NOTES

The Reichstag fire did not play a "decisive role in the Nazis' seizure of power." The Reichstag fire was simply exploited by Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering for propaganda purposes, but this exploitation was not premeditated – it was *ad hoc*. This is why the Nazis' exploitation of this event backfired on them, especially Goering. It was *not* planned. Hitler and Goering overestimated the situation and gave it far more importance than it actually had. Goebbels realized this sooner than the others, since he had to smooth over the silliness about this "long-awaited communist uprising" in the *Voelkischer Beobachter*. Van der Lubbe acted on his own, likely with the blessing of LICA and Moro Giafferi (Ingrid Weckert explores this circumstantial hypothesis in her book, *Flashpoint!*). There is no evidence that the SA started the fires or that van der Lubbe was a patsy of the NSDAP. Fritz Tobias and H. W. Koch investigated the Reichstag fire in the most intensive detail imaginable, and they came to completely different conclusions based on the evidence and the trial of van der Lubbe. The Jewish-Communist "Black Book" is where all these rumors come from. They are all baseless. Koch and Tobias both exposed this. The fire hurt the image of the Nazis for the very reason that it *looked* like they were behind it. The communists benefited from the fire at least as much as the Nazis did.

KPD members and SPD members were put into SS/SA-run concentration camps *before* the fire. The fire is therefore superfluous, in this respect. Average German workers were not arbitrarily put into concentration camps, regardless of their political affiliations. (Party members of the KPD and SPD, as well as Freemasons, were the primary – almost exclusive – victims of the Enabling Act that eventually came to pass.) This is a baseless claim by the author. Hitler was already appointed chancellor, as the author himself points out, so there was no need for the fire. Hitler needed the elections to happen as quickly as possible to solidify his power. The fire threatened to *delay* or even *cancel* the elections – the *opposite* of what Hitler needed and wanted. Hitler did not want martial law, as this might have threatened the elections. The fire did nothing to help Hitler get the votes he needed in the elections, *post facto*. He had the necessary support without the fire and consolidated his power by a wide margin. And, as H. W. Koch proves with evidence, the Enabling Act was happening regardless of the fire. Everyone knew this and effectively approved when they gave Hitler their votes. They all had a very clear idea of what Hitler in power would mean in practice. At any rate, Van der Lubbe was asked by the court to reenact his movements the day he set the fire in the Reichstag building, and he was able to

complete the routine in the exact manner as it happened with ease. Van der Lubbe had set multiple fires at various other locations in Germany that day, which were seen by bystanders and put out before they got out of hand. None of these *other* fires have ever been used against the Nazis. Why not? Hett says "the most likely" version, but this is conjecture on his part. Just because one "incendiary torch" did not ignite does not mean that van der Lubbe did not set the fire. I'm not sure what the relevance of that is supposed to be. Are we supposed to believe that the SA men who allegedly set the fire were stupid enough to leave behind implicating evidence? Did they not have a "secret tunnel" in which to hide such evidence?

That master race section is pure bunk. Himmler stated in his unpublished Posen speech – and I am paraphrasing here – that "we Germans operate between the extremes of supremacy and tolerance." I cover this in detail in *Black Nazis* and *hitler & himmler UNCENSORED*. *Herrenvolk* does not mean "master race". Its closest English equivalent is the concept of "white man's burden." Himmler did make those anti-tank ditch comments in a different speech at Posen (easily found online), but the author does not consider the context at all. The German soldier was being asked to fight a ruthless, staunch enemy in communism, so the German soldier had to 'steel himself' against sentimentality as much as possible. This is one of *those* speeches. It was typical wartime propaganda – *in order to save our people, we have to be more caring towards our own than towards these others*. Israel's wartime verbiage in 2023 is at least as harsh as, -- if not harsher than -- Himmler's was back in 1943. I can add that Himmler apologized to General Vlasov for *The Subhuman* pamphlet. He said that the pamphlet was not as much about race as it was about calling out a criminal, degenerate human type that resulted from Bolshevism.

The oil part is mostly correct, but I'm not sure why it matters. What is the author's point? The Axis got oil from Russia and Mexico, as well. The US was absolutely involved in the war before Pearl Harbor. The US was helping Britain in various roundabout ways and provoking Japan in embargo-type ways. This is what provoked the Japanese attack in the first place. If the author is trying to demonize the US, well, he has no need. The US was as guilty of warmongering as everyone else in that war. Britain was, as *The Union Jackal* demonstrates, the worst of all the players. And the Russians were the most ruthless.