

# 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 unexpected-

edly, 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 Eastern and Western fronts doomed 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.

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>1</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>2</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>3</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.

---

<sup>1</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>2</sup> That is, since the Franco-Prussian War.

<sup>3</sup> *Taylor, A. J. P.* The origins of the Second World War. M., 1995. P. 105.

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>1</sup>.

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?

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, 100 % of crude rubber was imported by the Reich via the USSR. Other materials were imported using the same scheme (those which the war-torn Germany was not able to purchase directly).



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.

*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>1</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>2</sup>.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacobsen, G.-A. 1939–1945. The Second World War. M., 1995. P. 153.

<sup>2</sup> Joachim von Ribbentrop. Memorandum by the State Secretary in the German Foreign Office (Weizsäcker).

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 "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

---

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*).

campaign — not enough to defeat Russia. And why defeat Russia? To be able to defeat Britain afterwards, to be sure<sup>1</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>2</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>3</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

---

<sup>1</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>2</sup> Churchill, W. The Second World War. V. 1. P. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. P. 174.



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 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>1</sup>.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from: Nuremberg Trial Proceedings V. 12, 118<sup>th</sup> 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>

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?**