



“Amerika Über Alles” — Our Nazi Nation

by Captain Eric H. May / October 3rd, 2007

Peter Guenther’s Prologue

The most persuasive anti-Nazi I ever knew was my mentor, Dr. Peter W. Guenther, who believed that Nazism was monstrous at every level. As a professor of humanities, he thought it was both inhumane and inhuman. As a professor of art history he thought its aesthetics were artless histrionics. He readily granted that his intellectual opinions were molded by his personal experiences. As a German veteran of World War II, he regretted the loss of his youth, the waste of his friends’ lives and the devastation that they had inflicted on others. He held Hitler accountable for all of this — after all, it was Hitler who had drafted them into the war. He had served from 1939 to 1945, from Poland to Norway to France to Russia. He once quipped that before every one of their invasions their leaders said they were fighting for national defense, but after the shooting started every soldier on every side believed that he was fighting for his own self-defense.

By the time of the Iraq war he was retired from academe, and I was writing military analysis for media. As US forces began storming up the Euphrates Valley in the spring of 2003, hell-bent on Baghdad, we began to discuss the limited American mobilized manpower and materiel, and the overall limitations of blitz tactics. Guided by his insights, I published a then-radical op-ed in the Houston Chronicle that predicted a quicksand war in Iraq, and maybe a world war as a result of it.

As the easy war promised us by the Bush administration wore on into the summer of 2003, Dr. Guenther and I began to note that there were more similarities between Post-9/11 America and Third Reich Germany than just over-reliance on Blitzkrieg tactics. We finally determined that the two nations were following parallel political courses. Most disturbing for my mentor, who had become a patriotic American citizen after World War II, was the painful conclusion that our American president, with his global war for a New American Century, was just another German fuhrer, with a world war for a Thousand Year Reich. “This is a bad copy of a bad original,” he said.

“Drang Nach Ost” — The Eastern Offensive

George W. Bush came into office with a secret war plan and no excuse to implement it — just as Hitler had come into office in 1933 with the same predicament. Both of them wanted the prize of Middle Eastern oil. In Hitler’s case that meant going through “Judeo-Bolshevik” Russia on the way, while in Bush’s case that meant going through “Islamofascist” Iraq. In Hitler’s case the guiding document was *Mein Kampf*, while in Bush’s case there were two. *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm* was presented to the Israeli government in 1996 by American neocons Douglas Feith, Richard Perle and David Wurmser, among others. *Restructuring America’s Defenses* was presented to the American government in 2000. Its arguments mirrored the Israeli document, and had been drawn up by the neocons as well. In 2001 Feith, Perle and Wurmser became key Bush administration members.

Neither Hitler’s nor Bush’s plans for world dominance could have been pursued without some good luck, though.

Both leaders entered office with over half their nations opposing them, and an avid opposition that wanted to pull them down. Hitler's good luck came with the Reichstag fire, blamed on Jewish Communists, which mobilized his fatherland to rally behind him. Bush's good luck happened on 9/11, blamed on Muslim Fundamentalists, which mobilized his homeland to rally behind him.

In both cases, their followers smiled at their good luck, and began their new order of things. Hitler quickly instituted an Enabling Act for the protection of the German people, slated for expiration in five years, which was quietly continued. Bush quickly instituted a Patriot Act for the protection of the American people, slated for expiration in five years, which was quietly continued. Hitler created the *Geheime Staatspolizei* (Gestapo) to further protect the German people, while Bush created the Homeland Security Agency (Homesecca) to do the same for the American people.

“Führer Prinzip” — The Unitary Executive

Both leaders were believers in the authoritarian concept. A few weeks before assuming office, Bush said outright that he thought dictatorship would be a fine form of government, if he could be the dictator. They both believed that power should come from above and obedience should come from below, and they offered protection in exchange for loyalty. Thus no one was surprised when Hermann Goering made a fortune helping to run Germany, just as no one was surprised when Irving “Scooter” Libby received a pardon for his pro-Bush political crimes in America.

Both leaders supplemented their new security police and security acts with concentration camps such as Dachau and Gitmo, initially designed for only a small percentage of national enemies. Both dispensed with international rules and regulations in their treatment of enemies in those installations, and applied a wide variety of innovative persuasive techniques to extract information and obtain confessions. The lessons learned in these proto-type camps proved to be invaluable in later establishments such as Auschwitz and Abu Ghraib.

Both leaders relied on agreeable legislatures. In Germany the Reichstag cheered enthusiastically as it endorsed the increase in police powers, the reduction in civil rights and the national march to world war. In America Congress did the same things, but in more subdued fashion, even with a show of dissent. In Germany, Hitler declared a dictatorship under Article 48, provided by the old Weimar Constitution for the event of a national emergency. In America Bush recently created National Security Presidential Directive 51 (NSPD 51), thereby legalizing a dictatorship in the event of a national emergency.

“Gott Mit Uns” — God's on Our Side

Neither Hitler nor Bush could have effected their radical plans without a party full of functionaries and a compliant national media, of course. Hitler relied on his “Nazi” party, a word derived from the name of his National Socialist organization. He had a brilliant individual named Joseph Goebbels to control the Reich Propaganda Ministry and rally the public behind Nazi policies. Bush relied on his “Nozi” party, a word derived from “Zionism,” with the first four letters Z-i-o-n remixed into N-o-z-i. He had a brilliant cartel of Zionists to control the American Mainstream Media and rally the public behind Nozi policies.

The greatest accomplishment of both the Nazi and Nozi parties was convincing themselves and their citizens that they were not conspirators of any sort, but rather the victims of an international conspiracy. The Nazi party never tired of saying that Judeo-Communism was the hidden enemy, against which all the powers of a determined fatherland had to be directed, and that they were the targets of anti-German propaganda. The Nozi party never tires of saying that Islamo-Fascism is the hidden enemy, against which all the powers of a determined homeland have to be directed, and that they are the targets of anti-Semitic propaganda.

The rest of the world didn't buy the pro-war propaganda from Germany's Nazis three generations ago, and they don't buy it from America's Nozis three generations later. The way the rest of the world sees it, what we have been

taught to call the axis of evil is not so dangerous to the world as the axis of America and Israel. They see American naval forces massing in the name of national defense against Iran, and they remember Iraq. They see Israeli air forces attacking Syria, and they remember Lebanon. The rest of the world knows who we have become, even if we don't.

Peter Guenther's Epilogue: He died in 2005, and was followed by his wife Andrea six months later. They had been married for 58 years, and had been American citizens for more than 50. For more about my friendship with them, refer to the first and fourth volumes of my 2003 Iraq war correspondence [here](#).

Captain May is a former Army military intelligence and public affairs officer, as well as a former NBC editorial writer. His political and military analyses have appeared in The Wall Street Journal, The Houston Chronicle and Military Intelligence Magazine. He can be reached at: captainmay@prodigy.net. [Read other articles by Captain Eric](#), or [visit Captain Eric's website](#).

This article was posted on Wednesday, October 3rd, 2007 at 5:01 am and is filed under [Military/Militarism](#).

[Send to a friend](#).

6 comments on this article so far ...

anniemal said on October 3rd, 2007 at 4:45 pm #

If you're struggling for social justice (as your banner implies), you should probably look into what Saddam was doing in Iraq. While I do agree that Americans were misled in this war, Saddam was an awful leader who regularly practiced the awful human rights violations that I am sure you are campaigning against. The world is a better place without him and we do have the American military to thank for that. Bush is by far no angel, no politician ever is, but a comparison to Hitler makes the writer look unintelligent. Hitler provided an environment for the mass slaughter of millions based on their ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religion. That can not be compared to the war in Iraq, which is very minuscule in size when compared to all the wars throughout human history or even simply those of the last century.

Brian said on October 3rd, 2007 at 6:52 pm #

We can look back even further than from present 100 years or so and see that Herodotus a 6th century historian pretty much defined how and why everyone goes to war: and explain it well, I have come to believe the the wars in Iraq and Iran and Afghanistan, under the pretext of fighting terrorism, are really not only about the control of oil but about something more insidious.

Drawing on history and ancient history in particular I am reminded of parallels.

Herodotus reminds us that there really are no such things as proxy wars, there only wars between power blocs for control of resources, labor and access to resources; these are supplemented by pride national honor and the will of the gods. In his first chapter he uses the illustration of women being subject to expropriation, later he expands this analysis to include land, olive oil, gold and other objects of man's insatiable desire.

Today as in Hitler's day the material desire is for oil and natural resources.

Importantly he notes that the conflicts in the Greek islands and along Asia Minor were really conflicts between one group of Greeks against another who were supported by Persia. This he would say is an immutable law of warfare- that war only exists between power blocs, the people between them like the islands off Asia minor are only casualties of war- and it is in contrast to Thucydides' "laws" driving the Pelopponesian war which seem wholly immaterial, he says they are based on national honor, pride, etc.

If we were to extrapolate, Herodotus would have us believe that the wars against Iraq, the coming war against Iran and the war against

Afghanistan are about two things: economics and oil and access to both of these and regimes that are favorable to a status quo based on the dollar and the "dollar value" of oil. They are a quest to "reclaim" a national honor lost through the loss of the manufacturing base within the US. They have very little to do with perceived or real threats, because these threats can only come from the power blocs themselves, and the proxy wars are largely the figments of planners whose only risk of seeing blood is if their secretary gets a paper cut.

But if we again extrapolate from Herodotus and his idea that these are not proxy wars, well, what are they? Herodotus would lead us to believe that they are wars directed against Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union as well as China and not against Iran, Iraq or Afghanistan per se. They seek hegemony in the region only in so far as they can capitalize on access to oil, its transport and its value in terms of the dollar. Its transportation in the Caspian, its pipelines across Eurasia, as well as the added bonus of under utilized forests in Siberia and manufacturing potential from the North Pole to the deserts of Uzbekistan. Herodotus knew all of these places from stories, and wrote about them with some detail.

It is interesting to note that in his analysis Herodotus gives two examples of successful resistance to the overwhelming dominance of the Persian military, one in Scythia and one in Greece. In Scythia the battle is won through winter, deception and skill, in Greece through deception baiting and using geography as a weapon. I find both of these examples intriguing on a number of levels.

But I ask, Captian May, how does one prevent overwhelming dominance from taking place? Has it already? Is it not the elites of the G8 who desperately want to pull all the states of the world into line with the Washington Consensus? And since these are all pretty much behind the scenes, how can Americans do anything to stop them from carrying out these suicidal or eugenic type plans?

Greg said on October 3rd, 2007 at 8:23 pm #

I can see where Capt. May is coming from, however if you actually look at the history of the Reichstag fire (<http://www.historyplace.com/worldwar2/riseofhitler/burns.htm>) as seen in the link I have embedded. You will see that it was Hitler's doing, not some other party that caused the Reichstag fire. Now Bush on the other hand did not go telling some secret servicemen to go take over planes in the guise of Islamic extremists and fly them into buildings. Yes he did use this to rally the U.S behind him, but what American who bled red, white and blue wouldn't rally to help that cause?

Many people get this idea that America is becoming a Nazi-like state and I do agree in most ways. However I believe that some of these things must be done, for say the war in Iraq. We may have entered the war fists flying in every direction, but at least we have better intentions for the Iraqi peoples than mass genocide and oppression..

Gerald said on October 3rd, 2007 at 8:40 pm #

Anniemal argues the comparison of Bush to Hitler is unfair because Hitler's evil far surpasses anything for which Bush is responsible.

I say if evil is just a matter of degree... Give the man more time. Remember, folks say he is rather slow.

deang said on October 3rd, 2007 at 9:04 pm #

Claims that the US occupation of Iraq is better than having Hussein there can only be maintained if you overlook the fact that Hussein maintained the infrastructure of the country while the US has destroyed it and refuses to restore it; that Hussein slaughtered, tortured, and imprisoned far fewer people than the US has while in Iraq; that Hussein did not sow his country with cluster bombs, depleted uranium, trigger-happy soldiers, and civil war plots; and that Hussein did not trigger the largest refugee flight in the history of the Middle East. All these things that Hussein did not do the US has done. No wonder most Iraqis want the US out. It would help if the US would undo some of the damage they've done to Iraq, pay reparations, and remove their military a bases as well.

jeff abrahamse said on October 3rd, 2007 at 11:13 pm #

Greg-the war in Iraq was only necessary to secure oil to fuel the empire and to spread yet more military bases around the world to better project American power- this is the project for the new American century (WMDs were the first false reason for this war- saving the Iraqi people was a later excuse so it was not the original intention- besides the Iraqi people could have been spared much of there suffering if previous American governments did not support Hussein in the first place). It has been said a million times before that saving the Iraqi people from a cruel dictator was just one of many rationalizations offered by Bush and company

for the war, but the earlier neocon documents such as those mentioned in the article above were quite clear about the true reasons for this war. If concern for others was the goal of the current American government (or for just about any other American administration for that matter) they would be spending money on bettering the world for purely altruistic reasons rather than offering up phoney excuses to cover up the real motives involved- namely greed and power.

All content © 2007 Dissident Voice and respective authors.