
From: "JB Campbell" <jb_campbell@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, October 03, 2003 2:07 AM

Subject: More on German trade

- here's a little piece I sent to Ingrid
Rimland the other day:

Ingrid -

John Kaminski sent me a note asking about the banks' opposition to the German barter system.

John -

Lorenz' question about why the bankers were against Germany's method of trade reminds me of the Congressional hearings on the war at about the time of the outbreak of war. General Leonard Wood testified that he had visited with Churchill in, I think, 1938. He said that Churchill told him, "Germany is getting too strong again. We shall have to smash her in another war." Wood asked him, "Wouldn't it be better to try to compete with Germany, rather than go to war?" Churchill said, "No."

Wood didn't know - and nobody would until David Irving's Churchill's War was published in 1989? - that Churchill had by that time been bought off by the Jews, namely by Sir Henry Strakosch, a Czech Jew who was a mining magnate in South Africa. Churchill was broke and had placed an ad in the Times for his ancestral home, Chartwell. Strakosch came to his rescue and paid all his debts, allowing WSC to keep his estate and 40 servants. The deal was that he would take orders from the Anti-Nazi League, which became The Focus, led by Felix Frankfurter and Sir Robert Waley-Cohen, head of Shell Oil in the UK. He was under orders from then on to take England to war against Germany, no matter how reasonable-sounding Hitler might be.

Hitler's financial problem was that the Allies had stolen all of Germany's gold under the criminal terms of the Versailles Treaty. The international bankers controlled all countries by their manipulated gold standard and expected the prostrate Germany to stay on the team, despite having no gold. So Hitler simply took Germany off the gold standard and announced that her economy (and currency and credit) would be based on the productivity of the German worker, and that all must work hard to rise out of the Versailles slave

conditions. He informed the British ambassador that there would be no more "reparations payments," and the envoy huffed, "I shall inform my minister of this!" But nothing was done because they were guilty and had just about strangled the golden goose.

(The French justified their invasion and occupation of the mighty Ruhr Valley industrial center in the '20s for the reason that Germany failed to deliver 250,000 telephone poles as ordered.)

That was how the German economic miracle started. Germany really had no money and was forced to trade high quality capital goods for food. And, just when Hitler was appointed Chancellor, the New York criminal attorney, Samuel Untermyer (the same Jew who blackmailed Wilson into appointing Brandeis to the Supreme Court and later into joining the British in WWI), organized an international boycott of German goods. This hurt, of course, because direct trade was the lifeblood of Germany and this Jewish boycott was a deadly threat. (The German government responded with a one-day boycott of all Jewish merchants in Germany - on a Saturday, April Fool's Day, 1933. Most of the people ignored the boycott.) The idea was to starve the Germans so they would fire Hitler.

But this is the root cause of growing German antipathy towards Jews - the total rip-off of everything and the deliberate, calculated plot to starve them out, all over again! The numbers of Germans who starved to death in post-WWI period are staggering - in the hundreds of thousands. Of course, these numbers would pale in comparison with the 13 million Germans Eisenhower starved to death (including a million PoWs) from 1945-54. (See James Bacque) Some have said to me, "That can't be true! We'd have heard about it! Why didn't the Germans complain about this, if it were true?" I asked them, "Complain to whom? The Americans? The Soviets? The British? The French? - they were all in on it, but it was our program." It was called the Morgenthau Plan, executed by Ike Eisenhower. The Reds were stealing everything from their zone and working millions of captured German soldiers to death in the Gulags.

This program continues but now it's just known as paying "reparations" to the State of Israel, something that did not exist before 1948. This is why it is imperative to keep the Germans guilty in their minds about The Holocaust, so those payments keep coming. (Us, too!)

And, despite 58 years of US occupation and brainwashing, it is amazing that they had the guts to say no to our American psychos on Iraq.

Bruce

25 June 07. Hail Mark! Many thanks for your letter of 21 June 07, with the latest news of your 'social life' in ZOG's gulag. As you indicate, it looks as if your zoggies deem you to be 'special'. I understand the real meaning of STG is "Screw This Goy." That seems to be the only consistency in its application, in particular in the case of White Goyim. In my evaluation of my gulag correspondence, "STG" is applied when one does nothing. Then it is assumed that he is planning to do something. If he defends himself, he is deemed "STG", or "Security Threat Group" when he belongs to no group at all. One zoggie made up a group for an individual. He called it "The White Supremes." I said that sounded like something stolen from Motown Black singers, "The Supremes." I asked the zoggie's victim if he belonged to a White Motown group of singers, but he denied any knowledge of such a group. One zoggie censored a French movie flier about the Christmas Truce of World War I, in which Germans, French & British stopped fighting to celebrate Christmas. The flier showed a French officer shaking hands with a German officer in no man's land, surrounded by their soldiers. The gulag zoggie rejected the flier because it (1) Showed "armed gang members", (2) "Gang gestures", & (3) "Gang garb". At first, I was angry, but then I realized that armies were indeed armed gangs. I was in such a gang myself. We were wearing gang costumes, had weapons, & exchanged gang signs. It was called the U.S. Army. I advised the prisoner to avoid gangs: don't enlist.

I'm pleasantly surprised you could obtain a copy of "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion." I understand that they were issued as a speech by Zionist Herzl before The World Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland, in 1897. Jews have called The Protocols "a forgery," but it is certainly accurate & predictive of jewish behavior & objectives, so it must be the most truthful 'forgery' ever made. We should ask what it "forged", for there must be an original document.

Two jews, Louis Nizer & Quentin Reynolds, forged a version of "Mein Kampf," which was "Mein Kampf" in name only. That was before World War II. Adolf Hitler sued the jew forgers in California. Hitler won the case, so the jews had to recall all copies of their forgery & destroy them, by court order! The USA entered the War in 1941, so Hitler may have won his civil suit as late as 1940, even 1941. Oy veh! My view of The Protocols is that the jews are good at overthrowing states, but they are terrible at running them. Their Soviet Jewnion was an economic basket-case which required food shipments after their genocidal "agrarian reforms" & mismanagement. Israel cannot exist without great amounts of aid from Zionist Occupied Germany & the USA. The tragedy is that jews seem unable to survive without Gentile host peoples. If I were a jew, I'd be scared.

The Protocols outlined how the jews would takeover Russia. They had taken over Britain & the USA long before Russia's 1917 Revolution, so The Protocols did not apply to countries already ruled by jew banksters. Jewish behavior is naturally subversive, so they just do their business as usual. Parasites weaken their hosts, without killing them immediately. If they did that, they'd be unsuccessful parasites.

In regard to the 2nd Amendment, the right to keep & bear arms; as you say, using them is deemed a crime under ZOG, in defence of one's person or property.

The Tri-Lateral Commission is one more Rockefeller jew-bankster front for mischief, like their Council on Foreign Relations & their Bilderbergers.

I don't know any place I've visited which is anything like "the old days," for politics, economics & demographics have changed radically, in a short time. The world is much different now than it was in the 1960s, when my travels really began. In 1966, I travelled by sea from France, to Egypt & then to India, via the Suez Canal. The next year, The Six Day War occurred & The Suez Canal was closed until 1974, if I recall correctly. Africa is going back to the bush, which is becoming deserts under Black misrule. Bandits & pirates are back, big time, so travel is no longer as safe as when I saw the world. Like you, I've felt that I'd be more at home in the 19th or early 20th century. My grandfather would be most at home in our high-tech era, especially since horses gave him asthma. Horses have never bothered me, & I've ridden them for hundreds of miles, along with mules & camels. My father was in the right era, but he was unable to become a professional aviator. He loved to fly, but I prefer other means of travel, of the sort available to my grandfather, who loved everything modern. I'm sure he'd love to fly, as did my father.

I've never been to Australia, but my contacts there say it has changed much for the worse demographically & politically. Still, it would be worth a visit, had I any business to do there. Of course, I might be arrested for thought-crime.

Your name is typically Germanic. I understand that everyone can look up his name & family history on the Internet. All the best, & ORION!

Eric