



Valérie Devon

Presents

# Vincent Reynouard editorials

Einsatzgruppen part 1  
Hitler and the Jewish's war

Sans Concession tv  
Editorials tv

Einsatzgruppen, these mobile military units that, on the East Front from June 1941, would have had as a mission to systematically slaughter Jews. The existence of such killings, which would have caused several hundreds, or even several thousands victims is undeniable. But, with others, I affirm that it was not part in the context, of a systematic massacre of Jews.

I know that here some will say to me: *"Stop! We do not care if these massacres were systematic or not. They exist, that's all we care! Because all these horrors could have been avoided, if Hitler didn't unleash the war. Finally, all the dead from this conflict had to be attributed to the Führer, because it was him who provoked the all thing with his imperialist policy, the invasion of Poland on September 1st, 1939, then the one of USSR in June 1941. So, Hitler is the great culprit, and through him the imperialist nationalism, kneads of racism, xenophobia, and antisemitism, period."*

I've already heard this argument a thousand time.

The first part of this video will refute it, and will tell the reasons why Hitler, thought he had been forced into the war by Jewish organizations. The second part will specifically be devoted, to the Einsatzgruppen actions on the East, in the context of an ideological warfare to the life and to the death.

### **Who provoked the Second World War ?**

Who was the main responsible of the war ? This is a crucial question. as proof take that fragment of Einsatzgruppen trial.

The main defendant was Otto Ohlendorf. He specifically commanded the Einsatzgruppe D.



At the hearing, the prosecution brought the discussion on murdered children on the East. **(TMI, green series, vol.IV, p.356)** The prosecutor told the defendant: *"Will you agree that there was absolutely no rational basis, for killing children except genocide and killing of races?"*

What Ohlendorf replied: *"I believe that it is very simple to explain, if one starts from the fact that this order, [of assignment of Einsatzgruppen], did not only try to achieve security, but also permanent security, because children would have grown up, and surely, being the children of parents would have been killed, they would constitute a danger no smaller than that of the parents."*

Here we find a typical example of a spillover effect, in which an ideological war to death drove you into a war with no rules in addition, like those that took place on the East, where civilian population took part, directly or not, to fights. Ohlendorf's message was the following: *"If we have killed children, it was not for genocide purpose, but because we were embedded in a partisan war where, with the killing of men and women we considered as dangerous, we also have to kill their progeny."*

**(Doc.NO-3028)** This German report gives us a good example. As the German discovered in between two assignments, that partisans, men, and also women, dressed into civilian clothes and mingled with villagers to perform agricultural work, they had destroyed the villages and shot the population.

**(Doc.NO-2909)** Here, women were directly involved in the little war. They attracted drivers in their rooms by offering them their bodies, which allowed accomplices to sabotage vehicles during that time.

**(Doc.NOKW-1156)** There, women and girls act with bands of partisans as nurses or couriers. This example may seem insignificant, but do not forget that this war of partisans was very cruel.

**(Doc.NO-2961)** This German report on the anti-bands warfare demonstrates it. The author wrote: *"In the guerrilla warfare the enemy employs fanatical fighters trained in the communist ideology, who will not shrink from any act of violence. This is now, more than ever, a matter of life and death. This struggle has nothing to do any more with soldierly chivalry, or the regulations of the Geneva Convention"*

The author continued: *"If that war against the bands in the East and in the Balkans, is not waged with the most brutal methods, the available forces will in the near future no longer be sufficient to overcome this plague. For this reason the troops are justified and obliged in this combat to resort to all measures, even against women and children, without leniency, as long as they are successful."*

It is easy today to condemn the Germans for these facts, but it's forgetting what caused them. Otto Ohlendorf underlined the fact that personally, he had never seen children killed by Einsatzgruppen. **(TMI, green série, vol.IV, p.356-357)** The prosecutor retorted him indignantly: *"Are you saying they didn't kill children now?"*

*"I did not say that."* replied the accused, *"May I finish? I attended three mass executions and did not see any children [among the victims], and no command ever searched for children, but I have seen many children killed in this war through air attacks, for the security of other nations, and orders carried out to bomb, no matter whether many children were killed or not."*

The prosecutor asked him if he was referring to the German children killed under Allied bombers, Ohlendorf answered positively, which earned him the following reply: *"Do you try to draw a moral comparison, between the bomber who drop bombs hoping that it will not kill children, and yourself who shot children deliberately ? Is that a fair moral comparison?"*

Ohlendorf replied: *"I cannot imagine that those plane which systematically covered, a city that was fortified city, with incendiaries and explosive bombs, square meters by square meters, and also with phosphorus bombs, and this done from block to block, including the squares where the civilian population had fled to, as I have seen it in Dresden, I cannot imagine that this men could possibly hope, not to kill any civilian population, and no children. And, when you then read the announcements of the Allied leader on this, and we are quit willing to submit them as document, you will read that these killings were accepted quite knowingly, because one believe that only through this terror, as it was described, could demoralized the [German] people, and under such blow the military power of the Germans would then also break down."*

Here again the message was clear. Ohlendorf said: *"You also, in this war to death, have slaughtered children. Therefore why do you blame us since you have done the same?"*



Knowing that they could not contradict him on that last point, the prosecutor had to retreat and admitted : *"Very well, let's concede. I think there is truth in what you say, though I never saw it"* So, he retaliate as followed: *"Does it occur to you that when the German Wehrmacht drove into Poland without provocation, and when you drove into Norway, and when you drove into the Low Countries, and when you crushed France, and when you destroyed Belgrade, Yugoslavia, Greece, when you put Rumania, Bulgaria under you heel, and then attempted to destroyed the Russian State, does it occur to you that people resisting your tyranny, stand on a higher moral level, when they resort to the same horrible cruelties, which you initiated, in order to destroy your tyranny? Answer that, please."*

The prosecutor emerged the perennial argument that can be summarized as: *"Even if what we have done is wrong, we can be forgiven for doing it, because you started the all thing first, so your actions led us to answer by using the same methods."*

Ohlendorf answered: *"You will understand that I look at the events of the war which you referred to in a different way that you do."*

The accused was entering the field of primary responsibility. It's unfortunate that the discussion has stopped here, because we were in the heart of the heart of the problem. So, I'm going to continue this discussion today, starting with a first comment.

From the events of Norway, the entire operations mentioned by the prosecutor, was the development of a war that had spread, because of the strategic initiatives, and counter initiatives, adopted by each camp. In fact, everything had started with the invasion of Poland by Germans troops on September 1st, 1939. Therefore the question is the following: Who made this invasion unavoidable? In other word: who made the 2nd World War unavoidable?

Since 1939 the answer is: "Germany did, Hitler did!" But, as I have already demonstrate that fact a multiple times, It is England which, by its underground maneuvers, caused the invasion of Poland. England was thus the main aggressor. Because, as it was written by a specialist in international law from the 19th century, the real aggressor is not the one who attack first, but the one that led the war unavoidable.

Here, some will answered that democracies had enough with Germans claims and acts of force, so it was imperative to stop Hitler's imperialism. I would object them that in that folder, democracies feelings don't need to be considered. The only important issues are the followings: Did, Germans claims about Polish corridor, and about the city of Dantzig, were legitimates?



What were England's actions during the tentative to solved the German-Polish conflict?

Perhaps, some will object to me that it's impossible to judge each other's guilt, only by focusing on Poland's events from September 1939. But, the fact that in the Ohlendorf's trial, the prosecutor asked the crucial question about primary responsibilities, starting by denouncing this point proves the opposite. Each other's guilt can only be judged by objectively studying, the sequence of events that occurred between August 22nd, and September 5th, 1939.

On that subject, I've already answered by demonstrating the frightful guilt of England. But, let's just suppose, yes.

Let's expand the debate. You say: "*Invasion of Poland was Hitler's fault.*" and: "*Anyway, democracies was sick of Hitler's acts of force.*" Ok, for now, let's say your right. But, why did Hitler emerged? And above all, Why did such an uncompromising Hitler in exterior policy emerged?



The answer to the first question is obvious, Hitler was the product of the Treaty of Versailles, This drawing published before 1933 illustrated this fact with intelligence and brightness. So, if we want to study the distant responsibilities of the 2nd World War, we must first go back to the years 1918-1919, when the Treaty of Versailles was written, discussed and imposed to Germany.

In a book published in 1920, The senator Raphaël-Georges Levy, describes the peace of 1919, as a "*Fair Peace*". Among the 440 articles from the Treaty of Versailles, he could not see a single one, that could have possibly led to a desire for revenge, therefore the winners had nothing to fear from a free debate.

But, at the Nuremberg's Trial, (TMI, vol.X,p.99) all discussions about the validity of the Treaty of Versailles, and the fact that it was imposed by force to Germany, were forbidden. All documents filed by the defense were rejected without examination.

This was an obvious confession. Far from being fair, The peace treaties of Versailles and Trianon were full of war promises. Therefore, only sincere revisions could have calmed the defeated by restoring him some hope. This have not been done or not enough. Consequently: Hitler emerged.

At Nuremberg, (TMI,vol.IX,p.470) Herman Göring underlined that many Germans had voted for the National Socialist Party, because they wanted the Treaty of Versailles to be revised, A revision that the weakness of Germany at the time, and inflexibility of some, made impossible.

But Versailles was not the only treaty in question. The peace of 1919 was set by several treaties signed in 1919. I think more especially about the Treaty of St Germain, that have fixed Austria's fate, and the one of Trianon, that have fixed the one of Hungaria.



Therefore Hitler was elected among other things, to liquidate the treaties of Versailles, St Germain, and Trianon, that had ripped off from Germany, lands that were authentically Germans, and had taken to Austria-Hungaria every hope of a national rebirth. This chart summarizes what the Versailles Treaty had taken to Germany in terms of population, wealth basement, industry and agriculture.

Losses were considerable, leaving Germany fatally weakened. Hungary for its part was totally mutilated, even dismembered, In the name of a principle of nationalities with many variables geometries.



Here is what would have remain of France, if she had been butchered like Hungary at the end of a lost war.

Its butchering had allowed to create Czecho-Slovakia, an artificial entity populated by, nearly 1/4 of Germans, added to 1/5th of Hungarians, but also Russians, Jews, and Polish, concentrated in the region of Teschen. And for Austria, it remains as a rump states, inhabited by 6 millions occupants, with one third agglomerated in just one city: Vienna. Early as November 1918, this country without any future had claimed to be reattached to the Reich, **(Georges Champeaux, la croisade des démocraties, vol.I,1941)** In April and May 1921, two referendums organized in two Austrian regions: the Tyrol and the Salzburg, had resulted in 99% of favorables votes for the reattachment to the Reich, but the consultation was interrupted because the Treaty of Versailles required independence of the country.

Yes, really, the so called peace of 1919, was full of future conflicts. The 10th of July 1921, during the debates on the Treaty of Trianon's ratification, **(J.O.,sénat, 11 juillet 1921,p.1697)** Anatole de Monsie recalled the opinion of two British military. The first one argued that the text was creating half a dozen Alsaces-Lorraines, and the second that this sharing contains the germ of a new war. If some wanted to avoid the war, it would have been necessary to repair the flagrant injustices in making the necessary revision. Hitler undertook to make it happen. Until 1938, despite the adversaries unwillingness, and especially the unwillingness of France, The Fürher manage to achieve its objectives in a peaceful way. On September 1938, the Munich's conference, helped to peacefully solved the problem of Germans, Hungarians, and Polish minorities in Czechoslovakia. The German minority of the Sudeten returned to the Reich; the region of Teschen to the Poland; and many regions from the south to the Hungary.

The case had not been easy to solved, and after the borders revision, 480 000 Germans from the Sudeten stayed on the Slovakian territory, while 680 000 Czechs were becoming Germans subjects. On that time, Europe was so close to the war that, if Hitler really wanted the war, he would have obtain the war.

For example, he just had to support Hungary which, in November 1938, threatened to invade South Carpathian Ukraine that she claimed to be hers. However, an energetic telegram



(Documents of German Foreign Policy, série D, vol. IV, p. 159) from the 21st of November, sent by the German's Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Hungary, allowed to avoid the disaster. This document is really important, because it demonstrated the German's willingness for peace. The Third Reich wanted to avoid the war for two reasons.

In 1938, the Führer succeeded to rehabilitate Germany, and to make with this country left bled dry, a social success model. It is not for nothing that in National-Socialism, there is the word: Socialism. Interviewed much later by a Britannic journalist, a Goebbels' relative, to whom it was asked to summarize in one word his experience of Hitler's Germany, pronounced the word: "Paradise".

In his pamphlet published in 1938 (*L'école des cadavres*), Louis-Ferdinand Céline wrote: *"Fascists states don't want the war, they have nothing to win in a war. Everything to loose. If the peace could last three or four years more, all states in Europe will turn fascists, quite simply, spontaneously. Why? Because fascists' states realized right in front our eyes, between Aryans, without gold, without Jews, without Freemasons, this famous socialist program, the one that kikes and communists are always mouthful and never realize."*

Céline was wrong on the willingness he attributed to all European's states, but he was right on two points: Fascists states had realized the socialist program, and Hitler didn't want to compromise that success, into a military adventure even more crazy than Germany wasn't ready for it.

Because, yes, military speaking, and despite Hitler's words during a conference with a Slovak representative, the Third Reich was not ready to assume a war. Of course, everyone knows that kind of pictures that could presuppose an irresistible strike force, but, if it's still possible to exhibit men in uniforms and some pieces of armaments, the reality is sometimes more cruel.



The 4th of June 1946 in Nuremberg, **(TMI,vol.XV,p.349-350)** The General Jodl underline that, the first tranche of German rearmament, won't be finished until 1942-1943. He reminded that in 1935, Germany have 36 divisions to oppose the 90 that could align, in peacetime, France, Poland and Czechoslovakia, a number that could rise to 190 in case of war.

Three years later, Even if the situation was going better for the German side, Germany wasn't ready so far. In Nuremberg, **(TMI,volX,p.427)** General Keitel reminded it, underlining the fact that at the time, Germany would not even had the military necessary means, to cross the fortified borders of Czechoslovakia. That's why in 1938, Hitler made every efforts to solved pacifically the Czechoslovakian problem.

Still today, Munich's Conference is seen as Hitler's diplomatic victory founded on threatening. In reality, the Conference of Munich had solved nothing, and I affirm that, it is finally what cause Hitler's lost.

Let me explain myself: After the Sudeten returned to the Reich, the Führer that had solely renounced to the Alsace-Lorraine, had just one last territorial claim, It was about the Corridor, this strip of land that in 1919, had been torn away from Germany, to give the recreated Poland an access to the sea. Until 1919, Germany was thus cut in two parts, with Upper Silesia that was now detached from motherland. Almost as if the region Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, was separated from France by a corridor that gives Switzerland an access to the sea. This corridor was the most glaring injustice from the Treaty of Versailles, and could offer hopes for amicable resolution but here is the problem: Untill 1933, Germany had vainly tried to shake the yoke of Versailles. Hitler only succeeded with a very firm diplomacy, and on many aspects, quite an adventurous one. Just remember Rhineland rearmament. Hitler was therefore convinced that at the slightest retraction, he could loose all his prestige, and could not obtain anything at all anymore. But if he succeed to obtain everything he wanted, without a war, It was also thanks to the goodwill of the Great Britain.

I especially think about Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain that, on September 15th, 1938, for example, had accepted to discuss with Hitler in Berlin, in the middle of the Czechs crisis. From the beginning of that interview, **(Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945, série D,vol.II,p.786)** Chamberlain keen to stressed his action in favor of the Anglo-German rapprochement. England which was on that time a major power of the Occidental Europe, its kindness had allowed the Führer to revise many injustices from the peace of 1919. But the following of events would cause the reversal of the situation.

Munich's crisis had left Czechoslovakia, divided into three majors entities, that were technically and culturally distinct: Boheme-Moravia, a mostly Czechs territory, with a strong German minority; Slovakia; And South Carpathian Ukraine.

Knowing that time was on claims based on nationalities principles, the survival of this artificial entity was more than doubtful. In England however, Nevil Chamberlain had toiled to gain acceptance of the Munich's agreement. A disintegration of Czechoslovakia, would have

finally cause the loss of, either the political character as Herman Göring feared, at least his benevolent policy. And this is what happened.

Weakened by the Sudeten affair, Czechoslovakia started to fall apart. In December 1938, the German's deputy of the Sudeten, Ernzt Kuntz, warned Berlin, that the German minority in that country was living a very difficult situation, mostly due to the constant Czechs critics. This information was not a scoop properly speaking but the author insisted. That's why, after addressing to the army a first directive (**Nuremberg Document 136-C**), for a possible entry into Czechoslovakia, Hitler transmitted a second one (**Nuremberg Document 138-C**), on December 17th, 1938, that complemented the first one.

Here, some will cry out: *"So, you see quite well that Hitler wished to unleash a military operation against Czechoslovakia!"* Really? but, I must remind you that on the 4th of December 1941, the American press revealed the existence of the President Roosevelt's secret plan, to unleashing war against Germany in Europe.



Does this simple fact turned Roosevelt into a criminal against the peace? of course not. Every state's leader have the duty to deal with every eventualities. So did Hitler for Czechoslovakia, which was not the proof of an aggressive intent. But the Führer didn't want to let a situation rot that could have caused a conflict. On January 21st, 1939, He metted his Czech's homologue, and gave him a speech devoid of any ambiguity. Underlining that Czechoslovakia, wasn't a major nation anymore, that she could no longer pretend, to have the policy of a major nation, and that her future was for now, into the Reich economic orbit. An orbit that, to the condition of a voluntarily entrance, would allow her to have her share.

Some could be shocked by such language. But it was the one of a state's leader mindful to avoid any complications, on one corner of a continent whose instability threatened to escalate. Besides, if it would be vain to deny relationships, between the Reich and some separatist forces in his neighbor, documents tends to demonstrate that (**Documents on German Foreign**

**Policy, ser.D,vol.VI,doc.n°159**), at the end of January 1939, Germany was calmly waiting to appreciate the evolution of the situation.

On January 30th, 1939, by the way, in his famous speech where some only retains the small passage about the Jews, Hitler affirmed his hope that Czechoslovakia, could find a satisfactory balance. And when, on the following February 12th, (**memorandum of the conversation between V.Tuka and Hitler 12 février 1939**), the Slovakian leader, Vojtech Tuka, told the Führer that Slovakian destiny, was in the Führer's hands Hitler was careful about not to give him, or even to promise him, a concrete help. He confined itself to say that he would see as a good thing an independent Slovakia, and ended the interview. Briefly, the Führer didn't want to directly intervene in the affairs of this country.

Two weeks later, in a verbal note to the French ambassador (**Note to the Embassy of France , February 28, 1939, doc.n°175**), Germany reaffirmed that she was observing, and was awaiting for further events. Hypocrisy? Absolutely not. Because documents amply demonstrate that fact.

On that time, the Czechoslovakians chancellor was acting, in order to satisfy the Führer and initiate a rapprochement policy with the Reich. Everything was still possible and the Reich had no intention to rush things. But Slovakia, manifested each day more her desire of independence. Starting from early March, negotiations took place between the Czechs central government, and Slovakians leaders. Czechoslovakia was creaking in her middle. Sometimes violent disorders broke out, in the regions of German minority, and in South Carpathian Rhotenia.

Two days later however, answering to his Italian ally, Germany repeated, that she was just observing, even if she was ready to all eventuality. That eventuality was the entrance of Germans troops in the case of an ultimatum.

On March the 11th, The Slovakian government addressed an appeal to Germany. Today, some declares that this appeal was sent with the Reich complicity. It's possible, but Czechoslovakia was falling apart, causing an international situation that threatened to degenerate. On the borders, Polish and Hungarians armies was also mobilized, ready to intervene. The situation was becoming very dangerous.

On March the 13th, Hitler's told again to Tiso (**Document of German Foreign Policy, n°202,p.243**), that he was supporting Slovakia in her struggle for independence, but that he didn't want of that country that never was German, and had never became part of Germany. Still to that date (**doc. N°205,p.247**), the Führer was hesitating on the decision to take. He urgently recalled Göring that was in San Remo, but on March the 13th and the 14th, the Czechs President, Hácha, asked to meet Hitler.

On the very same day just before four o'clock in the morning. South Carpathian Ukraine, proclaimed her independence under the Reich protection. Soon after, the Slovakian diet, also proclaimed her independence. The situation could end in anarchy, even into a civil war and, fatally, into a war itself. Therefore it was necessary to act.

On March the 15th finally, the new Czechoslovakians president, Hácha, met the Führer to the Reich chancellery. Hácha underlined that for a long time, he was certain of the impossibility, for all nationalities that were in Czechoslovakia, to live peacefully together. Adopting the same discourse that the Slovakian leader, he exposed his conviction, which was that Slovakian's destiny, was now into the Führer's hands.

The following is known. In order to conjure any danger of civil or international war, in the hours that followed the meeting, Germans troops crossed the Czechoslovakians border.



Slovakia became an independent state, and Bohem-Moravia a German protectorate. The artificial entity made by the victors of 1918 had passed away. But in France and in England it was the consternation. The craziest rumors were spreading.

The French's ambassador in Berlin reported to his government a narrative of the Hácha-Hitler meeting (**Le Livre Jaune Français, 1939, doc.77,p.100-101**), that he claimed holding from a trustworthy person, and was talking about an Hácha and his chancellor, that would have resist during hours to the intolerable German pressure, while the meeting only last one hours, that they would have literally been pursued around the table by Hitler and his ministers, to put in their hands a pen by force and make them sign the agreement. briefly, a real tragicomic scene.

More serious however. In Great Britain, Czechs crisis epilogue, definitely ruined the conciliation policy lead as best he could by Chamberlain, and against the warmongers from the Churchill-Duff Cooper's clan.

On March the 15th, the English ambassador in Berlin had signaled (**doc.n°244,p.281**), that Anglo-German relationships were back to a far most anterior state, that is to say, from a time of great distrust and hostility. Two days later, Chamberlain pronounced a really firm speech against German policy, a speech that could have been told by Churchill or Duff Cooper. But in reality, the reversal of Britannic policy was anterior.

From January 3rd of 1939, the German ambassador in Ireland, had a confidential talking with the Irish Prime Minister. This one was categorical. In England the prevalent feeling was that Munich agreements were a defeat for the country. Therefore, it was feared that in the event of a new international crisis, a repetition of Munich would be impossible.

Hitler had thus to deal with the Polish Corridor's case, in a really, really, unfavorable atmosphere.

Moreover, Poland was resurrected in 1919, and a strong nationalistic feeling inhabit her. A feeling often tinted with germanophobia by the way. So, in that case, Hitler's political willingness, convinced, by reason, of his good rights on Poland, and also convinced that he could not retreat without loosing all his prestige and so, all chances to obtain something anymore. This willingness as i said, will hurts the Polish nationalistic feelings, mixed with Britannic intransigence. According to all probabilities, the Führer knew it.


That's why, to achieve more surely to a peaceful solution, Hitler made and offer that would cause the effect of a bomb.

On January 6, 1939, by the intermediary of his Minister of Foreign Affairs, he made understand to Poland that he renounced to the Corridor (**Excerpts from the German White Book, doc.n°18,p.62**). All that he wanted, was the return of Dantzig to the Reich, a motorway, and a railroad, that would cross the Corridor, to link Germany and Higher Silesia.

Becoming from Hitler this renunciation to lands that were authentically German, was totally unexpected. and demonstrated his willingness to reach a negotiated solution. But, without any surprise, Poland stayed evasive.

Then came a real important event.

On January the 14th, the Polish ambassador in Washington, had long interview with the American ambassador in Paris. This one returned to France with the President Roosevelt's secret directives.



With many others, the document that reported this interview, got naturally rejected in Nuremberg when the defense presented it. The victors of 1945 would have liked if this document came to disappear, but copies have been published.

Thus, here was the President Roosevelt directives:

1) Activation of the foreign policy under the direction of President Roosevelt, that energetically and clearly condemned totalitarians states.

2) American war preparatives on sea ; on land ; and in the air. Preparatives executed to an accelerated rate, and swallowing up the sum of 1,250 millions of dollars.

3) The President's formal opinion that England and France, must stop any compromise policy with totalitarian states. They can't engage with them any discussions with the aim of territorial modifications of any kind.

4) The moral insurance that United States renounced to isolation policy, and are ready, in case of a war, to actively intervene on the side of England and France. America intends to furnish to their disposal all its financial resources, and all its raw materials.

The impact that communication made on Polish government. quickly reflected on the facts. The 4th of February 1939 (**Le Livre Jaune Français,p.59**), Poland announced to her French ally, that she categorically refused to accept the establishing of a "*corridor in the Corridor*", neither to ear about the construction of a railway road that would belong to Germany, nor about a motorway having an extraterritorial function.

As for the returned of the German city of Dantzig, to the Reich, it was also out of question. And when the 26th of March 1939, the German Minister of Foreign Affairs repeated (**Doc n°38,p.92**), to the Polish ambassador, the German's proposals, this one answered that: "*he had the unpleasant duty to point out that, all pursuits of those Germans projects, especially for the return of Dantzig to the Reich, would signify a war with the Poland.*"

One accused today the Reich to have led a firm diplomacy, but it was nothing compared to the insolent Poland. How to explain this categorical refusal of German willingness, Yet so unexpected, as moderate they were? And how to explain this warmongers language while, obviously, the little Poland was no size to confront her bigger neighbor.

It's simply because two days before, England had offered its unconditional assistance, to Poland in the case of an exterior crisis. (**Les relations polono-allemandes et polono-soviétique 1933-1939, recueil de documents officiels, Flammarion 1910,p.98**) This fact was kept secret during one week.

But on March the 31st, in a declaration in the House of Commons Chamberlain stated: "*In the case of any action, clearly endangering Polish independence, and to which Polish government will estimate as its vital interest to resist with its national forces, the government of her Majesty, will consider itself, as being liable to immediately support Poland by any means.*"

We thus understand the Polish intransigences and blustering. Opposed to all diplomatics retreat, Hitler however persisted in the pacific way (**TMI,vol.XV,p.350**). Cause on that time, Germany could destroy Poland alone. But she would have been unable to repel an attack, operated by the hundred divisions that in case of war, France and Great Britain could have launch against the Reich.

In April 1939, Hitler said to his generals: "*I would be an idiot if I would drift into a world war,*" "*on account of the lousy Corridor question as the fool of 1914 did.*"

But his will to obtain an entente at all cost, faced the Polish intransigence, strongly supported by Britannic warranty.

That's why, on the 23rd of August 1939, operating an ideological flip, Hitler signed with Stalin a non-aggression pact.



The day before the pact's signature, speaking to his generals, Hitler claimed (**Doc PS-798**) to be convinced that Great Britain, will refuse to enter into a war before two or three years. The Führer was naturally counting on the new situation.

Undoubtedly supported by his Minister of Foreign Affairs, even though he contested that fact on his memory, he estimated as certain that without the Russian support, and without the deceased Czechoslovakia, England would not dare to intervene in the German-Polish dispute. Consequently, facing the Poland inflexibility blinded by England warranty, On September 1st, 1939, Hitler choose to solved that dispute through military means. He hoped that the conflict will remain localized as for example, the Russian-Polish war of 1920. It was the only kind of conflict that didn't mortgaged the future of the national-socialistic revolution.

But two days later "bam-bang-crack", Contrarily to Germans hopes, Great Britain, then France, declared war to the Reich.

That news petrified Hitler with horror, whom, after remaining stunned a little while, threw furiously to his Minister of Foreign policy: *"And now?!"* This comment betrayed Fürher's disarray, who was now in a dangerous and impressible situation, into a war against two country that could destroy him. In the Chancellery anti-chamber, national-socialists that came for news, did not rejoice, quite the contrary, Hitler's interpreter wrote: *"a deep silence felled, Gøring turned him self toward me and said: If we loose that war may the heaven have mercy*



on us! Gæbbels was on a corner, dejected, withdraw within himself; Everywhere I looked were dismayed faces, Even the most modest members of the Parti that were in this room."

Is this really the reaction of men that were conspiring to unleash a war of revenge? Certainly not. It can never been said enough, in 1939, Germany did not want to unleash a war on the West.

As I've already explained else where, in an ultimate tentative to save the peace of the world, Hitler rallied Mussolini's mediation offer, which at the beginning of September, wanted to renew, in extremis, the Munich diplomatic feat, to peacefully solved the German-Polish conflict. But as it was expected by the Irish Prime Minister, England didn't want of a new Munich anymore. Therefore on the height of cynicism, England formulated unacceptable exigences, that she knew they would scupper the project, without being publicly shown as responsible for that failure. Please note the confession. Britannic government knew that Hitler wanted to solve German-Polish conflict without fighting, which mean peacefully. A bit of goodwill would thus be sufficient, to overcome the crisis without bloodshed.

Attacked on two fronts, Poland military collapsed in less that four weeks.

On October 6th, 1939, Hitler reached out his hand to France and England, for a large conference to be convened, and could solved the last major European problems, born from the peace of 1919, and establish the preliminary basis of an international cooperation.

**Freiburger Zeitung**  
und Wirtschaftsblatt  
Die große Heimatzeitung Oberbadens

156. Jahrgang Samstag, 7. Oktober 1939 Nummer 274

**Die große Rede des Führers in der historischen Reichstagsitzung am 6. Oktober 1939**

**Europa steht am Scheideweg!**

Der Führer zeigt die letzte Möglichkeit zu Friede und dauernder Verständigung — Die Neuordnung im osteuropäischen Raum — Konstruktive Vorschläge für die zukünftige Zusammenarbeit der Völker — Das heroische Beispiel des deutschen Soldaten

But England pushed back the offer without even an examination. Sooner after, France made the same, Yes, really. Democracies wanted the war. And why did they wanted it?


Few month later, Winston Churchill will reveal the reason. It was about defeat and destroy national-socialist regime. Thus, it obviously was an ideological war. A war to the death, a crusade made by democracies, to annihilate the Third Reich. Poland only was a pretext as the future will demonstrate by the way.

Despite of this, On July the 19th, 1940, once more time, Hitler gave once again his hand to England, for that war to cease and as he said, had absolutely no meanings anymore. On the

last minutes of his lecture, the Führer launched: *"I had no will to make the war, but to build a social states of the highest cultural level, Each more years added to that war, robbed me from that task"*

So, once more time Hitler addressed a call to the Britannic good sens, but, with no any surprise, this last one rejected once more time the offer. It was thus a war to the death, an ideological extermination war. The Führer was now certain of it.

Except that, in my video: *"Why does Hitler was antisemitic?"* I have explained the reasons of the Führer's anti-Judaism. Today, I add this document coming from Britannic archives, which I expected to have the original before quoting it.



This is a report that on the 28th of March 1933, the Britannic ambassador addressed to his government. It was written: *"Before that Hitlerite government took office on February, the Jewish problem in Germany was admittedly becoming a serious one."*

To explain this, the author invoked the *"racial superiority of the Jews,"* and the fact that *"on an artistic and intellectual sens, the average German, was inferior to the Jew."* Hence for the fact that *"the achievement of the Jews, are entirely out of proportion to their numbers. In a country where they hardly amount 2% of the population, they have practically monopolized some professions, among them: the teaching professions, medicine, the law, the press, imaginative literature, and architecture"* the ambassador underlined that: *"numbers of the leaders of the left parties were Jews,"* he spoke unflinchingly of their link with Bolshevism, and noted that *"Jewish press had always been internationalist rather than nationalist."* as for the *"Jewish recent literature" that was entirely "anti-German" or "at any rate non German."* Therefore we understand why the Jew was considered in Germany as an enemy.


However, Germans had not forget that early as 1933, powerful Jewish organizations had declared the war to the Reich.



An economic warfare in a first time, but still a war. Therefore, didn't these powerful associations bear an heavily responsibility, in the ideological crusade democracies were engaging?

Hitler for his part firmly believed it so, and he was not the only one. During the Csech crisis, the Czechoslovakian chancelor clearly declared (**Documents on German Foreign Policy, ser.D,vollV,p.193**) to him that in his country, *"the enemies of Germany were not Nationalists or chauvinists, but the Marxist and the Communists, who were trained by the Jews."*

Few month later, A really accusingly document felled into Germans hand. it was a report from the Polish ambassador in Washington, addressed to the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs.



The ambassador wrote: *"The states of mind, that actually reign in the United States is characterized by, a constantly rising hatred of fascism, particularly oriented on the person of the Chancellor Hitler, and above all, on every aspect that refers to national-socialism. Propaganda is mainly into the hand of the Jews. Radio, cinema, press and periodicals, belong to them at almost one hundred percents."*

May be that was exaggerated, But I note that, in his Journal, the great aviator Charles Lindbergh wrote: *"There is in the United, so many people that are so angry against Germany, that they wish a war. They will oppose on every single agreements between France and Germany what ever they might be, The Jews will used their influence in that last direction."*

August 23rd of 1939, he noted: *"The Jewish influence in our press, on the radio and in our movies is worrying us."*

In September 1941, he underlined that: *"the importance of the Jewish influence that drive this country into the war."*

Thus we better understand why Hitler spoke about a Jewish war, and saw in the Jewish people a decidedly hostile group. However, in the East, The Jews can be counted by millions. For now, the non-aggression pact was respected, but by the end of France campaign, the first cracklings were going to happen. USSR invasion on June 22nd, 1941, and Einsatzgruppen's arrival was not far.

It will be the object of the second part.

Bonsoir.