necessary to bring discipline to Germany, which so clearly had showed its independence. The British Intelligence Service didn't accomplish revolutions in Russia and Germany to make two of them friends!

Two days after the Treaty of Rapallo had been signed, on April 18, 1922 governments of the Entente countries, the Little Entente countries (Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Romania) and Poland, and Portugal addressed Germany with a sharp note. They accused Germany of being disloyal to the Allies, as well as of “secretly signing of the agreement with Russia behind backs of its colleagues”. The Mass Media caused incredible disturbance. Finally, Joseph Wirth and Walter Rathenau, leaders of the German delegation, paid a visit to the Soviet delegation next day, on April 19th, and begged (!) to return them the signed agreement. The representatives of the “free democratic” Germany were in such panic that they were visiting the British embassy, calling Berlin and coming back to talk the Soviet delegation into pretending there hadn't been an agreement signed all the time! Naturally, Russian diplomatic officials didn't understand that, and the agreement remained in effect.

And instantly the powers required by the Anglo-Saxon roused in the country of beer and sausage. Like frogs in the drying up moor they were waiting for their time. When the moor dries up, they are waiting petrified. Though, when some vivifying moisture is spilled, they become extremely active. It was just like that with German political parties. With the necessary ones, naturally, with the nationalistic ones.

Let me remind you that the Treaty of Rapallo was signed on *April 16, 1922*. And of all things “the abrupt increase of the amount of party members” of NSDAP started right in *spring 1922!*<sup>79</sup> It was in *1922–1923* that runaway inflation started in Germany. The population was rashly becoming poor.

And *in the middle of 1922* Adolf Hitler got some money. Rather a lot of money, in fact. It was because he planned to hold a party conference in Munich in *January 1923*. Five thousand of perfectly (and freshly!) uniformed troopers should have marched in front of their leader<sup>80</sup>. At the same time twelve sites for holding of meetings were leased. Orchestras, folk dancers and even a famous clown were hired to attract the audience<sup>81</sup>. Right after Rapallo, in *spring 1922*, the print run of the Hitlerite newspaper rapidly increased from 8 to 17.5 thousand copies<sup>82</sup>. And when the conference ended, they started to issue *Völkischer Beobachter* every day. So, there were some coincidences...

Now we can answer the question why the mysterious foreign sponsors supported the young Nazi movement. German nationalists actively used outer forces to destabilize the situation in the country. Nazis were effective and valuable not personally but for the ability to provoke in Germany the governmental crisis and to remove the cabinet, so disliked by the Anglo-Saxon, that had guts to sign an agreement with Bolsheviks. Weimar Republic was the democratic country and the cabinet would easily resign should the political situation in the country go worse. Instead of resignation

---

<sup>79</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. Perm. V.1. P. 253.

<sup>80</sup> During the Genoa conference Henry Deterding, Head of the oil company Royal Dutch offered to establish a united consortium that would get all oil concessions in Russia. When the offer failed, he instantly appeared among those financially supporting the beginning politician Adolf Hitler (*Geiden, K.* NSDAP way. The Führer and his party. M., 2004. P. 146).

<sup>81</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.1. P. 261.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.* P. 352.

(if not accepted) the nationalists could also organize assassination. Let us once again remember the date of conclusion of the Soviet and German treaty of Rapallo. It was *April 16, 1922*. And on *June 24, 1922* the group of nationalist plotters assassinated the Minister of the Foreign Affairs of Germany, Walther Rathenau, who was ethnic Jewish. This was an obvious example for all German politicians: the assassinated was for approximation with Moscow<sup>83</sup>. Though for gradual approximation, looking back to the West.

Already on November 14, 1922 Josef Wirth, German Chancellor, resigned. He was the one who authorized the Treaty of Rapallo. Wirth frankly wanted the approximation of Germany with the Soviet Russia, however, he was for gradual steps and feared reaction of the western states to such foreign policy and independence of Germany<sup>84</sup>. Death of Walther Rathenau was convincing and showed that such fears did really had grounds.

Along with the tension inside the German government the pressure from outside also grew stronger. Delays in payment of reparations became an excuse. Some time earlier in the history the Entente countries did not rush Germany but then it was the different time. After Rathenau's assassination and resignation of Wirth some crucial measures followed. In January 1923 the French troops occupied the major industrial land of Germany – Ruhr<sup>85</sup> to take under control coal mining and shipment. German government urged the population to put up passive resistance. The French really did behave as the invaders. For example, they executed by shooting from the machine gun a demonstration of workers at one of the factories in Essen. Thirteen people were killed and over thirty were injured. When the funerals of the killed were visited by about half a million people, the French military court sentenced the owner of the firm and eight employees that held management positions to fifteen and twenty years of imprisonment accordingly<sup>86</sup>.

The whole Germany clenched its teeth in indignation. Diversions and attacks of the French soldiers started on the territory of Ruhr which were followed by numerous death sentences<sup>87</sup>. What about the Nazis that dressed as the extreme German patriots at the meetings?

For those who understands the true financial sources of Hitler, it would be no surprise that members of his party did not participate in struggle with the French. On the contrary, Hitler personally promised to expel anyone who was actively participating in the resistance of Ruhr occupation! There were actual cases when he fulfilled his threat. According to witnesses it was just a year earlier when Hitler was talking about the necessity of the partisan warfare if the Ruhr land was occupied!<sup>88</sup>

The grown and stronger NSDAP could be easily used as any other nationalistic groups for destabilization of the inner affairs in Germany. There is such a twist of fate! Those who more than any others shout about the Great Russia, Great Germany and so on, in most cases blindly used the geopolitical rivals of its countries to weaken and disintegrate them! Let's think about the noble but short-sighted White Russians. Rejecting the pure thought about "trading Russia", heads of the White Movement lost in the Civil War in the end and gave up the country to Bolsheviks. Contemporary Russian skinheads and extreme nationalists do not even suspect that by beating up the "blacks" they firstly damage their own country. It is not about the image of the state but about

---

<sup>83</sup> *Sadovaya, G.M.* Walther Rathenau: the Path to Rapallo // History and Historiography of the Foreign World in Persons Samara, 1999. P. 121–139.

<sup>84</sup> *Gintzberg, L.I.* Josef Wirth: a Path to Struggle for Peace and Partnership between the Peoples/Modern and Contemporary History 1981. No. 1.P. 105–124; No. 2.P. 102–121.

<sup>85</sup> The Ruhr land is approximately 90 km long and 45 km wide. We will mention this land later on again but keep in mind for now that this small piece of land produced about 80 % of German coal, cast iron and steel and had the most developed railway system in the world.

<sup>86</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.1. P. 265.

<sup>87</sup> In Ruhr land 400 people were executed for acts of sabotage and 300 of them were executed by ... the German authorities (*Preparata, G.G.* Hitler Inc. How Britain and America Made the Third Reich. P. 191).

<sup>88</sup> *Hanfstaengl, E.* Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 33.

the simple fact that in a multinational country assault of one nation by another always leads to disintegration which in the end is so desirable for its outside rivals. *In the same way Nazi Hitler voluntarily or involuntarily played into the French and English hands that financed him not by means of his mythical “separatism” but by the very pure “patriotism”!*<sup>89</sup>

Approximately one year before Hitler’s Beer Hall Putsch there had appeared several interesting personalities. Together with them there came the money which origin could not be explained by the historians. Financial streams flew to Hitler from many directions. Besides French and English (“Swiss”) sources American funds also found Hitler. In the same year of 1922 Germany was searching for new political personalities who could be later used depending on the situation: to replace the disliked politicians, to organize murders and provocations. At that time nobody was planning to lead Hitler to the power. Almost nobody even ever heard of such person.

That is why American military attaché in Germany captain Truman Smith at first met with entirely different people: the former general Ludendorff who was in charge of the German army during the World War I and Crown Prince Rupprecht. They told American captain about the new rising star. On November 20, 1922 captain met with Führer in his shabby flat on the first floor<sup>90</sup>. Hitler was quite frank with the American. It was clear that if the military attaché of the embassy was interested in politicians and not only in guns, the field of his activities should be larger than simply military issues. Yet unknown head of the small local Bavarian party told about his intention to “eliminate Bolshevism”, “to remove Versailles shackles”, to establish dictatorship and create a strong country. Practically Hitler used the rare chance when an American intelligence agent found him and offered his personality as the “civilisation sword” in the struggle with Marxism. That is with Russia!

The offer turned out to be very timely: such fanatics would be in need at any moment. It was not yet time to fight with the Russians but it was good idea to have a closer look at the guy. When captain Truman Smith returned to Berlin, he made a detailed report that was on November 25, 1922 sent by the embassy to Washington. The pity was that the official American military attaché could not occupy himself with the German politician too actively due to his diplomatic status. However Hitler seemed to the Yankee so perspective that the same day the future Führer was under control of the new contactee from the American intelligence service. Nazi leader gave the pass to the next meeting of the party to the Yankee but captain Truman Smith did not go there himself but sent their a “friend of his”. The friend’s name was Ernst Franz Sedgwick Hanfstaengl. The son of a successful art dealer, who had German father and American mother, was born in Bavaria and in 1909 graduated from Harvard University. The entire World War I half-German Hanfstaengl spent in the United States and was in no hurry to support his distant motherhood. Moreover he was not arrested being the German citizen when the USA declared war to Germany and when he promised “not to get involved into any anti-American activities”, he was let free. Why? Because his lawyer turned out to be the Secretary of State of the American President Theodore Roosevelt!<sup>91</sup>

However when Germany lost in the war, Hanfstaengl rushed back to his native country. In destroyed Germany that was suffering from inflation life of an “American” Ernst was an example of prosperity and affluence. He always had some money but the resource of his income was not always quite transparent: because the damned inflation destroyed German firm of his father. “Official” version of his prosperity was some kind of an art gallery in the United States. Such explanation was persuasive and could not be checked. That is a very convenient explanation.

When Ernst received an invitation to the meeting in which Hitler was going to take part, he instantly liked him and they soon became friends. Later he even wrote the memoir books called *My*

---

<sup>89</sup> Right after the Hitler’s putsch (8–9.11.1923). *Chancellor*; G. Stresemann resigned (23.11.1923).

<sup>90</sup> *Shirer, W. Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. M., 1991. P. 38.*

<sup>91</sup> *Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 22.*

*Friend Adolf, My Enemy Hitler and Hitler. Missed Years.* I would really recommend everybody to read those books. Why? Not because the books have some literature value but rather because of some impressive facts set forth in the books. It turns out that vanity is typical not only of poets and artists, commanders and men of letters. It is typical of the intelligence agents as well. That is why in the afternoon of their lives they slowly write a modest book in which, of course, they do not reveal all the facts, no. But they very neatly insert the truth among the well-known historical facts, they insert such truth in hues so that the attentive reader would realize that author of the book was rendering history secretly from everybody – helping the weird fanatic Adolf Hitler.

There is something to write about indeed. Ernst who was two meters tall was nicknamed by Nazis “Putzi” which meant “baby” (or “funny” or “amusing”). Under this name he entered the history of the German Nationalistic Movement and history books. Narrow-minded historians picture Hanfstaengl as a typical motley forgetting that such role is the most convenient for hidden impact on the ruler.



Ernst Hanfstaengl, American intelligence agent following the task from his government but not his heart provided Adolf Hitler with truly invaluable services

Putzi's role in establishment of NSDAP as the party and Hitler as the political leader has never been really appreciated. Pianist Hanfstaengl introduced the coarse corporal to Munich nobility, its arts and literature circles. Meeting such people as the Hanfstaengl family attached some respectability that lacked Hitler's personality and established new important connections. As a matter of fact Putzi and his wife Helen were the first noble family that opened the doors of their house to Hitler. Most probably they were his first "stylists" and "image-makers". Hitler learnt how to behave in the society and acquired some manners.

He was always welcome in the Hanfstaengl villa. It was the place where Hitler could not only enjoy his favorite Wagner played live on the piano but also get some financial support. Putzi Hanfstaengl was rich and could afford to support a little the beginner-politician. He could suggest something, show the correct direction. Ideas that Hanfstaengl put into the head of Hitler-beginner were honestly revealed in his memoirs: "Should there be another war, it will be inevitably won by those supported by America. The only correct policy that you should stand up for is friendship with the United States. If Americans occur on the side of your rivals, you will loose any war"<sup>92</sup>.

Take notice that such advocacy was addressed not to the leader of the state or head of the government but to the yet unknown leader of a marginal organization. Thanks to the editor who wrote introduction to Hanfstaengl's book: He formulated Putzi's words in a shorter and simpler manner: His ideas consisted in the fact that Germany would never get balance and magnitude without partnership with Britain and especially with the United States. The main idea that he was trying to fix in Hitler's head was that any attempts to balance accounts in Europe would turn delusive if those two naval states joined the opposing party"<sup>93</sup>.

Those thoughts were good and correct. If we develop them further, we will get the following: be friends with England and the USA and fight with Russia. It seems we have already come across those ideas somewhere, have seen them already. But where? In Hitler's *Mein Kampf*! It is getting more and more interesting: in 1923 Hanfstaengl had geopolitical dialogues with Hitler, he educated the future Führer, extended his outlooks. And no later than in 1924 the "student" already wrote a book where he word by word repeated the ideas of his friend. So who is the real author of *Mein Kampf*? Turns out it's an American intelligence agent.

If somebody has doubts with regards to why Ernst Hanfstaengl "by accident" got to know Adolf Hitler, just advise such person to read Hanfstaengl's books. There would be no more doubts. Too many factors point at the fact to which authority the rich American "friend" of the German Nazis belonged to. Beyond any doubt Hitler was the talented orator. But such talent had to be developed and nourished. Ernst Hanfstaengl was the one who supported Hitler in becoming a self-confident leader. He lifted his oratory talent to the next level: "I told him about an efficient use of the expressive aphorisms in the American political life and explained how this can be intensified by caustic headings in the newspapers, how speech can be made brighter with phonetic and alliteration effects"<sup>94</sup>.

Hitler agreed. In fact he absorbed almost everything like a sponge. "In many respects Hitler was pliable and compliant"<sup>95</sup>, – pointed out Hanfstaengl. Within developing his orator's talent Hitler asked quite reasonable questions:

"You are absolutely right. But how can I drum my ideas into the heads of the German people without being published? Newspapers completely ignore me. How can I think about my oratory

---

<sup>92</sup> Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 36, 62.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid. P. 9–10.

<sup>94</sup> Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 51.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid. P. 63.

successes with our damned Völkischer Beobachter that comes out weekly? We will not achieve anything until it is published daily”<sup>96</sup>.

It was the year of 1923. In November Hitler would make an attempt of the coup d’etat. He badly needed propaganda to get support of the people. And propaganda required financing. Too bad it was nowhere to get the financing. Possibly the future Führer would be a simple orator forever who made speeches at Munich beer feasts if not for a saying: rather have a hundred friends than a hundred rubles.

Adolf Hitler did not have a hundred of friends but he had one true friend. And that was enough because his friend was Ernst Hanfstaengl. He would be the one to finance propaganda! “In March 1923 Hanfstaengl gave Hitler a loan in the amount of one thousand dollars. During those times such sum was a lot of money”<sup>97</sup>.

Don’t get confused about the word “loan”. There are many grounds to suppose that Putzi didn’t rush Hitler to return that money. And one thousand was really a great sum of money in those times! According to Hanfstaengl even one dollar was a fortune not to mention a thousand!<sup>98</sup>

Members of the Nazi party used the money to purchase two new printing machines for their newspaper Völkischer Beobachter. At that moment Hitler’s newspaper was no longer a small piece of paper, but became a regular newspaper that came out daily. It was not the only Hanfstaengl’s contribution in creating Nazi’s major mouthpiece. He personally attracted a cartoonist Schwarzer to develop the new bright heading, the “cap” and suggested the new motto for the newspaper – “Labour and Bread”<sup>99</sup>.

When publishing was arranged smoothly, Hanfstaengl helped Hitler in other small but very important matters. He was the one who explained Hitler that music was extremely important to throw the crowd into ecstasies and to force historic enthusiasm. As example Putzi played for Führer Harvard marches and Hitler even made SA orchestra to memorize the melody. Afterwards Hanfstaengl composed about ten new march melodies for the Assault Division!<sup>100</sup> when Hitler was elected Chancellor, the Assault Division would be marching under the Brandenburg Gate to those “pathetic marches” composed by an American.

At the same time the fact of Putzi’s supporting Nazi and transfer of the money was thoroughly hidden by Hanfstaengl. Several times he mentions that in his memoirs: “I decided to secretly support the nationalistic-socialistic party”; “I... understood that any support which I provided had to be kept secret”; “I still kept in secret my support of the Nazi and could not allow any fuss about it”<sup>101</sup>.

What was the reason to hide it? Explanations were quite unconvincing: “I am a member of the family firm”. So what important business did Hanfstaengl have with Hitler that it was allowed to walk with him in the street but not allowed to help him with money? Upon arrival from America to the native land the future Führer’s fan was engaged not in trading or brokerage but in studying of the Bavarian king-patron Ludwig II<sup>102</sup>. It is all the same as being afraid of being compromised during Yeltzin’s time for studying the favourites of empress Catherine II or Elisabeth. What else Hanfstaengl was engaged in other than teaching Hitler, sponsoring him and going into business trips with him? It is hard to understand from his memoirs. He did not include detailed descriptions of his commercial activities.

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibid. P. 50–51.

<sup>97</sup> Heiden, K. The Path of NSDAP. Führer and His Party. P. 178.

<sup>98</sup> Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 40.

<sup>99</sup> Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 51.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid. P. 48.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid. P. 39, 55.

<sup>102</sup> Martirosyan, A. Who Brought War to USSR? M., 2007. P. 287.

Yet he did remember to tell the reader about the content of Hitler's book shelve which he once observed while visiting Führer. Would you be interested to find out what the head of the political party read in his free time? I guess so. You would look at the shelf, wouldn't you? Would you remember all the names? You would probably have a look and remember some of them. But you would hardly be able to reproduce the exact list of books when you wrote memoirs 25 years after. That's because you are an ordinary person. While Ernst Hanfstaengl, such a great friend of the Nazi leader made something extraordinary for an ordinary person "Books were all different. Finding some time I made a list of them"<sup>103</sup>, – wrote the American. Such behaviour that seems extraordinary for an average person is quite typical for an intelligence agent.

It seems that contacts with Hitler and collection of information were the major activity and work of his friend Hanfstaengl. The rest was only a kind of disguise. So, for example, Hanfstaengl supposedly wrote the script for a movie and supposedly it took him almost a year. But this movie was never even screened! Why? Because Putzi never wrote a script. He was systematically busy with the only thing really – preparing the future Führer for Germany. While telling about his script-making was a good reply to any question about his professional life. After all there was no such profession as supporting Hitler.

"The party always lacked money"<sup>104</sup>, – wrote Hanfstaengl in his book. Why then the two-meter friend and sponsor gave only one thousand dollars, not two, or three, or ten if he was so close to Hitler for a reason? Very simple: His legend was that he was rich but not a billionaire; he could not donate amounts that exceeded reasonable extents of the rich bourgeois. One thousand dollars was fine but not ten, no. Yet he could introduce Hitler to the right people, he could give good advice. Soon came the time, just before the putsch, when Hitler went to Switzerland to get some money. This country had always been home for intelligence services of all the countries of our world. Was it again the true friend who directed him there?

This fact is left unknown but we know for sure another thing: After failure with the putsch Hitler ran away to Hanfstaengl house located in settlement Uffing, 60 km from Munich<sup>105</sup>. At that moment Hitler was in despair, his hysterical personality was extremely stressed. Seeing no way out Hitler made a decision to shoot himself and put the revolver against his temple. As we know well it never happened. Who should we thank for saving the life of one of the most terrible savage in the history? Hanfstaengl's wife, she was the one who knocked out the revolver from Hitler's hand. It was in this house that Hitler got arrested by policemen and sent to prison where he began to classify his ideas (told by Hanfstaengl) into a book. The first thing Hitler did after coming out of prison was not visiting Göring or Rosenberg but visiting Hanfstaengl's new house behind the river Isar...

Hanfstaengl couple managed to save Hitler's life twice. For the first time it happened in 1923 during their car trip to Berlin. The road was going through Saxony which was practically under the power of communists. That is why in that part of Germany there existed an order to arrest Hitler and "was even assigned a price for his head". The unit of communistic militia stopped the car on the road. Then it was really the question of life and death. And at that very moment Hanfstaengl took out the Swiss passport out of his pocket (he used it to return from the USA) and explained that he was a foreigner going to the Leipzig Fair and accompanied by the driver and the footman. "You saved my life", said Hitler then. In the next years Hitler always remembered that incident with appreciation.

---

<sup>103</sup> *Hanfstaengl, E.* Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 44.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* P. 52.

<sup>105</sup> *Seward, D.* Napoleon and Hitler. Smolensk, 1995. P. 79.

While Hanfstaengl wrote in his book that “Hitler was offended that I called him the footman”.

Grateful Hitler did not forget his friend and appointed him to the responsible position of the Press Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the party. Besides Putzi was in the head of the department of foreign press in the staff of Führer’s deputy. In his business trips abroad he was actively advertising new German powers.

Skeptic would say that these facts do not prove anything. And he would be absolutely right! Yet Hanfstaengl’s biography includes some more interesting facts. That modest press secretary had some truly incredible contacts and acquaintances.

In summer 1932 a rather influential British politician came to Germany with a private visit. His name was Winston Churchill. In Sir Winston’s memoirs we find a very interesting note: “In hotel Regina one gentleman was introduced to one of my companions. His surname was Hanfstaengl. He talked about Führer a lot and seemed to be a close friend of his. As I found him entertaining and talkative and all the same he spoke good English I invited him to have lunch. He was really under a spell telling about Hitler’s opinions and views. I could feel he was completely charmed by him. **Most probably he was ordered to engineer contacts with me as he was clearly making all the attempts to leave a good impression.** After lunch he started playing the piano and he performed a lot of plays and songs so well that we all had a great pleasure. He turned out to know all my favourite English songs. And he was good at entertaining society. It turned out he was Führer’s favourite at that time. He told me that I had to meet Hitler personally and that it would be easy for him to engineer a meeting between us”<sup>106</sup>.

Sir Winston told about the matter as if some accidental acquaintance was trying to introduce him to Führer. In Hanfstaengl’s description the story sounded differently: “I spent quite a lot of time in the company of his son, Randolph (Churchill’s son. – *N.S.*) during our pre-election trips. I even organized plane flights together with him once or twice<sup>107</sup>. He paid my attention to the fact that his father comes with the visit to Germany and that we should arrange a meeting”<sup>108</sup>.

You must admit that knowing the son who several times had flights with Hitler and Hanfstaengl is something more than just “one gentleman was introduced to one of my companions”. One way or another but British politician agreed to arrange a meeting: “At that time I had no national prejudices against Hitler. I knew little of his doctrine, of his past and knew absolutely nothing of his personal qualities. I admire people who rise in defense of their defeated country even if I am on the other end. He had the full right to be a German patriot if he wanted to”<sup>109</sup>.

So who actually ordered Hanfstaengl to “make contact” with the British politician? Who ordered him to arrange a meeting of the two great political personalities? Hitler himself? No. Führer did not ask to arrange this contact because he did not go to that meeting with Churchill no matter how hard Ernst Hanfstaengl persuaded him to! “That is how Hitler missed the only chance to meet with me”<sup>110</sup>, – complained Churchill. A serious politician could not behave like that – first ask about the meeting with one of the leading political personalities of the most powerful state in the world and later failing to go that meeting. That was too childish and not frivolous. It was only half a year left before Hitler seized the power, and personal meeting with Churchill would not be unnecessary. It appears that Hanfstaengl was ordered to introduce Hitler to Churchill not by the

---

<sup>106</sup> Churchill, *W.* World War II V.1. P. 151.

<sup>107</sup> As Hitler was the major striking force of Nazis during the last year before his coming to the power in the country he was constantly flying to meetings from one German town to another. He was provided with a special rented plane and Goebbels came out with a good advertising slogan: “Führer over Germany”.

<sup>108</sup> Hanfstaengl, *E.* Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 200.

<sup>109</sup> Churchill, *W.* World War II V.1. P. 15.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.* P. 15.



Nazis but by that very intelligence service that very cleverly and neatly attached their agent to the rising star of the German politics Adolf Hitler. Otherwise why would he know Churchill's son and take him to pre-election flights?



Hitler and Hanfstaengl (the first on the left) at the plane during the continuous pre-election flights. Son of Winston Churchill several times participated in those flights

There is only one answer: all Hanfstaengl's activities were directed to persuade Hitler to be friends with England and the USA and for that purpose he was bringing Hitler closer to the strong people of the world. Even Führer's failure to appear at the meeting did not intervene the British politician from discussing some very delicate issues. With whom? With Hanfstaengl. "Tell me what your boss thinks about the alliance between your country, France and England?"<sup>111</sup> – asked Churchill.

And why on earth did an old fox Winston come to Germany? Maybe to find out who would be in the head of Germany in six months?

Hitler's good friend made many more good favours for him. For example, in February 1934 without notifying Führer he went to Benito Mussolini. The purpose of the trip of the modest press secretary was to push duce to stabilization of relationships. As Hanfstaengl told Mussolini "something must be wrong when such complications stand between our two fascist states"<sup>112</sup>. As we know from the history it was the time when the two dictators were moving towards each other. We should only wonder about one detail: how Hanfstaengl achieved to be received by the head of Italy? Is every German occurring on the territory of their country got treatment with Chianti and got to meet Mussolini? The rank of our hero was not so high to get there.

But Hanfstaengl's connections were truly fantastic. If you have an idea that all these breathtaking memoirs were written by Putzi following the image of baron von Münchhausen and all his memoirs are simple invention, you would be quite mistaken. Because if the statement about the

<sup>111</sup> Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 202.

<sup>112</sup> Hanfstaengl, E. Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 259–261.

visit to Mussolini is difficult to verify, there still exist some “concrete reinforced” evidences of the incredible powers of Ernst Hanfstaengl. After he had done so much for the Reich, he suddenly left Germany in 1937. Meaning that he secretly left the country because he supposedly had conflict with Hitler’s surroundings and felt threat to his life.

Where did our hero go? To his other home – America. It appeared that in America he had another good friend, his Harvard classmate – president of the USA Franklin Delano Roosevelt! Our German hero worked for Hitler in the position of the press secretary of foreign affairs of the party, so what? In the United States Putzi laid wreaths to the memorials ... with eagles and swastika, so what?

**During the World War II Hanfstaengl was working... as president Roosevelt’s counsel!**<sup>113</sup>

As an expert on the Nazi Germany he was working under arrest, that is under guard. He was under the guard of the sergeant of the American Army Egon Hanfstaengl. A namesake? No, he wasn’t. He was the son timely rescued from Germany and sent to guard his farther *under personal order of the American president!* This was the friendship which lasted exactly until Nazi consolidated its forces. There was no further need to direct or give advice: the war for which Hitler was so required, for which Hanfstaengl worked so much, was not far away. Or maybe simply the contract was over? It is a really dark story just as the one about Hitler coming to power.

Nevertheless, let’s return to Russia. After leaving the Western partners without the spoils at the Genoa Conference and after breaking through the diplomatic isolation by means of the Treaty of Rapallo, Lenin seemed to be completely exhausted. The 52 year old Vladimir Ilyich had a stroke. It happened *in May 1922*. This was the first time when the issue on successor rose. Practically Lenin appointed nobody after himself and the strokes that followed the first one did not allow him to fully govern the country. It resulted in the beginning of struggle for the Lenin’s heritage between Leon Trotsky and Joseph Stalin. The struggle unrolled in unstable economic and political conditions: *In 1922* the transfer from the New Economic Policy and the next step in “collection of the Russian lands” – establishment of USSR started in the country.

The date of Lenin’s death knew every single person in the Soviet Union: **January 21, 1924**. However there is another date just as important for understanding of fascism origins but hardly anyone remembers it<sup>114</sup>.

The interrelation between these two events cannot be left unnoticeable. England waited until Lenin died and only after that acknowledged the Soviet Union<sup>115</sup>. The matter was not in the non-acceptance of communism by the heads of Britain. The matter was in the principal position not to deal with the one who lied to them. The one who was sent to destroy the country and transfer it under governance of the West and who had fulfilled the first task but rejected to fulfill the second. In Genoa he demonstrated once again that he could perform political “somersaults” just as good as his British “friends”. Such issues as establishment of the diplomatic relations were not done within one week. Consultations were in the active phase before the death of the leader. And acknowledgement of USSR in nine days after Lenin’s passing away was quite a direct and unambiguous hint at which political course of the USSR would find understanding. Lenin’s “leaving” gave a wonderful opportunity to fix those problems that his sharp mind created for the Anglo-Saxon. And that situation had to be fixed by Trotsky. All the hopes were placed on him.

---

<sup>113</sup> *Shirer, W.* Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. P. 39.

<sup>114</sup> It was 1 February 1924. On that day the United Kingdom officially acknowledged USSR.

<sup>115</sup> Right after the patron, the vassals also started acknowledging USSR: on 7 February 1924 – Italy where Benito Mussolini was the Prime Minister, on 13 February – Norway, on 25 February – Austria, on 8 March – Greece, on 15 March – Sweden, on 18 June – Denmark, on 6 July – Albania, on 19 July – China, on 1 August – Mexico, on 28 October 1924 – France. The last in this “acknowledgement order” was Japan, it happened on 20 January 1925, while the United States acknowledged USSR on in 1933.

It is now the correct time to return to ideological disagreements between Joseph Stalin and Leon Trotsky, disagreement between the theory of constructing the socialism in one country and principal impossibility to do it. What is it – the construction of the new social structure? It is struggle, blood, civil war, sacrifices and devastation. Trotsky and Stalin had almost no disagreements in this issue. But the clash was over and it was time to restore the country. And this is where disagreements began. Stalin thought that to construct socialism in the USSR new factories, plants and railways had to be build. Socialism was supposed to improve the life of a working person. There was such a need to build kindergartens, schools and libraries. Socialism was aimed at eliminating illiteracy and ignorance. Sources were supposed to be contributed to improvement of the infrastructure, to construction of health resorts for working people. The purpose was not only to restore Russia but to improve it.

What did Trotsky offer? Socialism is impossible in one, separate Russia. Thus such large-scale construction was senseless from his point of view. Why would you need to build a roof without laying a foundation! And the foundation of the happy life in Russia could be only the world revolution. The revolution had to be performed and then deal with everything else. That meant no kindergartens and resorts. Nothing is needed after all other than financing of the world revolution movement and establishing of the strong army that would bring sunrise to the whole world on the edge of the blade. According to Trotsky such permanent revolution had to be exported all the time. What did it mean? It meant that at any moment USSR could attack any other country at its choice and discretion of comrade Trotsky. And at the choice of his foreign friends, those to whom Leon Trotsky sent the “railway” funds.

The situation was far from harmless. If Trotsky had won, all the country’s resources would be spent for establishing the threat for the surrounding world<sup>116</sup>. Therefore comrade Trotsky gave his supervisors from the British and American intelligence services a good reason to achieve the destruction of USSR through war. That is a reason for another military defeat of the Russian army and for creating a magnificent cause for country’s occupation. Who would accuse the West of the aggression if USSR was getting ready to attack? Nobody, everybody would only applaud. Besides the theory of revolution export would enable the United Kingdom with our own hands and with the blood of our own soldiers to create tension in the required territories of the world. The Persian Shah doesn’t want to grant England oil? The Red Army would bring revolution to Iran, would make a mess and later the white and innocent Englishmen would come and save the Persians from the brutal communists. And take the oil as a thank you note.

It is very appropriate to cite one of the statements of Joseph Stalin: “Opposition thinks that the issue on construction of socialism in USSR has only the theoretical pursuit. That is not correct. That is a complete delusion”<sup>117</sup>. Decision in regards of the course that the country would choose really determined its further practical actions. And those actions were completely opposite. If Stalin won, the country would be independent and restoration would begin, if Trotsky took advantage, the country would be at the edged of the next “October” and thousands of the Russian men might fall dead on the battle fields trying to set on fire Europe and Asia.

**And the main thing: if Trotsky’s ideas triumphed over, USSR would have no allies at all!** Because there are no other socialistic countries in the world and all the capital countries were our enemies a priori! And that meant that the Treaty of Rapallo that was so dangerous for England would die away.

The first large collision between Stalin and Trotsky happened in January 1923 because of the mentioned above occupation of Ruhr by the French. Trotsky called upon the support of the

---

<sup>116</sup> Rezun-Suvorov attributes such brutal aggression to USSR of the Stalin period, thus, explaining the mechanism of the World War II. While such concept lost in the battle together with its author Trotsky and Stalin never used it. At the VII congress of Communist International in 1935 it was officially declared that the world revolution was not prepared any more.

<sup>117</sup> *Stalin, J.V.* Collected works. V.9. P. 37.

communists who as we well remember arranged the uprising in Hamburg in October 1923. That meant to sacrifice friendship with Germany for the idea of the world revolution. Friendship with the Germans was not only parties, handshakes and smiles of the diplomats. Friendship was also equipment, machines, optics that other than Germany nobody supplied to our country. USSR badly needed all the above. That is why Stalin was absolutely against the intervention. And there was no intervention.

In January 1924 Lenin died and the battle for Russia came out into the open phase. It was yet unclear who was going to win. Quite possible that another war might be required for Russia's destruction. For that purpose there had to be the country that would start such war. And such country needed a relevant leader.

Trial over the Nazi putschists took place in February-March 1924. Hitler was sentenced to 5 years of prison. Without losing any time he started dictating his future book *Mein Kampf* to Rudolf Hess in which as we remember he was celebrating the advantages of the England and Germany alliance for the both countries. You are not surprised, are you? He was supposed to be placed in the cell, he was supposed to be re-educated but he was not supposed to write books! But the prison for Führer was like a resort. Good feeding, numerous visitors that took about 6 hours per day<sup>118</sup>.

Hitler was provided with the most favourable conditions. "The place of confinement looked like a Deli store. The grocery store with flower, fruit and wine departments with large inventory could be opened in his prison cell"<sup>119</sup>, – this is how Ernst Hanfstaengl described Hitler's place of imprisonment. By the way the American came to that prison with a visit not because of the sentimental feelings. He was getting ready to drag Hitler out of that difficult situation. Hitler's manuscript, the masterpiece, was secretly carried out from the prison and was already typed in the printing facility of *Völkischer Beobachter* but the Nazi newspaper had numerous invoices payable. That invoices had to paid, otherwise all that had been done, would be all for nothing.

"I paid some of the invoices and confirmed some others, that was enough to keep the newspaper operating"<sup>120</sup>, – wrote Hitler's "kind genius" in his memoirs. Pro-English Hitler's ideas expressed in the book belonged to Hanfstaengl in many aspects and it would be a pity if the book had not been published. And that did not really cost some great money, some simple trifles. *Instead of five years of Hitler's imprisonment he spent there only thirteen months!*<sup>121</sup> The support was not significant but played the crucial role...

Hitler walked free from jail and the next financial miracle occurred right away. Later on Hitler was miraculously boosting German's economy but first of all the financial miracle happened to him personally. The finished manuscript of his book *Four Years of Struggle against Lies, Stupidity and Cowardice* was published under the new name *Mein Kampf*. The issue of the book would not be very big and the interest from the readers would be even less. In 1926 the second volume of *Mein Kampf* went out but it did not change the core of the matter. The first volume was sold in 1925 in the amount of 10 thousand copies, in 1926 in the amount of 7 thousand copies. In 1927 both volumes found only 5,607 buyers and in 1928 even fewer – only 3,015<sup>122</sup>.

It is clear that with such number of issues or with such "sales" as we currently call it the writer could not survive. However the young "writer" Adolf Hitler lives a rather well-to-do life. It seemed that he had no other sources of income. But it did not prevent him from living a free and easy life. After coming out of prison Hitler spent only half a year in his former old flat in Munich, since 1925 he was renting and later he bought a villa in the Alps, in the notorious Obersalzberg. Besides he

---

<sup>118</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.2. P.5.

<sup>119</sup> *Hanfstaengl, E.* Hitler. The Missing Years. P. 119.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.* P. 122.

<sup>121</sup> Hitler was in prison from November 12, 1923 to December 20, 1924.

<sup>122</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.2. P. 82.

bought a Mercedes-compressor of the latest model something that not every writer could afford and for Germany of that time it was unusually expensive purchase<sup>123</sup>. Hitler's lifestyle started acquiring the gloss that was so typical of him later: good clothes, money, a car and a driver. Tax police of Weimar Republic was quite interested in the sources of the unknown income of Führer that gave him an opportunity to live luxuriously right after his imprisonment. Responding to the tax authority request Hitler replied: "Neither in 1924 nor in the first quarter of 1925 I received any income at all. I paid for living expenses with the loans that I took in the bank. Money that I spent for the car is from the same source".

The correspondence between Hitler and tax authorities is the subject for a separate story. "My personal demands are limited to the very simple things, I do not drink alcohol or smoke tobacco, I eat in the cheapest restaurants and other than the apartment rent I have no expenses that the income of writer-publicist could not cover"<sup>124</sup>, – responded Adolf Hitler to the tax authorities. As in the section "profession" Führer indicated in particular: Writer-publicist. The only income indicated in his tax declarations was the income from selling books as was due for the writer. However Hitler's debit and credit did not agree: the expenses were much over the income which gave rise to questions from the tax inspectors. Führer used loans as the explanation; he insisted that he took loans to make purchases. However the sources which he used to discharge the loans are obscure as of today

Let us return to the USSR again. I do not want to describe all the details of the battle between the two communistic leaders. Though such wording is not quite correct. Practically within the frames of one and the same political organization there were two completely different parties. The party aimed at restoration and construction of the new Russia, and the party striving to sacrifice the country to the interests of the world revolution, or if speaking directly to the interests of the West.

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> *Fest, I.* Hitler. V.2. P. 82.

## **Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.**

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.